

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Communication ETDs

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

11-29-1972

A State-Wide Survey of Public Opinions Toward the University of New Mexico

Hilary H. Horan

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/cj_etds



Part of the Journalism Studies Commons

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87106

POLICY ON USE OF THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Unpublished theses and dissertations accepted for master's and doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of New Mexico Library are open to the public for inspection and reference work. *They are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors.* The work of other authors should always be given full credit. Avoid quoting in amounts, over and beyond scholarly needs, such as might impair or destroy the property rights and financial benefits of another author.

To afford reasonable safeguards to authors, and consistent with the above principles, anyone quoting from theses and dissertations must observe the following conditions:

1. Direct quotations during the first two years after completion may be made only with the written permission of the author.
2. After a lapse of two years, theses and dissertations may be quoted without specific prior permission in works of original scholarship provided appropriate credit is given in the case of each quotation.
3. Quotations that are complete units in themselves (e.g., complete chapters or sections) in whatever form they may be reproduced and quotations of whatever length presented as primary material for their own sake (as in anthologies or books of readings) ALWAYS require consent of the authors.
4. The quoting author is responsible for determining "fair use" of material he uses.

This thesis/dissertation by Hilary H. Horan has been used by the following persons whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above conditions. (A library which borrows this thesis/dissertation for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.)

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE

<u>C. Lister</u>	<u>W. J. Allen</u>	<u>3-25-79</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

This thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of The University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

A STATE-WIDE SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINIONS
TOWARD THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Title

HILARY H. HORAN

Candidate

SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Department

Wayne R. Moellenberg

Dean

Nov. 29, 1972

Date

Committee

Gerald Goldhaber

Chairman

Jesse E. Price

Lawrence R. Koenig

A STATE-WIDE SURVEY OF PUBLIC
OPINIONS TOWARD THE UNIVERSITY
OF NEW MEXICO

BY

HILARY H. HORAN

B.A., Loyola of Montreal

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
December, 1972

638966

LD
3781
05631478
cop. 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Very grateful appreciation is extended to all of the related sponsors of this study. I would like to thank Dr. Sherman Smith, Dr. Lee Zink, Mr. Reese Smith, and Mr. Jess Price for their financial support and assistance in conducting this survey. I am deeply indebted to Drs. Gerald Goldhaber and Lawrence Rosenfeld for their very close supervision and direction throughout the study. I thank them for their patience and instruction.

A STATE-WIDE SURVEY OF PUBLIC
OPINIONS TOWARD THE UNIVERSITY
OF NEW MEXICO

BY

Hilary H. Horan
B.A., Loyola of Montreal

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

December, 1972

ABSTRACT

This field study was a survey designed to collect and analyze data regarding the public's opinion of the University of New Mexico. The first of its kind at U.N.M., it constructed a channel of feedback from the public to the University. The information obtained by the study establishes a base for expected responses of subsequent studies. This study measured existing attitudes in relation to demographic data.

A mail questionnaire was sent to a stratified random sample of 3000 derived from each of New Mexico's thirty-two counties' voting lists. The questionnaire incorporated several types of scales which were coded for computer data analysis. The computer program used was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. A chi square analysis was performed on each of the cross tabulations.

The method employed for data collection was the mail questionnaire. The instrument was composed of scaled forms of the research questions listed above. The questions were demographic, informational and attitudinal in nature. These questions were important in establishing representativeness of the sample to the population and in analyzing the opinions of the different factions of the population on the basis of age, sex, locale of residence, etc.

The study was designed primarily to be an aid to the Office of Public Information by supplying them with data from which to form their public relations objectives. The research questions which it asked were: which media are the greatest source of U.N.M. information, which geographical areas hold what opinions, what opinions are held by each of the socio-economic levels, age groups, and political parties.

This information was desired for use in the preparation of information releases, and public relation campaigns.

Significant relationships between the variables are reported as are trends, if any. Relationships are interpreted in light of other data given and then the conclusions were drawn. On the basis of the conclusions, recommendations are offered as possible solutions to deficiencies in U.N.M.'s image projection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL.....	i
II. TITLE PAGE.....	ii
III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
IV. ABSTRACT TITLE PAGE.....	iv
V. ABSTRACT.....	v
VI. CONTENTS.....	vii
VII. LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
VIII. CHAPTER I.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Rationale.....	4
3. Statement of the Problem.....	9
a. Definition of Terms.....	10
b. Research Questions.....	10
c. Summary.....	14
IX. CHAPTER II.....	15
1. Methodology.....	15
2. Research Design.....	15
3. The Sampling Frame.....	15
4. The Sample.....	16
5. Sample Size.....	17
6. The Measuring Instrument.....	18
7. Mail Questionnaire.....	21
8. Coding Sheet.....	22
9. Procedure.....	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	Page
X. CHAPTER III.....	28
1. Analysis of Data.....	28
a. Sample Characteristics.....	28
b. Informational Questions.....	36
c. Attitudinal Questions.....	108
d. Summary of Findings.....	211
XI. CHAPTER IV.....	217
1. Summary.....	217
2. Interpretations and Conclusions.....	219
3. Recommendations.....	225
4. Limitations of the Study.....	227
5. Implications for Further Research.....	229
XII. APPENDIX.....	231
XIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	234

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
1	Proportion of Returns from Each County.....	28
2	Age of Respondent.....	30
3	Sex of Respondent.....	30
4	Ethnic Classification.....	31
5	Marital Status of Respondent.....	31
6	Respondent's Length of Residence in New Mexico.....	32
7	Highest Grade Completed in School.....	32
8	How Much Education Completed?.....	33
9	Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	33
10	Approximate Annual Income.....	34
11	Directly Connected with U.N.M.....	34
12	Political Affiliation.....	35
13	Understanding of U.N.M. as an Institution of a) Teaching b) Research c) Community Service.....	36
14	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Newsco.....	41
15	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Age of Respondent.....	42
16	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Sex of Respondent.....	43
17	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by How Much Education Completed?.....	44
18	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Hollingshead Index of Social Status.....	45
19	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Approximate Annual Income.....	46
20	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	47

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
21	Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution, by Political Party Preference.....	48
22	Should U.N.M. Be an Institution of a) Teaching b) Research c) Community Service.....	49
23	Awareness of Benefits of U.N.M. Research or Community Service.....	50
24	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Newsco.....	53
25	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Age of Respondent.....	54
26	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Sex of Respondent.....	55
27	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by How Much Education Completed?.....	56
28	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Hollingshead Index of Social Status.....	57
29	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Approximate Annual Income.....	58
30	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	59
31	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Political Party Preference.....	60
32	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Newsco, Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Male.....	61
33	Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits, by Newsco, Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Female.....	62
34	Source of Information on U.N.M.....	63
35	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Newsco.....	67

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
36	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Age of Respondent.....	68
37	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Sex of Respondent.....	69
38	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by How Much Education Completed?.....	70
39	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Hollingshead Index of Social Status.....	71
40	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Approximate Annual Income.....	72
41	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	73
42	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Political Party Preference.....	74
43	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Newsco Controlling For Sex of Respondent - Male.....	75
44	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Newsco, Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Female.....	76
45	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television by Newsco.....	79
46	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television by Age of Respondent.....	80
47	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television by Sex of Respondent.....	81
48	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television by How Much Education Completed?.....	82
49	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	83
50	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television by Approximate Annual Income.....	84

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
51	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	85
52	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper by Political Party Preference.....	86
53	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Newsco.....	89
54	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Age of Respondent.....	90
55	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Sex of Respondent.....	91
56	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	92
57	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by How Much Education Completed?.....	93
58	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Approximate Annual Income.....	94
59	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	95
60	Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Students by Political Party Preferences.....	96
61	Priority of Fields of Interest.....	97
62	Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Newsco....	100
63	Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Age of Respondent.....	101
64	Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Sex of Respondent.....	102
65	Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by How Much Education Completed?.....	103
66	Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	104
67	Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Approximate Annual Income.....	105

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.	Page
68 Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	106
69 Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Political Party Preference.....	107
70 Respondent's Awareness of Campus Disturbance, May 1972..	108
71 Appraisal of U.N.M.'s Teaching Service to State.....	109
72 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Newsco.....	111
73 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Age of Respondent.....	112
74 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Sex of Respondent.....	113
75 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by How Much Education Completed?.....	114
76 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	115
77 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Approximate Annual Income.....	116
78 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	117
79 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service by Political Party Preference.....	118
80 Appraisal of U.N.M.'s Research Service to State.....	119
81 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Services by Newsco.....	121
82 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by Age of Respondent.....	122
83 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by Sex of Respondent.....	123
84 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by How Much Education Completed?.....	124
85 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	125

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
86	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by Approximate Annual Income.....	126
87	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	127
88	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service by Political Party Preference.....	128
89	Appraisal of U.N.M.'s Community Service to State.....	129
90	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Newsco.....	131
91	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Age of Respondent.....	132
92	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Sex of Respondent.....	133
93	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by How Much Education Completed?.....	134
94	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	135
95	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Approximate Annual Income.....	136
96	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	137
97	Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service by Political Party Preference.....	138
98	Appraisal of U.N.M. Education in Relation to State Needs	139
99	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Newsco.....	142
100	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Age of Respondent.....	143
101	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Sex of Respondent.....	144

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
102	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by How Much Education Completed?.....	145
103	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	146
104	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Approximate Annual Income.....	147
105	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	148
106	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Political Party Preference.....	149
107	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status by Class I.....	150
108	Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status by Class V.....	151
109	Evaluation of U.N.M. Graduate's Capability.....	152
110	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Newsco.....	155
111	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Age of Respondent.....	156
112	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Sex of Respondent.....	157
113	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by How Much Education Completed?.....	158
114	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	159
115	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Approximate Annual Income.....	160
116	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Directly Connected With U.N.M.....	161
117	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Political Party Preference.....	162

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
118	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Class I by No Connection With U.N.M.....	163
119	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Class II by No Connection With U.N.M....	164
120	Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Class IV by No Connection With U.N.M....	165
121	Respondents' Attitude Toward Attending U.N.M.....	166
122	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Newsco.....	169
123	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Age of Respondent.....	170
124	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Sex of Respondent.....	171
125	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by How Much Education Completed?.....	172
126	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	173
127	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Male.....	174
128	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Approximate Annual Income.....	175
129	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Direct Connection With U.N.M.....	176
130	Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M. by Political Party Preference.....	177
131	Respondents' Attitude Toward Children Attending U.N.M....	178
132	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Newsco.....	181

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
133	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Age of Respondent.....	182
134	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Sex of Respondent.....	183
135	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by How Much Education Completed?.....	184
136	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status...	185
137	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status, Controlling for Connection With U.N.M., Parent of Student	186
138	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status, Controlling for Connection With U.N.M. No Connection.....	187
139	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Direct Connection With U.N.M.....	188
140	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Approximate Annual Income.....	189
141	Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M. by Political Party Preference.....	190
142	Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.....	191
143	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Newsco.....	193
144	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Age of Respondent.....	194
145	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Sex of Respondent.....	195
146	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by How Much Education Completed?.....	196
147	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	197
148	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Approximate Annual Income.....	198

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table No.		Page
149	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Direct Connection With U.N.M.....	199
150	Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M. by Political Party Preference.....	200
151	Effect of Campus Disturbance (May 1972) on Response to Questionnaire.....	201
152	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Newsco.....	203
153	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Age of Respondent.....	204
154	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Sex of Respondent.....	205
155	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by How Much Education Completed?.....	206
156	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status.....	207
157	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Approximate Annual Income.....	208
158	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Direct Connection With U.N.M.....	209
159	Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance by Political Party Preference.....	210
160	Employer Interest in Interviewing U.N.M. Graduates for Jobs.....	211

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The University of New Mexico has as its primary responsibility the task of serving the citizens of the State of New Mexico by offering the opportunity of a well-rounded education at the higher level. The ultimate goal of college or university education is to equip the maximum number of citizens with the understanding and wisdom which will aid them in becoming useful and responsible members of a democratic society. The University also recognizes its duty to supply other services which foster the culture and welfare of the people.¹

On October 29-31, 1971, a Community Leader's Conference was held at the D. H. Lawrence Ranch near Taos, New Mexico. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and explore the role of the University in today's society. Topics on the program included: "Are Colleges Helping to Solve Today's Problems;" "What Does the Public Expect Out of Colleges;" "What Do Students Expect Out of College;" and "New Trends in Academic Programs." Present at this conference were some fifty administration, faculty, staff, students and their spouses representing various interests and extensions of the University of New Mexico. In addition, there were more than fifty executives, community leaders and spouses from around the state.

It became apparent at this meeting that among this group of participants there was a wide difference of opinion as to what should be the goals of U.N.M. According to Jess Price, Director of Public Information, U.N.M., comments by some of the community leaders suggested that they may lack knowledge of the University's overall operation.²

¹The University of New Mexico Bulletin (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971) Vol. 84, No. 12, p. 76.

²Jess Price, interview with Hilary Horan, Dec. 6, 1971.

Considering the attitudes heard at the conference, certain participants from the University³ questioned whether the opinions expressed by these members of the New Mexico community were representative and valid measurements of the population's attitude. The concept of a statewide survey to poll the attitudes of New Mexico's population toward the University was brought up in an interview between Dr. Gerald Goldhaber of the Department of Speech Communication, U.N.M., and Dr. Lee Zink of the Bureau of Business Research (BBR) of The Institute for Social Research and Development (ISRAD).⁴ Specifics of such a study were not discussed at this time, but it was agreed among the directors of the BBR that an attitudinal study would be worthwhile and beneficial to the University in assessing the extent to which the public agreed with the University's perception of its stated goals.

"The importance of a public institution to project a favorable external image to its supporters" was offered to explain the relevance of the survey.⁵ Interviews with University officials confirmed their interest in such a report and revealed the areas they wished questioned. Advice was also sought from U.N.M. social research experts⁶ regarding the feasibility of a state wide attitudinal study and the specific mechanics involved with regard to methodology, sample size and procedure.

³Specifically, Jess Price and Sherman Smith (Administration and Development).

⁴Lee Zink, interview with Gerald Goldhaber, Nov. 9, 1971.

⁵Gerald Goldhaber, interview with Hilary Horan, Nov. 10, 1971.

⁶Lee Zink, Director of Bureau of Business Research, ISRAD; William Peters, Phd. School of Business and Administration Sciences, U.N.M.

During an interview with Jess Price, a document was produced which stated the justification for a state wide poll on higher education in New Mexico.

At a recent New Orleans meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, it was apparent that New Mexico, Arizona and a couple of western states are in a better position fiscally and also vis-a-vis their legislatures, at this moment in time, than most other states. The midwest seems to have been particularly hard hit economically and by an apparent public disenchantment with higher education. However, the legislatures in those states seem to be somewhat out of touch with the public, if polls taken by the institutions are correct. These show from 65 to 75 percent of the public supportive of higher education. Before the troubles befell universities the figures were 12 to 15 percentage points higher.

.... it might be to the advantage of everyone if, through the President's Council, a poll were undertaken on behalf of all institutions of higher education to help give us a reading of public attitudes toward the system as a whole. Barring that, a cooperative effort between UNM and State might be useful.⁷

A subsequent memo by Mr. Price to Vice President Smith stated:

I... concluded that a Statewide (i.e. New Mexico Government) or inter-institutional effort probably would not provide us with the data we would like to obtain about UNM. Hence, if there is to be a poll, I believe we should do our own.

I am not well enough informed on polling techniques to be sure, but it seems to me that we might have on campus the expertise for all or most of the job. The Bureau of Business Research has conducted a number of statewide surveys. And there should be people in Political Science, Speech and perhaps Psychology who could help us frame a proper questionnaire and the proper criteria to assure validity of results, insofar as this is possible. I believe periodic polling could help us determine PR objectives and priorities.⁸

⁷Jess Price, memo to Sherman Smith, Nov. 12, 1971.

⁸Jess Price, memo to Sherman Smith, Nov. 24, 1971.

The survey can allow for more accurate and efficient public relations performance. Reese Smith, Director of the U.N.M. Placement Center, in a later meeting, said that a poll of this nature could also help define the objectives and priorities of the University in terms of meeting the needs of the state through its educational directiveness.

A precedent has been set for such "town - gown" surveys. State universities such as Wisconsin, Minnesota, Arkansas and Utah have used them to measure public attitudes. After several years of repeated polling, Utah has been able to pinpoint areas of deficiency where remedial work could be done.⁹

The practical need for an opinion poll had become apparent. The desire to have this reading of public opinion had been expressed at different levels of the University and had gained support. It was next necessary to examine the theory of feedback channels.

RATIONALE

The theoretical need for such a survey has been justified, from several viewpoints, in literature. One of the "Laws" of public opinion as outlined by Cantril is that "People are less reluctant to have critical decisions made by their leaders if they feel that somehow they, the people, are taking some part in the decision."¹⁰

⁹From reports at the New Orleans meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Fall, 1971. Attempts have been made to obtain these reports, but they have not yet been made available by the individual schools.

¹⁰Hadley Cantril, Gauging Public Opinion, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947), p. 229.

While it was not the purpose of this study to create a "Hawthorne effect" in participative management across the community with regard to the University, this could have happened. That is to say, the people of New Mexico may have a more positive attitude toward the University knowing that the University is interested in their opinion.

According to Maslow this could be seen as an attempt on the part of the University to satisfy the esteem needs (level four) of the public. This would be achieved by making them an integral part of the decision making concerning the campus' policies.¹¹

Argyris also points out the importance of participative management.¹² It is his assertion that frustration occurs when the opportunity to participate is absent. Conversely, people will take more of an interest in, and be more supportive of programs in which they were participants in the formation.

Toffler asserts that there is "evidence the bureaucratic hierarchies, separating those who 'make decisions' from those who carry them out, are being altered, side stepped or broken."¹³ To allow the public supporters to feel excluded from participation in the orientation of U.N.M. could lead to our administration being altered, our budget side stepped or the institution, in general, broken. The public

¹¹Abraham Maslow, Eupsychian Management (Homewood: Irwin Press, 1965), pp. 15-27.

¹²Chris Argyris, "Participative Management" in Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management., David R. Hampton, ed. (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968), pp. 153-154.

¹³Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 119-120.

of New Mexico, according to this theory, must feel that their opinions are heard and that they have a determinate bearing on the direction of their institution.

While these are drastic ramifications of neglecting citizens' opinion, U.N.M. is not yet to that stage of public disenchantment. Therefore the results of this poll might well indicate in what way the University can adapt its operation to better meet the needs of the New Mexico community. Bennis claims that "stability has vanished" and that the only chance for the survival of an organization lies in its ability to adapt to the public's needs.¹⁴

Fox contends it is the "administration's responsibility to meet society's needs through policy determination."¹⁵ He further cites that state legislatures are demanding "accountability" of the universities to the public. In a similar article, Glenny also notes that both the public and legislatures are calling for university administrations to account for the "quality, kind, and cost of educational programs."¹⁶

Seiler asserts that the feedback process (the operation of that information loop which alerts the system to the effects of its behavior and permits modification of system behavior) is the means by which equilibrium is achieved. In this case, the University creates an equilibrium by polling the public to discover areas of deficiency in its image, (if any), countering the poor opinion through modification,

¹⁴Ibid. pp. 124-125.

¹⁵Gary C. Fox, "Campus Crisis: A Viewpoint," Journal of Education, Vol. 153 (December 1970) pp. 26-27.

¹⁶Lyman A. Glenny, "The Anonymous Leaders of Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLIII, (January 1972) pp. 9-10.

thus building a favorable public image. Seiler further suggests that subsequent testing is required to watch for patterns and trends. The channels for feedback must be maintained because an internal stability within an organization may lend a false feeling of security -- the reality not being realized until it is well impressed from the outside.¹⁷ Once again to apply this principle to the present study, one must remember that the University is largely dependent on the public of New Mexico (through their legislators) for monetary appropriations. To be unaware of any disfavor could result in the forced termination of any segment or all of the institution's functions.

The fact that the University maintains no formal or scientific channel for feedback is a problem emphasized by Tompkins in a concluding statement of his research for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

The strongest recommendation made by the research in this section is that management [a public institution] must learn that it is in its own best interest to be concerned with upward communication.¹⁸

By suggesting certain basic characteristics of the structure of behavior, the feedback concept is significant because it suggests potential dialectics between the University and the public according to Annett.¹⁹ This leads us to an internalizing effect which should take place within the University organization upon the knowledge of these results.

¹⁷John A. Seiler, Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior (Homewood: Irwin Press, 1969), pp. 12-13.

¹⁸N.A.S.A. Conference on Organizational Communication (Huntsville: N.A.S.A., 1967). p. 13.

¹⁹John Annett, Feedback and Human Behavior (Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1969), p. 36.

Knowledge of results [KR] as a demonstrable form of feedback has at various times been credited with all three functions, the informative function of feedback and the reinforcing function and incentive function of reward and punishment.²⁰

In terms of social theories of influences, Kelman states that there are three processes which public opinion may induce. They are compliance, identification and internalization.²¹ It is the intent of this survey to show where in the public favor the University stands. Should this KR result in any modification of its present functioning, it would most likely be through one of these processes.

Compliance would occur if the University accepted public influence because it hoped to achieve a favorable reaction from the people. Identification would take place if the University adopted behavior derived from the public because this behavior is associated with a satisfying self defining relationship to the public. Finally, internalization could be said to occur should the University accept the public influence because the induced behavior becomes congruent with its value system.

In summary, the establishment of a feedback channel should:

1. Increase the public's interest and support of the University through the participative process.
2. Discover areas in which the University is deficient in projecting a favorable image to the voting public.
3. Accurately measure the public's opinion of the University of New Mexico.

²⁰Ibid. p. 37.

²¹Herbert C. Kelman, "Processes of Opinion Change." Public Opinion Quarterly, 25, (1961), pp. 60-67.

4. Help to justify the University's existence (both fiscally and prima facie) to the legislature as a publicly supported institution of higher education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to create a channel for feedback which could provide an accurate indication of public opinion.

The image of the University of New Mexico and other universities has suffered in recent years. In general this is due to the civil unrest and the universities' position in the polarization of political views.²² But aside from specific events that are covered by the mass media, it also has been shown that a general image can be communicated to the New Mexico Community that does not alter on occasion of isolated incidents. The function of communicating a favorable image to the public lies with everyone connected with U.N.M., but formally the communication is generally channeled through the Office of Public Information. This study was designed to be an aid to that office by supplying them with data from which to form their P.R. objectives. The survey was concerned with which media are the greatest source of U.N.M. information, which geographical areas hold what opinions, what opinions are held by each of the several socio-economic levels in New Mexico, and other important variables to be used as the basis for information releases. Also shown are overall reactions to U.N.M. as well as the areas in which there is a desire for more information. This survey,

²²Fox, op. cit. p. 26.

then, is the primary attempt by the University to establish a feedback channel for the purpose of indicating what areas might need more informational services to retain or regain the public's support.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

COMMUNITY or NEW MEXICO COMMUNITY. The society of the State of New Mexico including public, industrial and business segments.

OPINION. This is defined as an expression of an attitude toward a specific topic.

POPULATION or PUBLIC. These terms refer to the registered voters of New Mexico now residing in that state.

SAMPLE. That segment of the population whose responses will be analyzed to determine the image which U.N.M. presents to the public.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A copy of the questionnaire is included in Chapter II. The concepts which the questions probe have, for the most part, been suggested by University officials. Basically, the research questions of this study were the analyses of the independent variables (attitudes) when cross-tabulated with the dependent variables (demographic factors).

1. Is the perception of U.N.M. as an institution of community service significantly altered by:
 - a. geographic area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex

- d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
2. Is the opinion toward the adequacy of U.N.M.'s teaching, research and community service significantly altered by:
- a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
3. Is public opinion of U.N.M. educational worth to the State significantly altered by:
- a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
4. Is respondent's desire to attend U.N.M. significantly affected by:
- a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation

5. Is desirability to send children to U.N.M. significantly affected by:
 - a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
6. Is the rating of U.N.M. graduates significantly affected by:
 - a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
7. Is awareness of U.N.M. research and community service benefits significantly altered by:
 - a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
8. Are sources of information about U.N.M. significantly different for any of these different categories:
 - a. geographical area

- b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
9. Is the overall satisfaction with U.N.M. significantly altered by:
- a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
10. Are there any areas of the University about which these groups would like to know more:
- a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex
 - d. social status
 - e. affiliation with U.N.M.
 - f. political party affiliation
11. Did the recent campus disturbance have a significant effect on the opinions of these groups toward U.N.M.
- a. geographical area
 - b. age group
 - c. sex

- d. social status
- e. affiliation with U.N.M.
- f. political party affiliation

SUMMARY

This study was concerned with the surveying of public opinion toward the University of New Mexico. The image which the University presents in different areas of operation has been measured. It is hoped, now, that the University can adapt accordingly with the knowledge of these results to better serve the New Mexico community. It is speculated that an improvement in function will present a more favorable image to the community and facilitate fiscal appropriations through the legislature. This study has been a start in that communication process.

"What is this absurd wall between the thing called
the University and the thing called the Community?"

Joel Jones²³

²³The Lobo, November 2, 1971, p. 1.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH DESIGN

This field study was a survey designed to collect and analyze data regarding the public's opinion of the University of New Mexico. The research is by nature, ex post facto;¹ i.e. that it measured existing attitudes (independent variables) in relation to demographic data (dependent variables). This study, the first conducted at the University of New Mexico, must be considered exploratory. Its purpose was to discover significant variables in the field situation, explain the relationships between variables, and to form a foundation for subsequent, more predictive studies.²

A mail questionnaire was sent to a stratified random sample of 3000 derived from each of New Mexico's thirty-two counties' voting lists. The questionnaire incorporated several types of scales which were coded for computer data analysis.

THE SAMPLING FRAME

According to the sampling services of ISRAD, nowhere does there exist an available list of the New Mexico population from which to draw a sample. William Watson of BBR suggested that city directories

¹Fred Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1964) p. 360.

²D. Katz, Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1953) p. 75.

offered the most complete listing of the population. However, previous ISRAD research this year has shown that these sources are already outdated due to the mobility of the population. The primary sponsor of this study, the Office of Public Information, agreed that voting lists would be adequate for a population listing. The rationale behind this selection is that it is the voters to whom the state legislators are responsible. Therefore, the population of this study was defined as all registered voters in the State of New Mexico (as of May 15, 1972, N = 408,432).

THE SAMPLE

A stratified random sample was systematically generated from each of the counties' voting lists. This was done through the use of a random numbers table. The sample was stratified by county in order to validly represent each region of the state. The percentage of voters in each county was computed and then multiplied by 3000 to yield the sample (n) from the county.

Each county is divided into voting precincts. If "n" were greater than the number of precincts, the number of voters required from each district was calculated and then names selected by page and line number of the precinct list. A table of random numbers was used in this process. If "n" were less than the number of precincts in a county, the table of random numbers was employed to designate which precinct number, page and name would be chosen. (In Bernalillo County with over 500 districts, the random process was used only to choose the precinct and page number. The entire page was then selected for the

sample with the exception of multiple registrations per household. Care was taken not to send more than one questionnaire to a family.)

SAMPLE SIZE

A "Table of Sample Sizes" was consulted to determine what size return would be required to yield statistic validity.³ The table was calculated to insure accuracy at various estimated percentages as well as at different levels of tolerance. It was agreed by all related sponsors that the 95% level of confidence and ± 5 standard error units would be acceptable. This was acceptable because for their purposes the findings would be adequately reliable with the smallest return and lowest cost. Because the maximum occurrence rate to be expected could not be estimated, the sample size had to be selected at the 50-50 percentage level. Considering these factors, the calculated sample size presented on the table was 384.

This formula means that ninety-five percent of the time, we can be sure that our findings are within $\pm 5\%$ of the actual public index, e.g., if the population is actually 80% supportive of U.N.M., ninety-five out of one hundred times that this study is repeated, the findings will show the public to fall between 75-85% (standard error term 5) supportive.

Previous mail questionnaire surveying in the State of New Mexico has yielded a return rate of about twelve to fifteen percent.⁴ This

³Mildred Parten, Surveys, Polls and Samples: Practical Procedures (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1966), p. 315.

⁴According to Bureau of Business Research, ISRAD.

required that approximately 3000 subjects be randomly chosen to receive the questionnaire.

THE MEASURING INSTRUMENT

The method used for data collection was a mail questionnaire. It included three kinds of questions: demographic, informational and attitudinal. The demographic data was necessary to demonstrate the representitiveness of the sample to the population. It was also important in analyzing the opinions of the different factions of the population on the basis of age, sex, locale, ethnic classification, socio-economic status, etc. Questions 1 - 12 were used to obtain this information. The responses to open-ended questions (income, occupation, education) were coded into categories to be used for social-class distinctions.

The informational and attitudinal questions contained all closed responses with the exception of "other" as a choice in two cases. The purpose of the informational questions was to reveal any misconceptions that the public might have regarding the University, i.e., in what areas the University may have failed or been particularly effective in communicating its public information.

The attitudinal questions attempted to measure the public's overall attitude to the University of New Mexico. The respondent was asked to appraise U.N.M.'s worth in separate fields and then to give an overall estimate of their attitude toward the University. The respondents were also asked to evaluate the capability of U.N.M. graduates with whom they had had contact. Five point scales, "1"

indicating "very low" "5" indicating "very high" were used for this measure. Their "satisfaction" with U.N.M. as the public supporters of the institution was measured by a Likert-type scale. According to both Edwards⁵ and Emmert⁶ Likert-type scales are as reliable as any other measurement scale of attitudes when less than twenty Likert-type statements are used.

The compilation of the questions in the survey is a result of input from all related sponsors. It was Mr. Smith's suggestion that we ask for recommendations from the community (particularly employers) that would help the University of New Mexico to fit itself more to the needs of the state.⁷ Dr. Lee Zink expressed a desire to ask the opinion of the taxpayers and relate it to the amount of actual information that they had about U.N.M. He wished to measure the public's attitude toward the worth of U.N.M. as an academic institution contributing to the welfare of the state and society. In these terms he suggested that mention be made of the teaching, research and service areas of the University in an attempt to measure the community's appraisal of the job being done.⁸ Mr. Price suggested that stratifications in the sample be analyzed along the lines of age, income, sex, ethnic group, education, occupation, location of household and affiliation, if any, the respondent has had with U.N.M. It was also

⁵A. L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), p. 162.

⁶Phillip Emmert and William Brooks, Methods of Research in Communication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), p. 204.

⁷Reese Smith, Private interview held Dec. 7, 1971.

⁸Lee Zink, Private interview held Dec. 6, 1971.

Mr. Price's suggestion that political affiliation should be added as a qualifier in the stratification of the responses.⁹ (This is in addition to Mr. Price's previously stated objectives of the survey.)

The questionnaire can only purport to have face validity; i.e., it is measuring what it says it is measuring. Aid in formulating the questions was solicited from Dr. Sherman Smith, Vice-President for Research, U.N.M.; Dr. Lee Zink, Director BBR of ISRAD; Mr. Jess Price, Director, Office of Public Information; Drs. G. Goldhaber and L. Rosenfeld, Department of Speech Communication. Also, some questions were adapted from a Criminal Justice Survey developed by Dr. Harold Mier, Department of Sociology.

Analysis will also be made between the demographic data of the respondents and the 1970 census data of New Mexico. This cannot be considered a true validity check as the populations are not the same, but it will render an appropriate indication of the representativeness of the sample.

⁹Jess Price, Memo to Hilary Horan, Dec. 9, 1971.

Postage
Will Be Paid
by
Addressee

MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE

Postage
Will Be Paid
by
Addressee

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO LIBRARY

No
Postage Stamp
Necessary
If Mailed in the
United States

LD
3781
10563H78
cop. 2

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT No. 677, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY

JESS PRICE, DIRECTOR
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87106



**PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87106**

Name

Address

OPINION POLL—UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Dear Citizen of New Mexico:

The University of New Mexico (in Albuquerque) is conducting an opinion poll to assess the attitudes of the New Mexico public toward the University of New Mexico. Your cooperation in completing this brief questionnaire and returning it by June 2, 1972, will enable the University to more adequately meet the needs of the people of this state.

Thank you very much for your interest and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Ferrel Heady
Ferrel Heady, President, UNM

Office
Coding
Only

Please fill in or check space where appropriate.

1. Home Zip code _____ 1. _____
2. Your age: Under 21 yrs _____; 21-30 _____; 31-40 _____; 41-50 _____; over 50 _____. 2. _____
3. Your sex: 1. _____ Male 2. _____ Female 3. _____
4. Your marital status:
 1. _____ Married, living with spouse
 2. _____ Legally married but separated
 3. _____ Divorced
 4. _____ Widowed
 5. _____ Single, never married
 4. _____
5. Your racial or ethnic classification:
 1. _____ Native American or Indian (tribe or pueblo: _____)
 2. _____ Hispano, Mexican American or Chicano
 3. _____ Black
 4. _____ Oriental
 5. _____ Other
 5. _____
6. How long have you lived in New Mexico? _____ years 6. _____
7. What was the last grade or year that you completed in school? _____ years 7. _____
8. How much education did you complete?
 1. _____ high school; 2. _____ two yr. college; 3. _____ University; 4. _____ Graduate
 8. _____
9. Please describe as specifically as possible your occupation (e.g., owner & manager of grocery store; dispatcher at transit company; mechanic at car clinic)

_____ 9. _____
10. Approximate annual income: \$ _____ 10. _____
11. Are you directly connected with UNM in any of the following ways:
 1. _____ Student 2. _____ Parent of Student 3. _____ Employee 4. _____ Alumnus
 5. _____ no connection 6. _____ other _____
 11. _____
12. Political party preference: 1. _____ Republican 2. _____ Democrat 3. _____ Other 12. _____
13. Is it your understanding that UNM is an institution of:
 - teaching 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no
 13. _____
14. research 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 14. _____
15. community service 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 15. _____
16. Do you feel that UNM *should* be an institution of:
 - teaching 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no
 16. _____
17. research 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 17. _____
18. community service 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 18. _____
19. Do you feel that UNM provides adequate service to the State with regard to:
 - teaching 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no
 19. _____
20. research 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 20. _____
21. community service 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 21. _____
22. On the whole, do you believe that UNM provides an education for its graduates which meets the needs of the state?
 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 3. _____ no opinion
 22. _____
23. If you are in an employer's position (with available jobs), are you interested in interviewing UNM graduates for a job with your company?
 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 3. _____ not an employer
 23. _____
24. If you have had an opportunity to evaluate the work of UNM graduates, how would you rate their capability on this scale? (If no contact, leave blank)
very low _____ very high
1 2 3 4 5 24. _____
25. Would you attend UNM if you had the opportunity?
 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 3. _____ no opinion
 25. _____
26. Would you like your children to attend UNM?
 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 3. _____ no opinion
 26. _____
27. Are you aware of any benefits of UNM research or service in your community?
 1. _____ yes 2. _____ no 3. _____ no opinion
 27. _____
28. Where do you obtain most of your information about UNM? (please check one)
 1. _____ newspaper
 2. _____ television
 3. _____ radio
 4. _____ Channel 5 specifically
 5. _____ "UNM Reports" specifically
 6. _____ students
 7. _____ friends
 8. _____ alumni publications
 9. _____ other _____
 28. _____

29. Please number, in order of importance to you, the fields of interest at UNM about which you would like to know more.

_____ teaching

_____ community service

_____ research

_____ other _____

29. _____

30. On the whole, how satisfied are you with UNM?

 very satisfied

 fairly satisfied

 uncertain or
no opinion

 somewhat
dissatisfied

 very dissatisfied

30. _____

31. Were you aware of events on the UNM campus May 9-13, 1972?

_____ yes

_____ no

31. _____

32. How has this affected your response to this questionnaire?

_____ positively

_____ negatively

_____ no affect

32. _____

CODING SHEET

		Card Column	Value
Identification Number		1	
		2	_____
		3	_____
		4	_____
		5	_____
		6	_____
		7	_____
		8	_____
		9	_____
1 Alphabetical County Listing 01 - 32		10	_____
2 Age Category 1-2-3-4-5			
3 Sex Category 1-2			
4 Marital Status 1-2-3-4-5			
5 Racial Classification 1-2-3-4-5			
6 Resident 1 = 1-2 yrs. 2 = 3-5 yrs 3 = 6-10 yrs. 4 = 11-15 yrs. 5 = 15 yrs.			
7 Education 1 = Advanced degree 2 = B.A. 3 = Partial Coll-Tech 4 = High School 5 = Partial High School 6 = Jr. High 7 = <7 yrs.		11	_____
8 Education Cross check 1-2-3-4		12	_____
9 A. Occupation (Status Code 1-2-3-4-5-6-7) B. Compute Hollingshead Index [(7) x 4 + (9A) x 7 = 1-2-3-4-5]		13	_____
10 Income 1 = <4000; 2 = <6000; 3 = <8000; 4 = <9000; 5 = <10,000; 6 = <12,000; 7 = <15,000; 8 = <25,000 9 = >25,000		14	_____
11 Connection with U.N.M. 1-2-3-4-5-6		15	_____
12 Political Party 1-2-3		16	_____
13 Understand U.N.M. teaching 1-2		17	_____
14 Understand U.N.M. research 1-2		18	_____
15 Understand U.N.M. community service 1-2		19	_____
16 Should be U.N.M. teaching 1-2		20	_____
17 Should be U.N.M. research 1-2		21	_____
18 Should be U.N.M. community service 1-2		22	_____
19 Adequate U.N.M. teaching 1-2		23	_____
20 Adequate U.N.M. research 1-2		24	_____
21 Adequate U.N.M. community service 1-2		25	_____
22 Education meets needs of State 1-2-3		26	_____

CODING SHEET (Continuation)

	Card Column	Value
23 Interview grads. 1-2-3	27	_____
24 Rate Capability of U.N.M. Grads. Low 1-2-3-4-5 High	28	_____
25 Would attend U.N.M. 1-2-3	29	_____
26 Like Children to attend 1-2-3	30	_____
27 Aware of benefits 1-2-3	31	_____
28 Information from newspaper 0-1	32	_____
Information from television 0-1	33	_____
Information from radio 0-1	34	_____
Information from Channel 5 0-1	35	_____
Information from U.N.M. reports 0-1	36	_____
Information from students 0-1	37	_____
Information from friends 0-1	38	_____
Information from Alumni Publication 0-1	39	_____
Information from other 0-1	40	_____
29 1 = T.R.CS; 2 = T.CS.R; 3 = R.T.CS; 4 = R.CS.T; 5 = CS.T.R; 6 = CS.R.T; 7 = other	41	_____
30 How satisfied with U.N.M.? 1-2-3-4-5	42	_____
31 Aware of events, May 72? 1-2	43	_____
32 Effect? 1-2-3	44	_____

PROCEDURE

Following is an outline of the procedure used in this study presented in chronological order.

November 12 - 24, 1971 -- Concept of state wide opinion poll discussed between Jess Price, Public Information Officer and Sherman Smith, Vice-President for Research. Agreement reached that, in theory, it is a worthwhile effort. Bureau of Business Research contacted for advice. Lee Zink, Director of BBR, agrees that poll is possible and that it could be beneficial to the University. Gerald Goldhaber, Professor, Department of Speech Communication, presented with direction of project.

November 29, 1971 -- Hilary Horan, Graduate Student, Department of Speech Communication, accepts opportunity to conduct research.

December 1 - 15, 1971 -- Interviews held by Horan with all related sponsors to define the purpose of the study, the concepts and constructs to be probed, and to formulate questions. Those interviewed during this time were: Jess Price, Lee Zink, Gerry Goldhaber, Sherman Smith, Reese Smith, William Watson, William Peters.

Jess Price and Reese Smith submitted questions and concepts which they wanted probed.

Gerry Goldhaber and Lee Zink offered suggestions and aid in survey methodology. Lee Zink further offered ISRAD services in practical assistance of the study.

William Peters and William Watson aided in design of the sample.

Sherman Smith was approached for financial support.

February 1 - March 31, 1972 -- Questionnaire formulated, submitted for approval, revised. Sampling frame defined, research design developed.

May 1, 1972 -- Secretary of State's Office contacted in Santa Fe to obtain permission to use voting lists for sampling frame. Permission was readily granted as the lists are open to the public for research purposes. The lists may not, however, be taken from the office. Consequently, dates were arranged and secretarial help procured to travel to Santa Fe to compile the sample mailing list.

May 10, 1972 -- Prospectus meeting held to finalize all procedure and design. Budget was presented and sponsorship arranged.

Postage (\$280.) was paid for by Vice-President for Research. The questionnaires were sent to the sample by First Class Mail (3000 x .08) and returned by the University's Business Reply Mail permit (400 x .10).

Printing (\$130.) of 3000 questionnaires was paid for by Bureau of Business Research. Questions were printed on $8\frac{1}{2}$ " x 15" two-fold post cards.

Computer Programming (\$50.) was arranged through ISRAD.

Xeroxing was done by Career Placement Services.

Office staff and personnel assistance was furnished by Public Information Bureau. This included the secretaries who traveled to Santa Fe to compile the mailing list for the sample.

May 12, 1972 -- Questions, in final form presented to printer for type setting.

May 15, 1972 -- Type was proofread at Bureau of Business Research and returned for printing. Questionnaire contained return address and postage.

Researcher and two secretaries travel to Secretary of State's Office in Capitol Building, Santa Fe. Adequate desk space, typewriters, etc. were provided. Full cooperation was offered. Researcher selected names for the sample as secretaries typed them on sheets of address labels.

May 16, 1972 -- Return to Santa Fe. Approximately 1000 labels can be typed per day, per secretary if information is complete on the voting list. In several counties, no street addresses were given requiring names randomly chosen from the lists to be crosschecked for addresses in telephone or city directories.

May 17, 1972 -- Half day in Santa Fe to complete sample. Return to U.N.M. to Xerox sheets of mailing labels. Labels on the Xerox sheets were numbered to match a corresponding questionnaire. This was to be used in the process of monitoring the returns.

May 18, 1972 -- Questionnaires printed, folded and delivered to Speech Seminar room. Student assistants number each questionnaire and attach adhesive mailing label.

May 19, 1972 -- Addressed questionnaires delivered to Campus Post Office for metering and mailing on Friday to be received throughout most of the State on Monday and Tuesday. (According to Toops,¹⁰ having a questionnaire received early in the week aids in a higher return rate.)

Any office that might receive an inquiry was notified of the existence of the study and asked to refer the call to the Public Information Office.

¹⁰H. A. Toops, "Validating the Questionnaire Method." Journal of Personnel Research, Vol. II (1923), pp. 153-161.

May 22 - June 9, 1972 -- Returns were received at Public Information Office. As a questionnaire was returned to the Office, the respondent's name was noted on the xerox list. The list was instrumental in keeping a constant tabulation by county. (Often the label had been removed, but less than three percent of the labels and numbers were obliterated.) Initial return was about ten percent (283).

June 12, 1972 -- A second questionnaire was sent to 450 selected names from the original sample who had not yet responded. This "wave" was weighted in proportion to counties where the response rate had been low. The return rate on this "wave" was just under twenty-five percent (105).

June 13 - 22, 1972 -- Questionnaires were coded and key punched onto data cards. Computer programming assistance was arranged through Lee Zink at ISRAD. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used for analysis.

June 23 - July 7, 1972 -- Suggestions were submitted by Jess Price, Gerry Goldhaber and others for variables to be cross tabulated. A chi square analysis was used. "Turn around" time at the Computer Center was often more than 24 hours due to technical breakdowns which occur often in warm weather. This lengthened, considerably, the amount of time taken for analysis.

The data collected, its statistical analysis and interpretation of it will be presented in Chapter III. The data is reported in nominal form which allows only for classification of responses. The characteristics of the sample will be described. All responses will be presented in tabular form as well as discussed verbally.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The demographic data furnished by the respondents is presented below. In cases where the same data is available for the population of registered voters in the state the results are compared to measure representativeness of sample.

Table 1

Proportion of Returns from Each County

County	% of State Voters	% of Return
1 Bernalillo	31.0	34.8
2 Catron	3.0	.5
3 Chaves	4.0	4.4
4 Colfax	1.4	.8
5 Curry	3.0	2.3
6 De Baca	.3	.3
7 Dona Ana	6.0	7.2
8 Eddy	4.0	3.4
9 Grant	2.0	2.1
10 Guadalupe	.7	.3
11 Harding	.2	0.0
12 Hidalgo	.4	.5
13 Lea	5.0	5.7

Table 1 (cont.)

Proportion of Returns from Each County

County	% of State Voters	% of Return
14 Lincoln	.9	2.3
15 Los Alamos	2.0	6.4
16 Luna	1.0	.5
17 McKinley	3.0	1.5
18 Mora	.6	0.0
19 Otero	3.0	2.1
20 Quay	1.0	.3
21 Rio Arriba	3.0	1.0
22 Roosevelt	2.0	.3
23 Sandoval	2.0	1.3
24 San Juan	4.0	4.9
25 San Miguel	2.0	1.3
26 Santa Fe	6.0	7.5
27 Sierra	.9	.5
28 Socorro	1.4	1.0
29 Taos	2.0	3.1
30 Torrance	.8	.3
31 Union	.6	.5
32 Valencia	4.0	3.1

A chi square analysis for goodness of fit showed no significant difference. Therefore, on the basis of percentages returned from each county, this sample is assumed to be representative of the state.

Table 2
Age of Respondent

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Under 21	20	5.2
21 - 30	78	20.2
31 - 40	81	20.9
41 - 50	83	21.4
Over 50	125	32.3
No Answer	$\frac{1}{388}$	$\frac{\text{Missing}}{100.0}$

Table 3
Sex of Respondent

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Male	264	68.2
Female	123	31.8
No Answer	$\frac{1}{388}$	$\frac{\text{Missing}}{100.0}$

Table 4
Ethnic Classification

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Native American or Indian*	57	14.7
Hispano, Mexican American or Chicano	45	11.6
Black	3	.8
Oriental	0	0
Other**	282	72.9
No Answer	<u>1</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

*Percentage of response to this question are higher than to be expected for the given population. This can probably be attributed to the phrasiology of the alternative. Many white-anglos, confused by the choices, selected this alternative. If it could be determined by other answers that the respondent did not belong in that category, he was coded appropriately.

**This category was meant to include Anglos.

Table 5
Marital Status of Respondent

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Married	311	80.8
Married, Separated	6	1.6
Divorced	18	4.7
Widowed	11	2.9
Single	39	10.1
No Answer	<u>3</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 6

Respondents' Length of Residency in New Mexico

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1 - 2 Years	9	2.3
3 - 5 Years	31	8.1
6 - 10 Years	50	13.0
11 - 15 Years	43	11.2
Over 15 Years	252	65.5
No Answer	<u>3</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 7

Highest Grade Completed in School

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Advanced Degree	84	22.0
College Graduate	83	21.7
Partial College of Technical School	89	23.3
High School	101	26.4
Partial High School	14	3.7
Junior High	10	2.6
Less than 7 Years	1	0.3
No Answer	<u>6</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 8
Level of Education Completed

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
High School	105	28.9
Two Year College	80	22.0
University	89	24.5
Graduate	89	24.5
No Answer	<u>25</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 9
Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Class I	58	15.1
Class II	96	25.1
Class III	90	23.5
Class IV	111	29.0
Class V	28	7.3
No Answer	<u>5</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 10
Approximate Annual Income

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
< \$4,000	42	13.0
< 6,000	32	9.9
< 8,000	39	12.1
< 9,000	20	6.2
< 10,000	14	4.3
< 12,000	48	14.9
< 15,000	50	15.5
< 25,000	53	16.4
> 25,000	25	7.7
No Answer	<u>65</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 11
Respondent's Connection with U.N.M.

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Student	14	3.6
Parent of Student	32	8.3
Employee	8	2.1
Alumnus	39	10.1
No Connection	270	69.9
Other	23	6.0
No Answer	<u>2</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0

Table 12
Political Party Preference

	Frequency	Percent in Sample	Actual Percentage of Voters in N.M.
Republican	133	34.9	30
Democrat	189	49.6	65
Other	59	15.5	5
No Answer	<u>7</u> 388	<u>Missing</u> 100.0	<u>0</u> 100.0

A chi square analysis for goodness of fit showed this variance to be significant. ($\chi^2 = 26.49$; $p < .01$). Thus, the return by political party may not truly be representative of the proportions in the population. However, when considering only registered Republicans and Democrats (and excluding "other") the sample may be considered representative of the population ($\chi^2 = 4.448$; $.01 < p < .05$).

The remainder of the questions can be classified into either informational or attitudinal categories. The frequencies of the responses to these questions are reported in their nominal form. Crosstabulations were computed on all questions whose response distribution varied sufficiently to produce a meaningful chi square analysis. The criterion for computing a crosstabulation on a question (or set of questions) was arbitrarily set as a response distribution of 70% / 30%.¹ Distributions exceeding this arbitrary criterion were assumed to be skewed in such a way as to make additional analysis meaningless. For

¹This decision was reached through consultation with Robert Anderson, Division of Government Research, ISRAD and Gerald Goldhaber, Department of Speech Communication, U.N.M. whose previous research experience has led to this conclusion.

example, if a response distribution to a question was 65% / 35% this data was crosstabulated with selected demographic variables. However, if the response distribution was 80% / 20%, no further analysis was conducted. The results of these crosstabulations (with a chi square analysis) will follow the presentation of frequencies. The responses to each question will also be verbally analyzed and interpreted.

The data in Table 13 refers to Questions 13, 14, 15 which asked if the respondent was aware of the three aspects of the University of New Mexico. The responses to Questions 13 and 14 indicated that U.N.M. adequately projects an image of being an institution of teaching and research. Question 15 indicates that U.N.M.'s image as a community service institution may not have been effectively communicated. Only 56% of the sample understood that U.N.M. was an institution of community service. Consequently crosstabulations with the dependent variables (demographics) were conducted to indicate in which segments of the population information may have been deficient about this aspect of U.N.M. The analysis of these crosstabulations are shown in Tables 14 - 21.

Table 13

INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS

Question 13.

Is it your understanding that U.N.M. is an institution of teaching?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	360	93.0
No	<u>27</u>	<u>7.0</u>
	387	100.0

Table 13 (cont.)

INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS

Question 14.

Is it your understanding that U.N.M. is an institution of research?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	292	75.5
No	$\frac{95}{387}$	$\frac{24.5}{100.0}$

Question 15.

Is it your understanding that U.N.M. is an institution of community service?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	217	56.7
No	$\frac{166}{383}$	$\frac{43.3}{100.0}$

NEWSCO

The variable NEWSCO was assigned for purposes of analysis to any group of counties designated by the Public Information Office to receive common news coverage. The terms NEWSCO-1, NEWSCO-2,...NEWSCO-13 will be used in the analysis of the data. The counties which each of these classifications denote are:

NEWSCO-1 Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia

NEWSCO-2 Los Alamos, Santa Fe

NEWSCO-3 Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Taos

NEWSCO-4 DeBaca, Guadalupe, Harding, Quay, Torrance

NEWSCO-5 Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro

NEWSO-6 Dona Ana, Hidalgo, Luna
 NEWSO-7 Chaves, Eddy
 NEWSO-8 Colfax, Union
 NEWSO-9 Lincoln, Otero
 NEWSO-10 Curry, Roosevelt
 NEWSO-11 Lea
 NEWSO-12 McKinley
 NEWSO-13 San Juan

Question 15

Is it your understanding that U.N.M. is an institution of community service?

NEWSO, the variable designation for a group of counties which receives common media coverage, was significant ($p < .05$). This means that there is a significant difference in knowledge regarding U.N.M.'s contribution to community service depending on in which news coverage area the respondent resided. Areas with especially low knowledge of this aspect were: NEWSO-5 (Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro) 33.3% yes; NEWSO-9 (Lincoln, Otero) 47.1% yes; NEWSO-10 (Curry, Roosevelt) 50% yes; NEWSO-11 (Lea) 27.3% yes; NEWSO-12 (McKinley) 33.3% yes; NEWSO-13 (San Juan) 38.9% yes. (See Table 14.)

Age, represented in Table 15, is also a significant factor ($p < .001$). There is a significant inverse relationship between age and understanding of U.N.M. as a community service institution. The older the age group, the lower the percentage who have a positive understanding of this aspect of U.N.M.

No significant difference was found between the males' response to this question and the females' response. (See Table 16.) Level of education completed was also not significantly related to the question. (See Table 17.) Level of social status according to Hollingshead did not significantly relate to the responses on this question. (See Table 18.) There was indication of a trend ($p < .2$) that lower income respondents were more often aware of the community service aspect of U.N.M. (See Table 19.)

A subject's affiliation with U.N.M. is significantly related to his understanding of U.N.M. as a community service institution. Of those who have been on campus (students, employees, alumni) between 84% and 92% indicated that they understood U.N.M. to be a community service institute. Parents of students were somewhat less aware (65%) and those with no or "other" connection (e.g. personal observation, contractors on campus, etc.) were even less aware. This is quite significant as this last category comprises almost 76% of the sample. This leads one to conclude that those with direct contact with U.N.M. are correct in their perceptions regarding community services, but half of those with no direct contact may be insufficiently informed. (See Table 20.)

Political party affiliation proved to be an insignificant factor with regard to this question. (See Table 21.)

In conclusion, it should be noted that the community service aspect of U.N.M. is only known to 57% of the voting population. News coverage areas where knowledge of community service is least prevalent are Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro, Lincoln, Otero, Lee, McKinley, and San Juan Counties.

Therefore, if the University wants to project the image of a community service institution to more people, it should especially increase efforts in these areas while maintaining their present programs.

Seemingly a campaign could be designed without regard to sex of the public, level of education, social status, or income.

Increased effort should be made through the public channels that reach those with no U.N.M. connection. Those with U.N.M. affiliation seem sufficiently well informed and the channels that reach them should be maintained.

Table 14

Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution?
by Newsco

COUNT	I												
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50			ROW			
COL	PCT	I								TOTAL			
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
1.	I	I	15	I	56	I	45	I	40	I	60	I	216
	I	I	6.9	I	25.9	I	20.8	I	18.5	I	27.8	I	56.5
	I	I	75.0	I	73.7	I	56.3	I	48.8	I	48.4	I	
	I	I	3.9	I	14.7	I	11.8	I	10.5	I	15.7	I	
2.	I	I	5	I	20	I	35	I	42	I	64	I	166
	I	I	3.0	I	12.0	I	21.1	I	25.3	I	38.6	I	43.5
	I	I	25.0	I	26.3	I	43.8	I	51.2	I	51.6	I	
	I	I	1.3	I	5.2	I	9.2	I	11.0	I	16.8	I	
COLUMN			20		76		80		82		124		382
TOTAL			5.2		19.9		20.9		21.5		32.5		100.0

SOMER'S D = 0.13872

6

Table 16

VAR003

		COUNT	I				
	ROW	PCT	IMALE		FEMALE		ROW
	COL	PCT	I				TOTAL
	TOT	PCT	I		1.I	2.I	
VAR015			I		I	I	
	1.		I	152	I	64	I 216
YES			I	70.4	I	29.6	I 56.5
			I	58.0	I	53.3	I
			I	39.8	I	16.8	I
			-I		-I		-I
	2.		I	110	I	56	I 166
NO			I	66.3	I	33.7	I 43.5
			I	42.0	I	46.7	I
			I	28.8	I	14.7	I
			-I		-I		-I
	COLUMN			262		120	382
	TOTAL			68.6		31.4	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 0.55605 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.03815
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.03813
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04384
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.04035
 GAMMA = 0.09465
 SOMER'S D = 0.04682

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

VAR008

		COUNT	I					ROW	
		ROW PCT	I HIGH	SCH	TWO YR C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW	
		COL PCT	IOOL	CLLEGE		TY.	TOTAL		
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I		
VAR015		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	57	I	42	I	52	I	205
	YES	I	27.8	I	20.5	I	25.4	I	57.3
		I	54.3	I	52.5	I	59.8	I	
NO		I	15.9	I	11.7	I	14.5	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	2.	I	48	I	38	I	35	I	153
		I	31.4	I	24.8	I	22.9	I	42.7
		I	45.7	I	47.5	I	40.2	I	
		I	13.4	I	10.6	I	9.8	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN			105		80		87		358
TOTAL			29.3		22.3		24.3		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.41913 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.08220

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.08193

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.06603

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.07987

GAMMA = -0.10896

SOMER'S D = -0.05344

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 30

U.N.M. A COMMUNITY SERVICE INSTITUTION?		HOLLINGSHEAD INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS	
U.N.M. A COMMUNITY SERVICE INSTITUTION?	HOLLINGSHEAD INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS	PERCENTAGE	
		U.N.M. A COMMUNITY SERVICE INSTITUTION?	HOLLINGSHEAD INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10
11	11	11	11
12	12	12	12
13	13	13	13
14	14	14	14
15	15	15	15
16	16	16	16
17	17	17	17
18	18	18	18
19	19	19	19
20	20	20	20
21	21	21	21
22	22	22	22
23	23	23	23
24	24	24	24
25	25	25	25
26	26	26	26
27	27	27	27
28	28	28	28
29	29	29	29
30	30	30	30
31	31	31	31
32	32	32	32
33	33	33	33
34	34	34	34
35	35	35	35
36	36	36	36
37	37	37	37
38	38	38	38
39	39	39	39
40	40	40	40
41	41	41	41
42	42	42	42
43	43	43	43
44	44	44	44
45	45	45	45
46	46	46	46
47	47	47	47
48	48	48	48
49	49	49	49
50	50	50	50
51	51	51	51
52	52	52	52
53	53	53	53
54	54	54	54
55	55	55	55
56	56	56	56
57	57	57	57
58	58	58	58
59	59	59	59
60	60	60	60
61	61	61	61
62	62	62	62
63	63	63	63
64	64	64	64
65	65	65	65
66	66	66	66
67	67	67	67
68	68	68	68
69	69	69	69
70	70	70	70
71	71	71	71
72	72	72	72
73	73	73	73
74	74	74	74
75	75	75	75
76	76	76	76
77	77	77	77
78	78	78	78
79	79	79	79
80	80	80	80
81	81	81	81
82	82	82	82
83	83	83	83
84	84	84	84
85	85	85	85
86	86	86	86
87	87	87	87
88	88	88	88
89	89	89	89
90	90	90	90
91	91	91	91
92	92	92	92
93	93	93	93
94	94	94	94
95	95	95	95
96	96	96	96
97	97	97	97
98	98	98	98
99	99	99	99
100	100	100	100

Table 18
 Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution?
 by Hollingshead Index of Social Status

COUNT						ROW
ROW PCT						TOTAL
COL PCT						
TOT PCT	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	
1.	31	59	46	63	16	215
	14.4	27.4	21.4	29.3	7.4	56.9
	57.4	62.1	51.1	56.8	57.1	
	8.2	15.6	12.2	16.7	4.2	
2.	23	36	44	48	12	163
	14.1	22.1	27.0	29.4	7.4	43.1
	42.6	37.9	48.9	43.2	42.9	
	6.1	9.5	11.6	12.7	3.2	
COLUMN	54	95	90	111	28	378
TOTAL	14.3	25.1	23.8	29.4	7.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.28634 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CRAMER'S V = 0.07777
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.07754
KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.02317
KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.02844
GAMMA = 0.03767
SOMER'S D = 0.01852

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

VAR 010

COUNT		I																	
ROW	PCT	I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000					ROW			
COL	PCT	I																	TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I								
-----I-----																			

CHI SQUARE = 11.98452 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.19383

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.19029

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.12720

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.16505

GAMMA = 0.19518

SOMER'S D = 0.09444

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 69

		VAR012					
		COUNT	I				
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER			
COL	PCT	IAN				ROW	TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I		
VAR015		I	I	I	I		
	1.	I	77	I	101	I	36
YES		I	36.0	I	47.2	I	16.8
		I	58.3	I	53.7	I	64.3
		I	20.5	I	26.9	I	9.6
		I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.	I	55	I	87	I	20
NO		I	34.0	I	53.7	I	12.3
		I	41.7	I	46.3	I	35.7
		I	14.6	I	23.1	I	5.3
		I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN			132		188		56
TOTAL			35.1		50.0		14.9
							376
							100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.12990 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.07526
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.07505
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01060
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.01154
 GAMMA = -0.01950
 SOMER'S D = -0.00955

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 12

Table 21

Crosstabulation of U.N.M. A Community Service Institution?
 by Political Party Preference

Table 22

Question 16.

Do you feel that U.N.M. should be an institution of teaching?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	377	98.4
No	$\frac{6}{383}$	$\frac{1.6}{100.0}$

Question 17.

Do you feel that U.N.M. should be an institution of research?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	326	90.1
No	$\frac{36}{382}$	$\frac{9.9}{100.0}$

Question 18.

Do you feel that U.N.M. should be an institution of community service?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	301	86.7
No	$\frac{46}{347}$	$\frac{13.3}{100.0}$

The responses to Questions 16, 17, and 18 indicate that a majority of the sample (87% - 98%) believe the U.N.M. should maintain the three aspects of teaching, research and community service. The percentages seem to show that the three facets are listed in order of priority but this is not conclusive as ordering was not requested in the poll. No crosstabulations were necessary due to the high percentage of positive responses.

Table 23

Question 27.

Are you aware of any benefits of U.N.M. research or service in your community?

Alternatives	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	142	36.7
No	192	49.6
No Opinion	<u>53</u> 387	<u>13.7</u> 100.0

Since almost half of the sample claimed to be unaware of benefits of U.N.M. research or service in their community, crosstabulations were run to determine which segments of the population these people were.

Question 27

Are you aware of any benefits of U.N.M. research or service in your community?

Crosstabulation with NEWSO showed a very high level of significance ($P < .001$). NEWSO's 1, 2, 3, and 12 appear to be much better informed (50% - 55%) about these benefits than the average for all NEWSO's (37%). While these four NEWSO's account for 60% of the sample, the remaining 40% indicated a decided lack of knowledge about any benefits. Percentages of negative responses in these NEWSO's range from 50% - 100% with four NEWSO's reporting no positive responses. (See Table 24.)

Age was not a significant factor on this question ($p < .05$). However there was a tendency for those under 21 years to know the most about research and service benefits. The same age group also had the highest degree of "no opinion." The group from 21 - 40 had the least

"no opinion" and their response was decidedly negative (58%). Responses from the oldest two age groups were very similar to each other. (See Table 25.)

There was not a significant difference in the responses of males and females to this informational question. (See Table 26.) A further crosstabulation, however, shows men to be decidedly ($p < .001$) more knowledgeable of the research and community benefits than women when compared by NEWSO. Still, males were only 40% aware and females only 30%. (See Table 32 - 33.) Levels of education completed by respondents also showed no significant bearing on response to this question. (See Table 27.) The Hollingshead index of social status did not contribute significantly to choice of response. (See Table 28.)

Income showed no significant bearing on response. The \$9000 - \$10,000 income bracket showed the most knowledge about the benefits. The top two income brackets (above \$15,000) were the most certain about this question (i.e., fewer "no opinion" responses), but their responses were mostly negative. It was the top income bracket who claimed to know the least about research and community benefits. (See Table 29.)

Connection with U.N.M. was highly significant ($p < .001$) in response to this question. The 24% of the sample directly connected with U.N.M. (students, parents of students, alumni, employees) were relatively aware of the benefits. (The combined "yes" answer from all those connected with U.N.M. was 78%.) However, of the 76% remaining with no direct connection, only 28% of them are aware of the research and service benefits. (See Table 30.)

The chi square analysis of Political Party Preference and response to Question 27 was significant ($p < .05$). Percentage wise, Republicans

most often claimed to be unaware of any benefits, while "other" claimed to be aware most often. Democrats had the highest percentage of "no opinion" (20%) and more often than not (in a ratio of 3 : 2) answered "no." (See Table 31.) Because most of the state legislators are aligned with a major party (Republican or Democrat), it may be important to make the constituents of these parties more aware of the benefits which U.N.M. provides.

It can be concluded, then, that the public was not aware of benefits of research and service in their community. The responses show that it was mainly the people with no connection to the University who were in the greatest need of information. Of these, those over twenty-one were least likely to be aware of any benefits and of these, women were less informed than men. However, this demographic breakdown is actually a moot point when only 37% of the public is aware of the benefits of U.N.M. An overall effort should be made by any department of the University to emphasize the name of the University when in contact with the public (e.g. meteorological reports, "Action Line" references, etc.). Also, official University signs should be on location of any research site or community service center (e.g. archeological site, medical or legal service). Endeavors should also be made to publicize any social benefits as widely as possible through public service announcements in the mass media.

	COLN		ROW
	RO		TOTAL
	9.1		
	-----I		
VAR	6	I	142
	4.2	I	36.7
Y	5.3	I	
	1.6	I	
	-----I		
	10	I	192
	5.2	I	49.6
N	8.8	I	
	2.6	I	
	-----I		
	1	I	53
	1.9	I	13.7
N	5.9	I	
	0.3	I	
	-----I		
	17		387
	4.4		100.0

(CO

Table 24

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits
by Newsco

TABLE 25

CROSSTABULATION AWARE OF RESEARCH OR COMMUNITY SERVICE BENEFITS
BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

AGE	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+
18-24	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
25-34	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
35-44	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
45-54	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
55-64	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
65-74	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
75+	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 25

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits
by Age of Respondent

COUNT	COUNT										ROW		
ROW PCT	I		UNDER 21		21-30		31-40		41-50		OVER 50		ROW
COL PCT	COL										TOTAL		
TOT PCT	TOT										TOTAL		
I	I										TOTAL		
1.I	1.I										TOTAL		
2.I	2.I										TOTAL		
3.I	3.I										TOTAL		
4.I	4.I										TOTAL		
5.I	5.I										TOTAL		
1.	I	9	I	26	I	28	I	30	I	49	I	142	
	I	6.3	I	18.3	I	19.7	I	21.1	I	34.5	I	36.8	
	I	45.0	I	33.3	I	35.0	I	36.1	I	39.2	I		
	I	2.3	I	6.7	I	7.3	I	7.8	I	12.7	I		
2.	I	6	I	46	I	46	I	37	I	56	I	191	
	I	3.1	I	24.1	I	24.1	I	19.4	I	29.3	I	49.5	
	I	30.0	I	59.0	I	57.5	I	44.6	I	44.8	I		
	I	1.6	I	11.9	I	11.9	I	9.6	I	14.5	I		
3.	I	5	I	6	I	6	I	16	I	20	I	53	
	I	9.4	I	11.3	I	11.3	I	30.2	I	37.7	I	13.7	
	I	25.0	I	7.7	I	7.5	I	19.3	I	16.0	I		
	I	1.3	I	1.6	I	1.6	I	4.1	I	5.2	I		
COLUMN	20	78	80	83	125	386							
TOTAL	5.2	20.2	20.7	21.5	32.4	100.0							

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

VAR003						
		COUNT	I			
ROW	PCT	IMALE		FEMALE		ROW
COL	PCT	I				TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I		
VAR027						
YES	1.	I	105	I	37	I 142
		I	73.9	I	26.1	I 36.8
		I	39.8	I	30.3	I
		I	27.2	I	9.6	I
NO	2.	I	124	I	67	I 191
		I	64.9	I	35.1	I 49.5
		I	47.0	I	54.9	I
		I	32.1	I	17.4	I
NO OPINION	3.	I	35	I	18	I 53
		I	66.0	I	34.0	I 13.7
		I	13.3	I	14.8	I
		I	9.1	I	4.7	I
COLUMN			264		122	386
TOTAL			68.4		31.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.22475 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.09140
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.09102
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.07713
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.07863
 GAMMA = 0.15110
 SOMER'S D = 0.09094

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

Table 26

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits
by Sex of Respondent

CHI SQUARE = 6.25035 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CRAMER'S V = 0.09291
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.13028
KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.05915
KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.05902
GAMMA = -0.08852
SOMER'S D = -0.05264

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 26

Table 27

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service
by How Much Education Completed?

VAR009

COUNT	I											ROW
ROW PCT	I											TOTAL
COL PCT	I											
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
1.	I	21	I	41	I	34	I	34	I	11	I	141
	I	14.9	I	29.1	I	24.1	I	24.1	I	7.8	I	36.9
	I	36.8	I	42.7	I	37.8	I	30.6	I	39.3	I	
	I	5.5	I	10.7	I	8.9	I	8.9	I	2.9	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
2.	I	32	I	40	I	40	I	65	I	13	I	190
	I	16.8	I	21.1	I	21.1	I	34.2	I	6.8	I	49.7
	I	56.1	I	41.7	I	44.4	I	58.6	I	46.4	I	
	I	8.4	I	10.5	I	10.5	I	17.0	I	3.4	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
3.	I	4	I	15	I	16	I	12	I	4	I	51
	I	7.8	I	29.4	I	31.4	I	23.5	I	7.8	I	13.4
	I	7.0	I	15.6	I	17.8	I	10.8	I	14.3	I	
	I	1.0	I	3.9	I	4.2	I	3.1	I	1.0	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN		57		96		90		111		28		382
TOTAL		14.9		25.1		23.6		29.1		7.3		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.11380 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.11506

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.16060

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04191

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.04266

GAMMA = 0.06148

SOMER'S D = 0.03697

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

6

VAR010																					
COUNT		I																			
ROW	PCT	I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000	ROW									
COL	PCT	I																			
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	TOTAL									
VAR027		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I								
YES	1.	I	18	I	9	I	13	I	6	I	8	I	22	I	15	I	23	I	8	I	122
		I	14.8	I	7.4	I	10.7	I	4.9	I	6.6	I	18.0	I	12.3	I	18.9	I	6.6	I	37.8
		I	42.9	I	28.1	I	33.3	I	30.0	I	57.1	I	45.8	I	30.0	I	43.4	I	32.0	I	
		I	5.6	I	2.8	I	4.0	I	1.9	I	2.5	I	6.8	I	4.6	I	7.1	I	2.5	I	
NO		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	2.	I	18	I	17	I	21	I	11	I	2	I	21	I	27	I	27	I	16	I	160
		I	11.3	I	10.6	I	13.1	I	6.9	I	1.3	I	13.1	I	16.9	I	16.9	I	10.0	I	49.5
		I	42.9	I	53.1	I	53.8	I	55.0	I	14.3	I	43.8	I	54.0	I	50.9	I	64.0	I	
NO OPINION		I	5.6	I	5.3	I	6.5	I	3.4	I	0.6	I	6.5	I	8.4	I	8.4	I	5.0	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	3.	I	6	I	6	I	5	I	3	I	4	I	5	I	8	I	3	I	1	I	41
		I	14.6	I	14.6	I	12.2	I	7.3	I	9.8	I	12.2	I	19.5	I	7.3	I	2.4	I	12.7
		I	14.3	I	18.8	I	12.8	I	15.0	I	28.6	I	10.4	I	16.0	I	5.7	I	4.0	I	
		I	1.9	I	1.9	I	1.5	I	0.9	I	1.2	I	1.5	I	2.5	I	0.9	I	0.3	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN		42		32		39		20		14		48		50		53		25		323	
TOTAL		13.0		9.9		12.1		6.2		4.3		14.9		15.5		16.4		7.7		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 19.17656 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.17229

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.23673

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.03586

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.03882

GAMMA = -0.04949

SOMER'S D = -0.02961

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 65

Table 30

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits
by Directly Connected with U.N.M.

VAR011

		COUNT	I											ROW		
ROW PCT		ISTUDENT	PARENT	O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO	CONNE	OTHER	ROW						
COL PCT		I	F	STUDEN	CTION								TOTAL			
TOT PCT		I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I								
VAR027		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I							
YES	1.	I	8	I	19	I	8	I	20	I	81	I	6	I	142	
		I	5.6	I	13.4	I	5.6	I	14.1	I	57.0	I	4.2	I	36.9	
		I	57.1	I	59.4	I	100.0	I	52.6	I	30.0	I	26.1	I		
		I	2.1	I	4.9	I	2.1	I	5.2	I	21.0	I	1.6	I		
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
NO	2.	I	6	I	9	I	0	I	14	I	150	I	11	I	190	
		I	3.2	I	4.7	I	0.0	I	7.4	I	78.9	I	5.8	I	49.4	
		I	42.9	I	28.1	I	0.0	I	36.8	I	55.6	I	47.8	I		
		I	1.6	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	3.6	I	39.0	I	2.9	I		
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
NO OPINION	3.	I	0	I	4	I	0	I	4	I	39	I	6	I	53	
		I	0.0	I	7.5	I	0.0	I	7.5	I	73.6	I	11.3	I	13.8	
		I	0.0	I	12.5	I	0.0	I	10.5	I	14.4	I	26.1	I		
		I	0.0	I	1.0	I	0.0	I	1.0	I	10.1	I	1.6	I		
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
COLUMN			14		32		8		38		270		23		385	
TOTAL			3.6		8.3		2.1		9.9		70.1		6.0		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 37.63107 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.22107

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.29840

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.22351

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.18131

GAMMA = 0.39810

SOMER'S D = 0.24860

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

VAR012

		COUNT	I			ROW				
		ROW PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER	TOTAL				
		COL PCT	IAN							
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR027	YES	-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----								
		1.	I	52	I	61	I	28	I	141
			I	36.9	I	43.3	I	19.9	I	37.1
			I	39.4	I	32.3	I	47.5	I	
	NO		I	13.7	I	16.1	I	7.4	I	
		-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----								
		2.	I	70	I	91	I	25	I	186
			I	37.6	I	48.9	I	13.4	I	48.9
	NO OPINION		I	53.0	I	48.1	I	42.4	I	
			I	18.4	I	23.9	I	6.6	I	
		-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----								
		3.	I	10	I	37	I	6	I	53
			I	18.9	I	69.8	I	11.3	I	13.9
			I	7.6	I	19.6	I	10.2	I	
			I	2.6	I	9.7	I	1.6	I	
		-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----								
		COLUMN		132		189		59	380	
		TOTAL		34.7		49.7		15.5	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 12.81421 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.12985
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18061
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.02118
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.01924
 GAMMA = 0.03494
 SOMER'S D = 0.02110

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

Table 31

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits
by Political Party Preference

NEWSCO

NEWSCO

		COUNT I																NEWSC						
		ROW PCT I																I						
		COL PCT I																ICURRY RD LEA						
		TOT PCT I																IOSEVELT						
		VAL																MCKINLEY SAN JUAN						
		OS SANTA																SAN JUAN						
		SAN M T																ROW						
		HARD GU																TOTAL						
		SOC SIE AL LUNA DDY																						
		NION																						
		OTERO																						
		9																						
		10.1																						
		11.1																						
		12.1																						
		13.1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						
		1																						

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 70.74477 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.36604
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.45972
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.22443
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.23265
 GAMMA = 0.31643
 SOMER'S D = 0.19603

NEWSCO					
RO LEA	MCKINLEY		SAN JUAN		ROW
T					TOTAL
0.1	11	12.1	13.1		

I	0	1	0	I	37
I	0.0	2.7	0.0	I	30.3
I	0.0	100.0	0.0	I	
I	0.0	0.8	0.0	I	

I	7	0	6	I	67
I	10.4	0.0	9.0	I	54.9
I	77.8	0.0	54.5	I	
I	5.7	0.0	4.9	I	

I	2	0	5	I	18
I	11.1	0.0	27.8	I	14.8
I	22.2	0.0	45.5	I	
I	1.6	0.0	4.1	I	

	9	1	11		122
	7.4	0.8	9.0		100.0

ARE = 50.39923 WITH 22 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

S V = 0.45448

ENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.54068

S TAU B = 0.24997

S TAU C = 0.25779

0.35557

D = 0.21256

OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

Table 33

Crosstabulation Aware of Research or Community Service Benefits
by Newsco, Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Female

NEWSCO																			NEWSCO			
COUNT	ROW	PCT	COL	PCT	TOT	PCT	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	5.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	ROW	IMCK	INLEY	SAN	JUAN	ROW
							VAL	OS	SANTA	SAN	M T	SOC	SIE	DDY	NION	OTERO	OSEVELT	TOTAL				TOTAL
VAR027																						
	1.	I	I	I	I	I	0	I	23	I	6	I	5	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I
YES		I	I	I	I	I	0.0	I	62.2	I	16.2	I	13.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.4	I	0.0	I
		I	I	I	I	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	42.9	I	45.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	33.3	I	0.0	I
		I	I	I	I	I	0.0	I	18.9	I	4.9	I	4.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.6	I	0.0	I
	2.	I	I	I	I	I	3	I	20	I	6	I	6	I	2	I	10	I	2	I	4	I
NO		I	I	I	I	I	4.5	I	29.9	I	9.0	I	9.0	I	3.0	I	14.9	I	3.0	I	6.0	I
		I	I	I	I	I	50.0	I	43.5	I	42.9	I	54.5	I	100.0	I	90.9	I	50.0	I	66.7	I
		I	I	I	I	I	2.5	I	16.4	I	4.9	I	4.9	I	1.6	I	8.2	I	1.6	I	3.3	I
	3.	I	I	I	I	I	3	I	3	I	2	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	2	I	0	I
NO OPINION		I	I	I	I	I	16.7	I	16.7	I	11.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	11.1	I	0.0	I
		I	I	I	I	I	50.0	I	6.5	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	9.1	I	50.0	I	0.0	I
		I	I	I	I	I	2.5	I	2.5	I	1.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	1.6	I	0.0	I
COLUMN							6		46		14		11		2		11		4		6	
TOTAL							4.9		37.7		11.5		9.0		1.6		9.0		3.3		4.9	

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 50.39923 WITH 22 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.45448
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.54068
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.24997
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.25779
 GAMMA = 0.35557
 SOMER'S D = 0.21256

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

Question 28.

Where do you obtain most of your information about U.N.M.? (Please check one.)

Since there was a high rate of occurrence of multiple answers (subjects checking more than one information source) the cumulative total of responses to all sources will exceed n (388).

Table 34

Source: Newspaper

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	245	63.1
No	<u>143</u> 388	<u>36.9</u> 100.0

Source: Television

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	181	46.6
No	<u>207</u> 388	<u>53.4</u> 100.0

Source: Radio

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	87	22.4
No	<u>301</u> 388	<u>77.6</u> 100.0

Source: Channel 5 specifically

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	60	15.5
No	<u>328</u> 388	<u>84.5</u> 100.0

Table 34 (cont.)

Source: "U.N.M. Reports"

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	19	4.9
No	$\frac{369}{388}$	$\frac{95.1}{100.0}$

Source: Students

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	122	31.4
No	$\frac{266}{388}$	$\frac{68.6}{100.0}$

Source: Friends

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	101	26.0
No	$\frac{287}{388}$	$\frac{74.0}{100.0}$

Source: Alumni Publications

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	34	8.8
No	$\frac{354}{388}$	$\frac{91.2}{100.0}$

Source: Other (Responses to this question were The Lobo,
Campus News, personal observation, professors.)

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	34	8.8
No	$\frac{354}{388}$	$\frac{91.2}{100.0}$

The highest positive frequencies reported were in newspapers (245 = 63%), television (181 = 47%) and students (122 = 31%). Cross-tabulations were conducted on these sources to find significant factors in the nature of the respondents.

Newspapers.

NEWSCO is not a significant variable ($p < .05$) according to the chi square analysis. The trend seems to be, however, that the larger urban areas of Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Los Alamos and Las Cruces depend less on the newspaper than the state average. However the frequencies in all NEWSCO's was 50 per cent or better. The conclusion is that newspapers are effective in communicating U.N.M. information to a large percentage of the public in all areas of the state. (See Table 35.)

There was a significant relationship ($p < .001$) between the age of the respondent and his propensity to receive his information about U.N.M. through the papers. The trend was for the sample to receive their information more through this medium as the age category was increased. Of those under twenty-one, half base their knowledge of U.N.M. on newspapers whereas of those over fifty, 74% considered newspapers a primary source. Information about U.N.M. reached 63% of the total sample through newsprint. (See Table 36.)

This is an important factor to consider when preparing press releases.

The crosstabulation between sex of respondent and newspapers as a source of information about U.N.M. did not show significance at the .05 level. There did seem to be a tendency ($p < .20$) for a higher percentage of men (66%) than women (58%) to report newspapers as a primary source. (See Table 37.)

The amount of formal education completed showed no significance in a crosstabulation with this question. (See Table 38.)

The Hollingshead index, while not significant in this comparison showed a tendency ($p < .20$) for the upper classes to receive their information through the newspapers. Of the 63% who selected newspapers, 67% of them were in Classes I, II, or III. (See Table 39.)

Crosstabulation of this question with income was not significant, although a slight trend ($p < .20$) was indicated. Those with incomes of \$10,000 and more accounted for more than half (56%) of the 207 positive responses. Those in the \$4,000 - \$6,000 income bracket reported that they were least likely to obtain their information about U.N.M. from the paper. (See Table 40.)

Direct connection with U.N.M. was not a significant factor at the .05 level. The largest part of the sample, those with no connection, reported in a ratio of 2 : 1 that they relied on the newspapers for information concerning U.N.M. Parents of students also relied heavily on the paper but alumni did not. The newspaper is probably the most effective medium to reach the most people. (See Table 41.)

The response by political party preference was not significant although reportedly a higher percentage of Republicans than Democrats ($p < .20$) receive their information from the newspaper and an even higher percentage of "other" selected the newspaper as a primary source. (See Table 42.)

TABLE 36			
CROSSTABULATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT U.N.M. FROM NEWSPAPER			
BY AGE OF RESPONDENT			
AGE	YES	NO	TOTAL
18-24	10.0	10.0	20.0
25-34	10.0	10.0	20.0
35-44	10.0	10.0	20.0
45-54	10.0	10.0	20.0
55-64	10.0	10.0	20.0
65-74	10.0	10.0	20.0
75-84	10.0	10.0	20.0
85-94	10.0	10.0	20.0
95-104	10.0	10.0	20.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	200.0

Table 36

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper
by Age of Respondent

VAR002

		COUNT											
		I											
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50	ROW					
COL	PCT	I						TOTAL					
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
VAR028		I	I	I	I	I	I	I					
	0.	I	10	I	43	I	28	I	30	I	32	I	143
NO		I	7.0	I	30.1	I	19.6	I	21.0	I	22.4	I	37.0
		I	50.0	I	55.1	I	34.6	I	36.1	I	25.6	I	
		I	2.6	I	11.1	I	7.2	I	7.8	I	8.3	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	10	I	35	I	53	I	53	I	93	I	244
YES		I	4.1	I	14.3	I	21.7	I	21.7	I	38.1	I	63.0
		I	50.0	I	44.9	I	65.4	I	63.9	I	74.4	I	
		I	2.6	I	9.0	I	13.7	I	13.7	I	24.0	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN			20		78		81		83		125		387
TOTAL			5.2		20.2		20.9		21.4		32.3		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.65778 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.22538

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.21986

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.18623

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.22202

GAMMA = 0.30521

SOMER'S D = 0.14557

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

		VAR003					
		COUNT	I				
		ROW PCT	MALE	FEMALE		ROW	
		COL PCT	I			TOTAL	
		TOT PCT	I	1.1	2.1		
VAR028		-----	I-----	I-----	I-----		
	0.	I	91	I	52	I	143
NO		I	63.6	I	36.4	I	37.0
		I	34.5	I	42.3	I	
		I	23.5	I	13.4	I	
		-----	I-----	I-----	I-----		
	1.	I	173	I	71	I	244
YES		I	70.9	I	29.1	I	63.0
		I	65.5	I	57.7	I	
		I	44.7	I	18.3	I	
		-----	I-----	I-----	I-----		
COLUMN			264		123		387
TOTAL			68.2		31.8		100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 1.87268 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.06956
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.06940
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.07531
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.06770
 GAMMA = -0.16400
 SOMER'S D = -0.07807

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

Table 37

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper
by Sex of Respondent

COUNT		VAR000	
TOTAL		1.000	
001	1	0.1	0.01
002	1	0.1	0.01
003	1	0.1	0.01
004	1	0.1	0.01
005	1	0.1	0.01
006	1	0.1	0.01
007	1	0.1	0.01
008	1	0.1	0.01
009	1	0.1	0.01
010	1	0.1	0.01
011	1	0.1	0.01
012	1	0.1	0.01
013	1	0.1	0.01
014	1	0.1	0.01
015	1	0.1	0.01
016	1	0.1	0.01
017	1	0.1	0.01
018	1	0.1	0.01
019	1	0.1	0.01
020	1	0.1	0.01
021	1	0.1	0.01
022	1	0.1	0.01
023	1	0.1	0.01
024	1	0.1	0.01
025	1	0.1	0.01
026	1	0.1	0.01
027	1	0.1	0.01
028	1	0.1	0.01
029	1	0.1	0.01
030	1	0.1	0.01
031	1	0.1	0.01
032	1	0.1	0.01
033	1	0.1	0.01
034	1	0.1	0.01
035	1	0.1	0.01
036	1	0.1	0.01
037	1	0.1	0.01
038	1	0.1	0.01
039	1	0.1	0.01
040	1	0.1	0.01
041	1	0.1	0.01
042	1	0.1	0.01
043	1	0.1	0.01
044	1	0.1	0.01
045	1	0.1	0.01
046	1	0.1	0.01
047	1	0.1	0.01
048	1	0.1	0.01
049	1	0.1	0.01
050	1	0.1	0.01
051	1	0.1	0.01
052	1	0.1	0.01
053	1	0.1	0.01
054	1	0.1	0.01
055	1	0.1	0.01
056	1	0.1	0.01
057	1	0.1	0.01
058	1	0.1	0.01
059	1	0.1	0.01
060	1	0.1	0.01
061	1	0.1	0.01
062	1	0.1	0.01
063	1	0.1	0.01
064	1	0.1	0.01
065	1	0.1	0.01
066	1	0.1	0.01
067	1	0.1	0.01
068	1	0.1	0.01
069	1	0.1	0.01
070	1	0.1	0.01
071	1	0.1	0.01
072	1	0.1	0.01
073	1	0.1	0.01
074	1	0.1	0.01
075	1	0.1	0.01
076	1	0.1	0.01
077	1	0.1	0.01
078	1	0.1	0.01
079	1	0.1	0.01
080	1	0.1	0.01
081	1	0.1	0.01
082	1	0.1	0.01
083	1	0.1	0.01
084	1	0.1	0.01
085	1	0.1	0.01
086	1	0.1	0.01
087	1	0.1	0.01
088	1	0.1	0.01
089	1	0.1	0.01
090	1	0.1	0.01
091	1	0.1	0.01
092	1	0.1	0.01
093	1	0.1	0.01
094	1	0.1	0.01
095	1	0.1	0.01
096	1	0.1	0.01
097	1	0.1	0.01
098	1	0.1	0.01
099	1	0.1	0.01
100	1	0.1	0.01

Table 39

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper
by Hollingshead Index of Social Status

COUNT	I										ROW	PCT										ROW
COL	PCT										I	I										TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I		2.I		3.I		4.I		5.I											
-----I-----																						

CHI SQUARE = 6.70331 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.13230

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.13115

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.09951

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.11892

GAMMA = -0.16567

SOMER'S D = -0.07725

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

		VAR010																	
		COUNT	I																
ROW	PCT	I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000	ROW							
COL	PCT	I										TOTAL							
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I								
VAR028		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I								
	0.	I	14	I	18	I	14	I	8	I	7	I	15	I	14	I	11	I	116
NO		I	12.1	I	15.5	I	12.1	I	6.9	I	6.0	I	12.9	I	12.1	I	12.9	I	35.9
		I	33.3	I	56.3	I	35.9	I	40.0	I	50.0	I	31.3	I	28.0	I	28.3	I	44.0
		I	4.3	I	5.6	I	4.3	I	2.5	I	2.2	I	4.6	I	4.3	I	4.6	I	3.4
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	1.	I	28	I	14	I	25	I	12	I	7	I	33	I	36	I	38	I	14
YES		I	13.5	I	6.8	I	12.1	I	5.8	I	3.4	I	15.9	I	17.4	I	18.4	I	6.8
		I	66.7	I	43.8	I	64.1	I	60.0	I	50.0	I	68.8	I	72.0	I	71.7	I	56.0
		I	8.7	I	4.3	I	7.7	I	3.7	I	2.2	I	10.2	I	11.1	I	11.8	I	4.3
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN			42		32		39		20		14		48		50		53		25
TOTAL			13.0		9.9		12.1		6.2		4.3		14.9		15.5		16.4		7.7

CHI SQUARE = 11.08221 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.18523

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18213

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.05984

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.07591

GAMMA = 0.09362

SOMER'S D = 0.04343

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 65

VAR011													
COUNT		I											
ROW PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO CONNE	OTHER	ROW						
COL PCT	F STUDEN	CTION											TOTAL
TOT PCT	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I							
VAR028	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	
NO	0.	I 6 I	I 11 I	I 3 I	I 23 I	I 90 I	I 10 I	I 143					
		I 4.2 I	I 7.7 I	I 2.1 I	I 16.1 I	I 62.9 I	I 7.0 I	I 37.0					
		I 42.9 I	I 34.4 I	I 37.5 I	I 59.0 I	I 33.3 I	I 43.5 I						
		I 1.6 I	I 2.8 I	I 0.8 I	I 6.0 I	I 23.3 I	I 2.6 I						
	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	
YES	1.	I 8 I	I 21 I	I 5 I	I 16 I	I 180 I	I 13 I	I 243					
		I 3.3 I	I 8.6 I	I 2.1 I	I 6.6 I	I 74.1 I	I 5.3 I	I 63.0					
		I 57.1 I	I 65.6 I	I 62.5 I	I 41.0 I	I 66.7 I	I 56.5 I						
		I 2.1 I	I 5.4 I	I 1.3 I	I 4.1 I	I 46.6 I	I 3.4 I						
	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	-----I	
COLUMN	14	32	8	39	270	23	386						
TOTAL	3.6	8.3	2.1	10.1	69.9	6.0	100.0						

CHI SQUARE = 10.34607 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.16372

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.16157

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.06308

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.06022

GAMMA = 0.12632

SOMER'S D = 0.06165

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

		VAR012					
		COUNT	I				
		ROW PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER	ROW	
		COL PCT	IAN				TOTAL
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	
VAR028		-----I-----I-----I-----I					
NO	0.	I	47	I	79	I	142
		I	33.1	I	55.6	I	37.3
		I	35.3	I	41.8	I	27.1
		I	12.3	I	20.7	I	4.2
		-I-----I-----I-----I					
YES	1.	I	86	I	110	I	239
		I	36.0	I	46.0	I	62.7
		I	64.7	I	58.2	I	72.9
		I	22.6	I	28.9	I	11.3
		-I-----I-----I-----I					
COLUMN			133		189		59
TOTAL			34.9		49.6		15.5
							381
							100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.47093 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.10833
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.10770
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.01700
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.01813
 GAMMA = 0.03207
 SOMER'S D = 0.01491

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

Table 42

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper
 by Political Party Preference

NEWSCO									
COUNT	I								
ROW PCT	I			BERN	SAN	MORA	RIO	ROW	
COL PCT	I			VAL		SAN	M	T	TOTAL
TOT PCT	I	0.1			1.1		3.1		
VAR028									
	0.	I	1	I	7	I	0	I	8
NO		I	12.5	I	87.5	I	0.0	I	50.0
		I	100.0	I	63.6	I	0.0	I	
		I	6.3	I	43.8	I	0.0	I	
		-I		-I		-I		-I	
	1.	I	0	I	4	I	4	I	8
YES		I	0.0	I	50.0	I	50.0	I	50.0
		I	0.0	I	36.4	I	100.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	25.0	I	25.0	I	
		-I		-I		-I		-I	
COLUMN			1		11		4		16
TOTAL			6.3		68.8		25.0		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.81818 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.60302
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.51640
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.58585
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.56250
 GAMMA = 1.00000
 SOMER'S D = 0.61017

Table 43

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Newspaper
 by Newsco Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Male

		NEWSCO																					
		COUNT	I																				
		ROW PCT	I	BERN	SAN	LOS	ALCM	MCRA	RIO	CAT	GRAN	CHAVES	E	COLFAX	U	LINCOLN	LEA	SAN JUAN	ROW				
		COL PCT	I	VAL	OS	SANTA	SAN	M	T	SOC	SIE	DDY		NION		OTERO			TOTAL				
		TOT PCT	I	0.1	1.1	2.1	3.1	5.1	7.1	8.1	9.1	11.1	13.1										
VAR028			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				
	0.	I	2	I	15	I	5	I	5	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	3	I	0	I	1	I	32
NO		I	6.3	I	46.9	I	15.6	I	15.6	I	0.0	I	3.1	I	0.0	I	9.4	I	0.0	I	3.1	I	55.2
		I	66.7	I	60.0	I	100.0	I	71.4	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	
		I	3.4	I	25.9	I	8.6	I	8.6	I	0.0	I	1.7	I	0.0	I	5.2	I	0.0	I	1.7	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	1	I	10	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	3	I	3	I	0	I	3	I	3	I	26
YES		I	3.8	I	38.5	I	0.0	I	7.7	I	3.8	I	11.5	I	11.5	I	0.0	I	11.5	I	11.5	I	44.8
		I	33.3	I	40.0	I	0.0	I	28.6	I	100.0	I	75.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	75.0	I	
		I	1.7	I	17.2	I	0.0	I	3.4	I	1.7	I	5.2	I	5.2	I	0.0	I	5.2	I	5.2	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN			3		25		5		7		1		4		3		3		3		4		58
TOTAL			5.2		43.1		8.6		12.1		1.7		6.9		5.2		5.2		5.2		6.9		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.20384 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.57541

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.49874

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.21170

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.26159

GAMMA = 0.33133

SOMER'S D = 0.16949

Source: Television

NEWSCO proved to be a significant variable at the .01 level. There was a trend for the more rural counties to employ television as their information source about U.N.M. NEWSCO-1, in the immediate area of U.N.M., relied very little on television as an information source. NEWSCO-7 (Chaves, Eddy) also reports very low information from television (31%). This could be due to the fact that much of the coverage of that area is by Texas stations. (See Table 45.)

Age yielded a curvi-linear relationship to the television variable ($p < .05$) i.e., the top and bottom age groups used television the least as an information source about U.N.M. The middle aged groups (21 - 50 years) employed the channel with the greatest frequencies. While significant in percentage, it would hardly be practical to aim informational coverage at this segment as the overall percentage is less than 25%. It should just be remembered that this age group (21 - 50) is the main recipient of U.N.M. information by television. (See Table 46.)

Sex of respondent was also significant ($p < .05$). Women were much more likely to receive information from television than men. However, once again, because the initial percentage is so low, a division on the basis of sex identifies a segment of the sample for which it may be impractical to develop new programs. (See Table 47.)

The crosstabulation between degree of formal education and television as an informational source was not significant. However there was a negative correlation between the level of education completed and the propensity to have television as a source of information. Television is therefore an unlikely channel to communicate University information to any voters with more than a high school education. (See Table 48.)

The Hollingshead index proved to be highly significant ($p < .001$) by the chi square analysis. Those in the first socio-economic class (major professionals, etc) were least likely to receive their information by television (22%). The lowest socio-economic class (laborers, etc.) were the most likely of those who use television as an information source, to receive their information through that medium. The second class (lesser professionals, etc.) had a relatively high percentage prone to employing television as their informational source. (See Table 49.)

Income was not a significant variable in analyzing the responses to this question. The responses were random in pattern and no trends could be observed. (See Table 50.)

Analysis of affiliation with U.N.M. did not reach significance at the .05 level. Of the U.N.M. students who answered, 64% claimed television as a prime source of information. This is surprising considering the "other" sources available to students, bulletins on campus, KUNM, The Lobo, etc. (Students who did check "other" generally designated The Lobo.) Parents of students are less dependent on television than their children for information about U.N.M. (50%). See Table 51.)

Political party preference was not a distinguishing factor either in the frequency of responses. Republicans and Democrats answered almost identically and in very close proportion to the sample total. (See Table 52.)

Table 45
 Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television
 by Newsco

		NEWSCO																				ROW TOTAL	
		COUNT	I																				
		ROW PCT	I																				
		COL PCT	I																				
		TOT PCT	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I										
VAR029			I																				
NO	0.	I	4	I	97	I	24	I	9	I	2	I	10	I	1	I	31	I	1	I	6	I	207
		I	1.9	I	46.9	I	11.6	I	4.3	I	1.0	I	4.8	I	0.5	I	15.0	I	0.5	I	2.9	I	53.4
		I	30.8	I	63.8	I	44.4	I	42.9	I	50.0	I	62.5	I	25.0	I	68.9	I	20.0	I	35.3	I	
		I	1.0	I	25.0	I	6.2	I	2.3	I	0.5	I	2.6	I	0.3	I	8.0	I	0.3	I	1.5	I	
YES	1.	I	9	I	55	I	30	I	12	I	2	I	6	I	3	I	14	I	4	I	11	I	181
		I	5.0	I	30.4	I	16.6	I	6.6	I	1.1	I	3.3	I	1.7	I	7.7	I	2.2	I	6.1	I	46.6
		I	69.2	I	36.2	I	55.6	I	57.1	I	50.0	I	37.5	I	75.0	I	31.1	I	80.0	I	64.7	I	
		I	2.3	I	14.2	I	7.7	I	3.1	I	0.5	I	1.5	I	0.8	I	3.6	I	1.0	I	2.8	I	
COLUMN			13		152		54		21		4		16		4		45		5		17		388
TOTAL			3.4		39.2		13.9		5.4		1.0		4.1		1.0		11.6		1.3		4.4		100.0

(CONTINUED)

NEWSCO											
COUNT I										ROW TOTAL	
ROW PCT	ICURRY	RO	LEA	MCKINLEY SAN JUAN							
COL PCT	IOSEVELT										
TOT PCT	I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I						
-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I											
VAR029	0.	I	5	I	10	I	3	I	4	I	207
		I	2.4	I	4.8	I	1.4	I	1.9	I	53.4
		I	50.0	I	45.5	I	50.0	I	21.1	I	
		I	1.3	I	2.6	I	0.8	I	1.0	I	
-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I											
YES	1.	I	5	I	12	I	3	I	15	I	181
		I	2.8	I	6.6	I	1.7	I	8.3	I	46.6
		I	50.0	I	54.5	I	50.0	I	78.9	I	
		I	1.3	I	3.1	I	0.8	I	3.9	I	
-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I											
COLUMN		10		22		6		19		388	
TOTAL		2.6		5.7		1.5		4.9		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 31.26465 WITH 13 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.28386

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.27308

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.11036

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.13920

GAMMA = 0.17187

SOMER'S D = 0.08709

VAR002

COUNT		I						ROW	
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50	TOTAL	
COL	PCT	I							
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I		
VAR029		I	I	I	I	I	I		
NO	0.	I	13	I 38	I 37	I 38	I 81	I	207
		I	6.3	I 18.4	I 17.9	I 18.4	I 39.1	I	53.5
		I	65.0	I 48.7	I 45.7	I 45.8	I 64.8	I	
		I	3.4	I 9.8	I 9.6	I 9.8	I 20.9	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I		
YES	1.	I	7	I 40	I 44	I 45	I 44	I	180
		I	3.9	I 22.2	I 24.4	I 25.0	I 24.4	I	46.5
		I	35.0	I 51.3	I 54.3	I 54.2	I 35.2	I	
		I	1.8	I 10.3	I 11.4	I 11.6	I 11.4	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I		
COLUMN			20	78	81	83	125	387	
TOTAL			5.2	20.2	20.9	21.4	32.3	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 12.17411 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.17736

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.17464

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.09129

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.11247

GAMMA = -0.14648

SOMER'S D = -0.07374

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

		VAR003			
		COUNT	I		
		ROW PCT	MALE	FEMALE	ROW TOTAL
		COL PCT	I		
		TOT PCT	I	1.1	2.1
VAR029		-----	I-----	I-----	I
	0.	I	153	I	54
		I	73.9	I	26.1
		I	58.0	I	43.9
		I	39.5	I	14.0
		-I-----	I-----	I-----	I
	1.	I	111	I	69
		I	61.7	I	38.3
		I	42.0	I	56.1
		I	28.7	I	17.8
		-I-----	I-----	I-----	I
	COLUMN		264	123	387
	TOTAL		68.2	31.8	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 6.10692 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.12562
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.12464
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.13118
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.12187
 GAMMA = 0.27569
 SOMER'S D = 0.14052

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

Table 47

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. From Television
by Sex of Respondent

VAR 008											
		COUNT	I								
ROW	PCT	I	HIGH SCH	TWO YR C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW				
COL	PCT	100L	COLLEGE		TY	TOTAL					
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I					
VAR029		-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I									
NO	0.	I	47	I	45	I	52	I	53	I	197
		I	23.9	I	22.8	I	26.4	I	26.9	I	54.3
		I	44.8	I	56.3	I	58.4	I	59.6	I	
		I	12.9	I	12.4	I	14.3	I	14.6	I	
		-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I									
YES	1.	I	58	I	35	I	37	I	36	I	166
		I	34.9	I	21.1	I	22.3	I	21.7	I	45.7
		I	55.2	I	43.8	I	41.6	I	40.4	I	
		I	16.0	I	9.6	I	10.2	I	9.9	I	
		-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I									
COLUMN		105		80		89		89		363	
TOTAL		28.9		22.0		24.5		24.5		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 5.57091 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.12388
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.12294
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.10224
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.12455
 GAMMA = -0.16700
 SOMER'S D = -0.08331

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

Table 48

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Television
 by How Much Education Completed

COUNT	I											
ROW PCT	I										ROW TOTAL	
COL PCT	I											
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----												
0.	I	45	I	43	I	51	I	54	I	12	I	205
	I	22.0	I	21.0	I	24.9	I	26.3	I	5.9	I	53.5
	I	77.6	I	44.8	I	56.7	I	48.6	I	42.9	I	
	I	11.7	I	11.2	I	13.3	I	14.1	I	3.1	I	
-I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----												
1.	I	13	I	53	I	39	I	57	I	16	I	178
	I	7.3	I	29.8	I	21.9	I	32.0	I	9.0	I	46.5
	I	22.4	I	55.2	I	43.3	I	51.4	I	57.1	I	
	I	3.4	I	13.8	I	10.2	I	14.9	I	4.2	I	
-I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----												
COLUMN		58		96		90		111		28		383
TOTAL		15.1		25.1		23.5		29.0		7.3		100.0

SOMER'S D = 0.09369

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

VAR010

COUNT I

ROW PCT I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000	ROW TOTAL
COL PCT I										
TOT PCT I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	
VAR029	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	
NO	0. I 15 I 20 I 19 I 12 I 6 I 31 I 31 I 29 I 14 I 177	I 8.5 I 11.3 I 10.7 I 6.8 I 3.4 I 17.5 I 17.5 I 16.4 I 7.9 I 54.8	I 35.7 I 62.5 I 48.7 I 60.0 I 42.9 I 64.6 I 62.0 I 54.7 I 56.0 I	I 4.6 I 6.2 I 5.9 I 3.7 I 1.9 I 9.6 I 9.6 I 9.0 I 4.3 I	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	
YES	1. I 27 I 12 I 20 I 8 I 8 I 17 I 19 I 24 I 11 I 146	I 18.5 I 8.2 I 13.7 I 5.5 I 5.5 I 11.6 I 13.0 I 16.4 I 7.5 I 45.2	I 64.3 I 37.5 I 51.3 I 40.0 I 57.1 I 35.4 I 38.0 I 45.3 I 44.0 I	I 8.4 I 3.7 I 6.2 I 2.5 I 2.5 I 5.3 I 5.9 I 7.4 I 3.4 I	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	-----I-----	
COLUMN	42	32	39	20	14	48	50	53	25	323
TOTAL	13.0	9.9	12.1	6.2	4.3	14.9	15.5	16.4	7.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.46534 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.18840

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18515

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.07712

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.10149

GAMMA = -0.11657

SOMER'S D = -0.05806

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 65

COUNT									
TOTAL									
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36
37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38
39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41
42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46
47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49
50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51
52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54
55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56
57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57
58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
59	59	59	59	59	59	59	59	59	59
60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61
62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62
63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63
64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67
68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69
70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
72	72	72	72	72	72	72	72	72	72
73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73
74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74
75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77
78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78
79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79
80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
82	82	82	82	82	82	82	82	82	82
83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83
84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84
85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87
88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88
89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91
92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93
94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96
97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98
99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 51

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Television
by Directly Connected with U.N.M.

VAR011

COUNT		I											ROW TOTAL
ROW	PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT	O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO	CONNE	OTHER				
COL	PCT	I	F	STUDEN				CTION					
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I					
VAR029		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
NO	0.	I	5	I	16	I	5	I	29	I	138	I	205
		I	2.4	I	7.8	I	2.4	I	14.1	I	67.3	I	53.1
		I	35.7	I	50.0	I	62.5	I	74.4	I	51.1	I	
		I	1.3	I	4.1	I	1.3	I	7.5	I	35.8	I	
YES	1.	I	9	I	16	I	3	I	10	I	132	I	181
		I	5.0	I	8.8	I	1.7	I	5.5	I	72.9	I	46.9
		I	64.3	I	50.0	I	37.5	I	25.6	I	48.9	I	
		I	2.3	I	4.1	I	0.8	I	2.6	I	34.2	I	
COLUMN		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
TOTAL			14		32		8		39		270	23	386
			3.6		8.3		2.1		10.1		69.9	6.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.62103 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.15788

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.15594

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.03868

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.03815

GAMMA = 0.07829

SOMER'S D = 0.03906

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

		VAR 012								
		COUNT	I							
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMCCRAT	OTHER					ROW	
COL	PCT	IAN							TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I					
VAR 029		I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
NO	0.	I	67	I	98	I	38	I	203	
		I	33.0	I	48.3	I	18.7	I	53.3	
		I	50.4	I	51.9	I	64.4	I		
		I	17.6	I	25.7	I	10.0	I		
YES		I		I		I		I		
	1.	I	66	I	91	I	21	I	178	
		I	37.1	I	51.1	I	11.8	I	46.7	
		I	49.6	I	48.1	I	35.6	I		
		I	17.3	I	23.9	I	5.5	I		
		I		I		I		I		
COLUMN			133		189		59		381	
TOTAL			34.9		49.6		15.5		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 3.53991 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.09639
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.09595
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.07192
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.07914
 GAMMA = -0.13057
 SOMER'S D = -0.06507

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

Table 52

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Television
by Political Party Preference

Source: Students

The crosstabulation with NEWSCO showed no significance on this question. For the most part (69%) voters do not receive information from students. This held true, for the greater part, across the NEWSCO breakdowns. (See Table 53.)

Age was not a significant factor either. The frequency percentages were fairly constant across the age groups and consistent with the total. It was the 31 - 50 age group who reported most relying on students for information. This is in contrast to the respondents under 21 relying least on students. (See Table 54.)

Percentages of responses did not vary appreciably at all from the total when analyzed by sex. (See Table 55.) The Hollingshead index also showed no significance. The percentages in each class were almost identical to the total percentages. (See Table 56.)

The level of education completed was a significant factor ($p < .05$). Those with only a high school education revealed that they were less likely than others to receive information from U.N.M. students. University graduates were the most likely to receive information from students. This is hardly relevant, though, as only 32% of the sample is prone to receiving information from students. (See Table 57.)

Responses differed significantly ($p < .05$) by income although no pattern was discernable. Voters in the \$15,000 - \$25,000 income bracket were least likely to obtain information from students. Overall, the public relies on the student for information only 32% of the time. (See Table 58.)

Parents of students differed somewhat from others in receiving information about the University from students. They claimed to hear information as often from students as they did from television (50%). "Other" (spouses of students, contractors on campus, etc.) also deviated considerably from the mean (48%). However, the chi square analysis was not significant on this crosstabulation. (See Table 59.)

The political preference was also not significant in crosstabulation with this variable. (See Table 60.)

NEWSCO

CURRY RD LEA	MCKINLEY SAN JUAN				ROW TOTAL
OSEVELT	10.1	11.1	12.1	13.1	
	10.1	11.1	12.1	13.1	266
6	1	16	3	13	68.6
2.3	1	6.0	1.1	4.9	
60.0	1	72.7	50.0	68.4	
1.5	1	4.1	0.8	3.4	
4	1	6	3	6	122
3.3	1	4.9	2.5	4.9	31.4
40.0	1	27.3	50.0	31.6	
1.0	1	1.5	0.8	1.5	
10		22	6	19	388
2.6		5.7	1.5	4.9	100.0

2.13561 WITH 13 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 .17685
 ICIENT = 0.17415
 -0.04545
 -0.05335
 5
 03338

Table 53

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students
 by Newsco

TABLE 54			
CROSSTABULATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT U.N.M. FROM STUDENTS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT			
AGE	U.N.M.	NO. OF STUDENTS	PERCENT
18-24	YES	10	10.0
18-24	NO	90	90.0
25-34	YES	15	15.0
25-34	NO	85	85.0
35-44	YES	20	20.0
35-44	NO	80	80.0
45-54	YES	25	25.0
45-54	NO	75	75.0
55-64	YES	30	30.0
55-64	NO	70	70.0
65-74	YES	35	35.0
65-74	NO	65	65.0
75-84	YES	40	40.0
75-84	NO	60	60.0
85-94	YES	45	45.0
85-94	NO	55	55.0
95-104	YES	50	50.0
95-104	NO	50	50.0
TOTAL	YES	200	20.0
TOTAL	NO	800	80.0
KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.0137			
GAMMA = -0.0197			
N = 1000			

Table 54

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students
by Age of Respondent

VAR002

		COUNT								ROW			
		ROW PCT	UNDER	21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50		TOTAL			
		COL PCT											
		TOT PCT	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
VAR033	NO	0.	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	265			
		I	15	I	54	I	51	I	57	I	88	I	68.5
		I	5.7	I	20.4	I	19.2	I	21.5	I	33.2	I	
		I	75.0	I	69.2	I	63.0	I	68.7	I	70.4	I	
YES	1.	I	3.9	I	14.0	I	13.2	I	14.7	I	22.7	I	
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	
		I	5	I	24	I	30	I	26	I	37	I	122
		I	4.1	I	19.7	I	24.6	I	21.3	I	30.3	I	31.5
	I	25.0	I	30.8	I	37.0	I	31.3	I	29.6	I		
	I	1.3	I	6.2	I	7.8	I	6.7	I	9.6	I		
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I		
COLUMN		20	78	81	83	125	387						
TOTAL		5.2	20.2	20.9	21.4	32.3	100.0						

CHI SQUARE = 1.77126 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.06765

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.06750

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01147

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.01317

GAMMA = -0.01997

SOMER'S D = -0.00863

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

VAR003						
	COUNT	I				
ROW	PCT	MALE		FEMALE		ROW
COL	PCT	I				TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I		
VAR033						
	0.	I	182	I	83	I 265
NO		I	68.7	I	31.3	I 68.5
		I	68.9	I	67.5	I
		I	47.0	I	21.4	I
		-I		-I		-I
	1.	I	82	I	40	I 122
YES		I	67.2	I	32.8	I 31.5
		I	31.1	I	32.5	I
		I	21.2	I	10.3	I
		-I		-I		-I
	COLUMN		264		123	387
	TOTAL		68.2		31.8	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 0.02900 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.00866
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.00866
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.01463
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.01266
 GAMMA = 0.03365
 SOMER'S D = 0.01460
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

Table 55

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students
by Sex of Respondent

VAR000									
TOTAL									
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
32	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
35	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
37	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
39	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
41	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
42	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
43	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
45	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
46	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
47	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
48	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
49	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
51	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
52	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
53	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
54	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
55	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
56	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
57	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
58	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
59	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
60	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
61	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
62	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
63	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
64	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
66	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
67	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
68	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
69	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
70	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
71	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
72	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
73	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
74	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
75	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
76	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
77	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
78	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
79	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
80	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
81	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
82	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
83	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
84	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
85	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
86	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
87	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
88	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
89	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
90	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
91	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
92	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
93	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
94	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
95	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
96	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
97	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
98	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 56

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

COLUMN	58	96	90	111	28	383
TOTAL	15.1	25.1	23.5	29.0	7.3	100.0

CRAMER'S V = 0.08215

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.04846

$$\text{GAMMA} = -0.08372$$

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

VAR008									
COUNT	I								
ROW PCT	I HIGH	SCH	TWO YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE			ROW
COL PCT	IOOL		CLLEGE		TY				TOTAL
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I				
VAR033	-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I								
	0.	I	83	I	54	I	51	I	247
NO		I	33.6	I	21.9	I	20.6	I	68.0
		I	79.0	I	67.5	I	57.3	I	
		I	22.9	I	14.9	I	14.0	I	16.3
		-I-----I-----I-----I-----I							
	1.	I	22	I	26	I	38	I	116
YES		I	19.0	I	22.4	I	32.8	I	32.0
		I	21.0	I	32.5	I	42.7	I	
		I	6.1	I	7.2	I	10.5	I	8.3
		-I-----I-----I-----I-----I							
COLUMN		105	80	89	89	363			
TOTAL		28.9	22.0	24.5	24.5	100.0			

CHI SQUARE = 10.70511 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.17173

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.16925

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.11431

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.13035

GAMMA = 0.19775

SOMER'S D = 0.08719

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

Table 57

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students
by How Much Education Completed

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students by Approximate Annual Income									
Income	Total	U.N.M. from Students				by Approximate Annual Income			
		1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000	7000	8000
1000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
2000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
3000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
4000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
5000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
6000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
7000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
8000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
9000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
10000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

Table 58

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students by Approximate Annual Income

		VAR010																			
COUNT		I																			
ROW	PCT	I<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000									ROW		
COL	PCT	I																		TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I										
VAR033		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	0.	I	30	I	20	I	24	I	16	I	11	I	42	I	32	I	29	I	19	I	223
NO		I	13.5	I	9.0	I	10.8	I	7.2	I	4.9	I	18.8	I	14.3	I	13.0	I	8.5	I	69.0
		I	71.4	I	62.5	I	61.5	I	80.0	I	78.6	I	87.5	I	64.0	I	54.7	I	76.0	I	
		I	9.3	I	6.2	I	7.4	I	5.0	I	3.4	I	13.0	I	9.9	I	9.0	I	5.9	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	12	I	12	I	15	I	4	I	3	I	6	I	18	I	24	I	6	I	100
YES		I	12.0	I	12.0	I	15.0	I	4.0	I	3.0	I	6.0	I	18.0	I	24.0	I	6.0	I	31.0
		I	28.6	I	37.5	I	38.5	I	20.0	I	21.4	I	12.5	I	36.0	I	45.3	I	24.0	I	
		I	3.7	I	3.7	I	4.6	I	1.2	I	0.9	I	1.9	I	5.6	I	7.4	I	1.9	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	COLUMN		42		32		39		20		14		48		50		53		25		323
	TOTAL		13.0		9.9		12.1		6.2		4.3		14.9		15.5		16.4		7.7		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.39827 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.23209

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.22608

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.02995

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.03661

GAMMA = 0.04871

SOMER'S D = 0.02095

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 65

VAR011

		COUNT											ROW			
		ROW PCT	ISTUDENT	FARENT		O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO CONNE		OTHER	ROW				
		COL PCT	I	F		STUDEN	CTION						TOTAL			
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I							
VAR033	NO	0.	I	9	I	16	I	5	I	26	I	196	I	12	I	264
			I	3.4	I	6.1	I	1.9	I	9.8	I	74.2	I	4.5	I	68.4
			I	64.3	I	50.0	I	62.5	I	66.7	I	72.6	I	52.2	I	
			I	2.3	I	4.1	I	1.3	I	6.7	I	50.8	I	3.1	I	
YES	1.	I	5	I	16	I	3	I	13	I	74	I	11	I	122	
		I	4.1	I	13.1	I	2.5	I	10.7	I	60.7	I	9.0	I	31.6	
		I	35.7	I	50.0	I	37.5	I	33.3	I	27.4	I	47.8	I		
		I	1.3	I	4.1	I	0.8	I	3.4	I	19.2	I	2.8	I		
		COLUMN		14		32		8		39		270		23		386
		TOTAL		3.6		8.3		2.1		10.1		69.9		6.0		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.30135 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.16336

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.16123

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.05457

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.05015

GAMMA = -0.11041

SOMER'S D = -0.05135

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

2

		VAR012							
		COUNT	I						
		ROW PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER				ROW
		COL PCT	IAN					TOTAL	
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I			
VAR033		-----I-----I-----I-----I							
NO	0.	I	97	I	123	I	41	I	261
		I	37.2	I	47.1	I	15.7	I	68.5
		I	72.9	I	65.1	I	69.5	I	
		I	25.5	I	32.3	I	10.8	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
YES	1.	I	36	I	66	I	18	I	120
		I	30.0	I	55.0	I	15.0	I	31.5
		I	27.1	I	34.9	I	30.5	I	
		I	9.4	I	17.3	I	4.7	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
		COLUMN	133		189		59		381
		TOTAL	34.9		49.6		15.5		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.26283 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.07707
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.07684
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04712
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.04828
 GAMMA = 0.09235
 SOMER'S D = 0.03970

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

Table 60

Crosstabulation of Information About U.N.M. from Students
 by Political Party Preference

Table 61

Question 29.

Please number, in order of importance to you, the fields of interest at U.N.M. about which you would like to know more.

_____ teaching	_____ community service
_____ research	_____ other _____

Alternatives	Frequency	Percentage
T. R. CS.	98	35.
T. CS. R.	33	11.8
R. T. CS.	31	11.1
R. CS. T.	20	7.1
CS. T. R.	60	21.4
CS. R. T.	19	6.8
Other	<u>19</u> 280	<u>6.8</u> 100.0

The reasons for the total frequency being 108 smaller than "n" is that many said they had sufficient knowledge and did not want to know any more about U.N.M. Several others simply missed or skipped the questions on the back flap of the questionnaire. Generally any respondent who checked "other" and wrote in a choice did not rank it among the other choices. Thus it was not ordered for analysis. Responses to "other" generally concerned a specific curriculum or course. One person asked to know more about U.N.M.'s fiscal expenditures.

Teaching was the aspect that 47% of the voters listed first. Next, however, 28% of the voters desired to know more about community service. Only 18% of the public chose research as their priority.

Question 29.

Please number, in order of importance to you, the fields of interest at U.N.M. about which you would like to know more.

_____ teaching	_____ community service
_____ research	_____ other _____

A crosstabulation with age was significant ($p < .05$). The 31-40 year group is most concerned with 1) teaching; 2) research; 3) community service. The 41 - 50 year group would most like to know more about 1) teaching; 2) community service; 3) research. The over 50 age group want more 1) research; 2) teaching; and 3) community service. The under 21 year group expressed the greatest desire to know more about 1) community service; 2) teaching; 3) research. (See Table 63.)

Sex was not a significant factor in analyzing this question by demographic variables. A trend was not apparent but seemingly men were more interested more often in community service than women were. (See Table 64.)

The amount of education completed proved to have a significant bearing on how the respondents answered. 1) teaching; 2) research; 3) community service was most important to high school graduates, University graduates and those with more advanced degrees. It was second choice for two-year college level respondents. Combined, this accounts for 35% of the sample. 1) Community service; 2) teaching; 3) research was the priority of two-year college respondents and second choice of high school and University graduates. Teaching and research were the areas in which the greater part (69%) of the respondents with graduate degrees were interested. Summarily, 78%

of all responses selected teaching as a first or second area that they would like to know more about. Forty-seven percent selected community service as a first or second priority. This analysis was significant ($p < .05$). (See Table 65.)

The Hollingshead index was not significant at the .05 level. The first alternative (1. teaching, 2. research, 3. community service) was chosen by Classes I, II, III, IV. Class V (the lowest) chose alternative six (1. community service, 2. teaching, 3. research). There was an inverse linear relationship on this alternative. As social status declined, the percentage of each class that selected this priority increased. (See Table 66.)

Income was not a significant variable. There were no apparent trends observed in the distribution. (See Table 67.)

Crosstabulation by direct connection to U.N.M. was also not significant. However it could be seen that students of U.N.M. and their parents were more interested in information about community service than research or teaching. Employees and alumni were primarily interested in teaching and relatively little in research or community service. Those with "other" or no connection were interested in teaching primarily and community service secondarily. (See Table 68.)

Crosstabulation by political party preference was not highly significant ($p < .20$). Alternative 1 (1. teaching, 2. research, 3. community service) was chosen most often by all parties. Alternative 5 (1. community service, 2. teaching, 3. research) was chosen second by all parties. This is in correlation to the total sample. (See Table 69.)

NEWSCO									
N I C U R R Y R O L E A M C K I N L E Y S A N J U A N R O W									
I O S E V A L T									
9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I	TOTAL				
VARC	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	2	I	9	I	2	I	6	I	98
T.	I	2.0	I	9.2	I	2.0	I	6.1	I
I	33.3	I	64.3	I	50.0	I	37.5	I	35.0
I	0.7	I	3.2	I	0.7	I	2.1	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	1	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	33
T.	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	6.1	I	3.0	I
I	16.7	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	6.3	I	11.8
I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.7	I	0.4	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	1	I	4	I	0	I	1	I	31
R.	I	3.2	I	12.9	I	0.0	I	3.2	I
I	16.7	I	28.6	I	0.0	I	6.3	I	11.1
I	0.4	I	1.4	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	20
R.	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	7.1
I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	1	I	1	I	0	I	4	I	60
C.	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	0.0	I	6.7	I
I	16.7	I	7.1	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	21.4
I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	1.4	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	0	I	0	I	0	I	3	I	19
C.	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	15.8	I
I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	18.8	I	6.8
I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.1	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	1	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	19
O.	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.3	I
I	16.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	6.3	I	6.8
I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.6		14		4		16		100.0
	2.1		5.0		1.4		5.7		100.0

(COI

3.25836 WITH 78 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

.23561

ICIENT = 0.49985

-0.04104

Table 62

Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About
by Newsco

NEWSCO																	NEWSCO										ROW TOTAL				
COUNT	I																I	CURRY REULEA			MCKINLEY SAN JUAN										
ROW PCT	I																I														
COL PCT	I																I														
TOT PCT	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I																
VAR037	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I									
T.R.CS	1.	I	5	I	32	I	15	I	10	I	1	I	2	I	2	I	8	I	1	I	3	I	2	I	9	I	2	I	6	I	98
		I	5.1	I	32.7	I	15.3	I	10.2	I	1.0	I	2.0	I	2.0	I	8.2	I	1.0	I	3.1	I	2.0	I	9.2	I	2.0	I	6.1	I	35.0
		I	71.4	I	25.0	I	42.9	I	58.8	I	25.0	I	28.6	I	50.0	I	38.1	I	20.0	I	25.0	I	33.3	I	64.3	I	50.0	I	37.5	I	
		I	1.8	I	11.4	I	5.4	I	3.6	I	0.4	I	0.7	I	0.7	I	2.9	I	0.4	I	1.1	I	0.7	I	3.2	I	0.7	I	2.1	I	
T.CS.R	2.	I	2	I	20	I	5	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	33
		I	6.1	I	60.6	I	15.2	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	6.1	I	3.0	I	11.8
		I	28.6	I	15.6	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	16.7	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	6.3	I	
		I	0.7	I	7.1	I	1.8	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.7	I	0.4	I	
R.T.CS	3.	I	0	I	14	I	4	I	0	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	0	I	1	I	3	I	1	I	4	I	0	I	1	I	31
		I	0.0	I	45.2	I	12.9	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	3.2	I	3.2	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	9.7	I	3.2	I	12.9	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	11.1
		I	0.0	I	10.9	I	11.4	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	14.3	I	25.0	I	0.0	I	20.0	I	25.0	I	16.7	I	28.6	I	0.0	I	6.3	I	
		I	0.0	I	5.0	I	1.4	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	1.1	I	0.4	I	1.4	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	
R.CS.T	4.	I	0	I	11	I	4	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	20
		I	0.0	I	55.0	I	20.0	I	5.0	I	5.0	I	5.0	I	0.0	I	10.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	7.1
		I	0.0	I	8.6	I	11.4	I	5.9	I	25.0	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	9.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	3.9	I	1.4	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
CS.T.R	5.	I	0	I	31	I	5	I	6	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	7	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	0	I	4	I	60
		I	0.0	I	51.7	I	8.3	I	10.0	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	11.7	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	0.0	I	6.7	I	21.4
		I	0.0	I	24.2	I	14.3	I	35.3	I	25.0	I	14.3	I	25.0	I	33.3	I	20.0	I	8.3	I	16.7	I	7.1	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	11.1	I	1.8	I	2.1	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	2.5	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	1.4	I	
CS.R.T	6.	I	0	I	11	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	3	I	19
		I	0.0	I	57.9	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	10.5	I	0.0	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	15.8	I	6.8
		I	0.0	I	8.6	I	2.9	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	9.5	I	0.0	I	8.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	18.8	I	
		I	0.0	I	3.9	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.7	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.1	I	
OTHER	7.	I	0	I	9	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	4	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	19
		I	0.0	I	47.4	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	10.5	I	5.3	I	21.1	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.3	I	6.8
		I	0.0	I	7.0	I	2.9	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	9.5	I	20.0	I	33.3	I	16.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	6.3	I	
		I	0.0	I	3.2	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.7	I	0.4	I	1.4	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.4	I	
COLUMN		7	128	35	17	4	7	4	21	5	12	6	14	4	16	280															
TOTAL		2.5	45.7	12.5	6.1	1.4	2.5	1.4	7.5	1.8	4.3	2.1	5.0	1.4	5.7	100.0															

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 93.25836 WITH 78 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.23561
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.49985
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.04104

TABLE 63			
CROSSTABULATION OF LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT BY AGE OF RESPONDENT			
AGE	SEX	EDUCATION	LIKES TO KNOW MORE ABOUT
18-24	M	HS GRAD	1.00
25-34	F	HS GRAD	1.00
35-44	M	HS GRAD	1.00
45-54	F	HS GRAD	1.00
55-64	M	HS GRAD	1.00
65-74	F	HS GRAD	1.00
75-84	M	HS GRAD	1.00
85-94	F	HS GRAD	1.00
95-104	M	HS GRAD	1.00
105-114	F	HS GRAD	1.00
115-124	M	HS GRAD	1.00
125-134	F	HS GRAD	1.00
135-144	M	HS GRAD	1.00
145-154	F	HS GRAD	1.00
155-164	M	HS GRAD	1.00
165-174	F	HS GRAD	1.00
175-184	M	HS GRAD	1.00
185-194	F	HS GRAD	1.00
195-204	M	HS GRAD	1.00
205-214	F	HS GRAD	1.00
215-224	M	HS GRAD	1.00
225-234	F	HS GRAD	1.00
235-244	M	HS GRAD	1.00
245-254	F	HS GRAD	1.00
255-264	M	HS GRAD	1.00
265-274	F	HS GRAD	1.00
275-284	M	HS GRAD	1.00
285-294	F	HS GRAD	1.00
295-304	M	HS GRAD	1.00
305-314	F	HS GRAD	1.00
315-324	M	HS GRAD	1.00
325-334	F	HS GRAD	1.00
335-344	M	HS GRAD	1.00
345-354	F	HS GRAD	1.00
355-364	M	HS GRAD	1.00
365-374	F	HS GRAD	1.00
375-384	M	HS GRAD	1.00
385-394	F	HS GRAD	1.00
395-404	M	HS GRAD	1.00
405-414	F	HS GRAD	1.00
415-424	M	HS GRAD	1.00
425-434	F	HS GRAD	1.00
435-444	M	HS GRAD	1.00
445-454	F	HS GRAD	1.00
455-464	M	HS GRAD	1.00
465-474	F	HS GRAD	1.00
475-484	M	HS GRAD	1.00
485-494	F	HS GRAD	1.00
495-504	M	HS GRAD	1.00
505-514	F	HS GRAD	1.00
515-524	M	HS GRAD	1.00
525-534	F	HS GRAD	1.00
535-544	M	HS GRAD	1.00
545-554	F	HS GRAD	1.00
555-564	M	HS GRAD	1.00
565-574	F	HS GRAD	1.00
575-584	M	HS GRAD	1.00
585-594	F	HS GRAD	1.00
595-604	M	HS GRAD	1.00
605-614	F	HS GRAD	1.00
615-624	M	HS GRAD	1.00
625-634	F	HS GRAD	1.00
635-644	M	HS GRAD	1.00
645-654	F	HS GRAD	1.00
655-664	M	HS GRAD	1.00
665-674	F	HS GRAD	1.00
675-684	M	HS GRAD	1.00
685-694	F	HS GRAD	1.00
695-704	M	HS GRAD	1.00
705-714	F	HS GRAD	1.00
715-724	M	HS GRAD	1.00
725-734	F	HS GRAD	1.00
735-744	M	HS GRAD	1.00
745-754	F	HS GRAD	1.00
755-764	M	HS GRAD	1.00
765-774	F	HS GRAD	1.00
775-784	M	HS GRAD	1.00
785-794	F	HS GRAD	1.00
795-804	M	HS GRAD	1.00
805-814	F	HS GRAD	1.00
815-824	M	HS GRAD	1.00
825-834	F	HS GRAD	1.00
835-844	M	HS GRAD	1.00
845-854	F	HS GRAD	1.00
855-864	M	HS GRAD	1.00
865-874	F	HS GRAD	1.00
875-884	M	HS GRAD	1.00
885-894	F	HS GRAD	1.00
895-904	M	HS GRAD	1.00
905-914	F	HS GRAD	1.00
915-924	M	HS GRAD	1.00
925-934	F	HS GRAD	1.00
935-944	M	HS GRAD	1.00
945-954	F	HS GRAD	1.00
955-964	M	HS GRAD	1.00
965-974	F	HS GRAD	1.00
975-984	M	HS GRAD	1.00
985-994	F	HS GRAD	1.00
995-1004	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1005-1014	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1015-1024	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1025-1034	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1035-1044	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1045-1054	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1055-1064	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1065-1074	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1075-1084	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1085-1094	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1095-1104	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1105-1114	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1115-1124	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1125-1134	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1135-1144	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1145-1154	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1155-1164	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1165-1174	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1175-1184	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1185-1194	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1195-1204	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1205-1214	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1215-1224	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1225-1234	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1235-1244	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1245-1254	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1255-1264	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1265-1274	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1275-1284	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1285-1294	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1295-1304	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1305-1314	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1315-1324	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1325-1334	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1335-1344	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1345-1354	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1355-1364	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1365-1374	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1375-1384	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1385-1394	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1395-1404	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1405-1414	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1415-1424	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1425-1434	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1435-1444	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1445-1454	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1455-1464	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1465-1474	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1475-1484	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1485-1494	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1495-1504	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1505-1514	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1515-1524	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1525-1534	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1535-1544	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1545-1554	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1555-1564	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1565-1574	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1575-1584	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1585-1594	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1595-1604	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1605-1614	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1615-1624	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1625-1634	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1635-1644	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1645-1654	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1655-1664	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1665-1674	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1675-1684	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1685-1694	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1695-1704	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1705-1714	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1715-1724	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1725-1734	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1735-1744	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1745-1754	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1755-1764	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1765-1774	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1775-1784	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1785-1794	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1795-1804	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1805-1814	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1815-1824	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1825-1834	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1835-1844	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1845-1854	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1855-1864	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1865-1874	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1875-1884	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1885-1894	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1895-1904	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1905-1914	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1915-1924	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1925-1934	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1935-1944	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1945-1954	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1955-1964	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1965-1974	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1975-1984	M	HS GRAD	1.00
1985-1994	F	HS GRAD	1.00
1995-2004	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2005-2014	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2015-2024	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2025-2034	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2035-2044	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2045-2054	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2055-2064	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2065-2074	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2075-2084	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2085-2094	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2095-2104	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2105-2114	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2115-2124	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2125-2134	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2135-2144	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2145-2154	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2155-2164	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2165-2174	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2175-2184	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2185-2194	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2195-2204	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2205-2214	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2215-2224	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2225-2234	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2235-2244	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2245-2254	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2255-2264	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2265-2274	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2275-2284	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2285-2294	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2295-2304	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2305-2314	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2315-2324	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2325-2334	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2335-2344	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2345-2354	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2355-2364	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2365-2374	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2375-2384	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2385-2394	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2395-2404	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2405-2414	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2415-2424	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2425-2434	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2435-2444	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2445-2454	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2455-2464	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2465-2474	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2475-2484	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2485-2494	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2495-2504	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2505-2514	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2515-2524	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2525-2534	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2535-2544	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2545-2554	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2555-2564	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2565-2574	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2575-2584	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2585-2594	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2595-2604	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2605-2614	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2615-2624	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2625-2634	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2635-2644	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2645-2654	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2655-2664	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2665-2674	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2675-2684	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2685-2694	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2695-2704	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2705-2714	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2715-2724	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2725-2734	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2735-2744	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2745-2754	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2755-2764	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2765-2774	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2775-2784	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2785-2794	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2795-2804	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2805-2814	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2815-2824	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2825-2834	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2835-2844	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2845-2854	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2855-2864	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2865-2874	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2875-2884	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2885-2894	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2895-2904	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2905-2914	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2915-2924	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2925-2934	F	HS GRAD	1.00
2935-2944	M	HS GRAD	1.00
2945-2954	F	HS GRAD	1.00</

VAR002

		COUNT							
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50	ROW	TOTAL
COL	PCT	I							
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I		
VAR037		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
1.	I	7	I	15	I	31	I	24	I
T.R.CS	I	7.1	I	15.3	I	31.6	I	24.5	I
	I	36.8	I	27.8	I	50.0	I	35.3	I
	I	2.5	I	5.4	I	11.1	I	8.6	I
2.	I	2	I	8	I	7	I	12	I
T.CS.R	I	6.1	I	24.2	I	21.2	I	36.4	I
	I	10.5	I	14.8	I	11.3	I	17.6	I
	I	0.7	I	2.9	I	2.5	I	4.3	I
3.	I	0	I	7	I	5	I	4	I
R.T.CS	I	0.0	I	22.6	I	16.1	I	12.9	I
	I	0.0	I	13.0	I	8.1	I	5.9	I
	I	0.0	I	2.5	I	1.8	I	1.4	I
4.	I	1	I	7	I	3	I	3	I
R.CS.T	I	5.0	I	35.0	I	15.0	I	15.0	I
	I	5.3	I	13.0	I	4.8	I	4.4	I
	I	0.4	I	2.5	I	1.1	I	1.1	I
5.	I	7	I	10	I	7	I	15	I
CS.T.R	I	11.7	I	16.7	I	11.7	I	25.0	I
	I	36.8	I	18.5	I	11.3	I	22.1	I
	I	2.5	I	3.6	I	2.5	I	5.4	I
6.	I	1	I	5	I	3	I	7	I
CS.R.T	I	5.3	I	26.3	I	15.8	I	36.8	I
	I	5.3	I	9.3	I	4.8	I	10.3	I
	I	0.4	I	1.8	I	1.1	I	2.5	I
7.	I	1	I	2	I	6	I	3	I
OTHER	I	5.3	I	10.5	I	31.6	I	15.8	I
	I	5.3	I	3.7	I	9.7	I	4.4	I
	I	0.4	I	0.7	I	2.1	I	1.1	I
COLUMN		19		54		62		68	
TOTAL		6.8		19.3		22.1		24.3	
								27.5	
								100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 36.99596 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.18175

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.34163

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.05139

		VAR 003			
		COUNT	I		
ROW	PCT	MALE	FEMALE	ROW	
COL	PCT			TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	1.I	2.I		
VAR037		I	I	I	
T.R.CS	1.	I 63	I 35	I 98	
		I 64.3	I 35.7	I 35.0	
		I 33.5	I 38.0	I	
		I 22.5	I 12.5	I	
		I	I	I	
T.CS.R	2.	I 24	I 9	I 33	
		I 72.7	I 27.3	I 11.8	
		I 12.8	I 9.8	I	
		I 8.6	I 3.2	I	
		I	I	I	
R.T.CS	3.	I 17	I 14	I 31	
		I 54.8	I 45.2	I 11.1	
		I 9.0	I 15.2	I	
		I 6.1	I 5.0	I	
		I	I	I	
R.CS.T	4.	I 12	I 8	I 20	
		I 60.0	I 40.0	I 7.1	
		I 6.4	I 8.7	I	
		I 4.3	I 2.9	I	
		I	I	I	
CS.T.R	5.	I 44	I 16	I 60	
		I 73.3	I 26.7	I 21.4	
		I 23.4	I 17.4	I	
		I 15.7	I 5.7	I	
		I	I	I	
CS.R.T	6.	I 15	I 4	I 19	
		I 78.9	I 21.1	I 6.8	
		I 8.0	I 4.3	I	
		I 5.4	I 1.4	I	
		I	I	I	
OTHER	7.	I 13	I 6	I 19	
		I 68.4	I 31.6	I 6.8	
		I 6.9	I 6.5	I	
		I 4.6	I 2.1	I	
		I	I	I	
COLUMN		188	92	280	
TOTAL		67.1	32.9	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 5.67540 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.14237
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.14095
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.05928

Table 64

Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About
 by Sex of Respondent

VAR008									
COUNT		I							
ROW	PCT	IHIGH	SCH	TWO	YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW
COL	PCT	IOOL	CLLEGE		TY				TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I			
VAR037									
T.R.CS	1.	I	29	I	16	I	24	I	92
		I	31.5	I	17.4	I	26.1	I	34.6
		I	38.7	I	24.2	I	34.3	I	
		I	10.9	I	6.0	I	9.0	I	
T.CS.R	2.	I	8	I	7	I	3	I	30
		I	26.7	I	23.3	I	10.0	I	11.3
		I	10.7	I	10.6	I	4.3	I	
		I	3.0	I	2.6	I	1.1	I	
R.T.CS	3.	I	5	I	14	I	10	I	31
		I	16.1	I	45.2	I	32.3	I	11.7
		I	6.7	I	21.2	I	14.3	I	
		I	1.9	I	5.3	I	3.8	I	
R.CS.T	4.	I	7	I	3	I	7	I	20
		I	35.0	I	15.0	I	35.0	I	7.5
		I	9.3	I	4.5	I	10.0	I	
		I	2.6	I	1.1	I	2.6	I	
CS.T.R	5.	I	15	I	19	I	13	I	55
		I	27.3	I	34.5	I	23.6	I	20.7
		I	20.0	I	28.8	I	18.6	I	
		I	5.6	I	7.1	I	4.9	I	
CS.R.T	6.	I	4	I	3	I	6	I	19
		I	21.1	I	15.8	I	31.6	I	7.1
		I	5.3	I	4.5	I	8.6	I	
		I	1.5	I	1.1	I	2.3	I	
OTHER	7.	I	7	I	4	I	7	I	19
		I	36.8	I	21.1	I	36.8	I	7.1
		I	9.3	I	6.1	I	10.0	I	
		I	2.6	I	1.5	I	2.6	I	
COLUMN		75		66		70		55	
TOTAL		28.2		24.8		26.3		20.7	
								266	
								100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 33.07452 WITH 18 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.20358
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.33255
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.04089

Table 65

Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About
 by How Much Education Completed

TABLE 66			
CROSSTABULATION OF LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT			
BY HOLLINGSHEAD'S INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS			
VARIABLE	HOLLINGSHEAD'S INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS		
	1-5	6-10	11-15
1. SEX	1.000	1.000	1.000
2. AGE	1.000	1.000	1.000
3. EDUCATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
4. OCCUPATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
5. INCOME	1.000	1.000	1.000
6. HOMEOWNERSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
7. MARRIAGE	1.000	1.000	1.000
8. CHILDREN	1.000	1.000	1.000
9. RELIGION	1.000	1.000	1.000
10. ETHNICITY	1.000	1.000	1.000
11. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
12. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
13. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
14. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
15. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
16. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
17. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
18. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
19. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
20. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
21. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
22. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
23. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
24. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
25. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
26. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
27. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
28. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
29. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
30. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
31. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
32. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
33. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
34. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
35. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
36. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
37. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
38. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
39. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
40. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
41. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
42. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
43. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
44. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
45. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
46. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
47. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
48. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
49. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
50. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
51. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
52. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
53. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
54. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
55. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
56. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
57. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
58. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
59. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
60. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
61. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
62. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
63. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
64. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
65. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
66. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
67. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
68. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
69. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
70. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
71. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
72. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
73. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
74. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
75. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
76. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
77. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
78. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
79. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
80. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
81. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
82. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
83. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
84. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
85. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
86. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
87. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
88. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
89. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
90. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
91. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
92. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
93. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
94. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
95. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
96. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
97. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
98. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000
99. CITIZENSHIP	1.000	1.000	1.000
100. NATURALIZATION	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 66

Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

VAR009

 CCUNT I
 ROW PCT I
 COL PCT I
 TOT PCT I

 ROW
 TOTAL

VAR037

		1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	5.1	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
1.	I	19	I	21	I	32	I
T.R.CS	I	19.6	I	21.6	I	33.0	I
	I	54.3	I	30.0	I	36.4	I
	I	6.9	I	7.6	I	11.6	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2.	I	4	I	12	I	8	I
T.CS.R	I	12.5	I	37.5	I	9.4	I
	I	11.4	I	17.1	I	4.7	I
	I	1.4	I	4.3	I	1.1	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
3.	I	3	I	6	I	13	I
R.T.CS	I	10.0	I	20.0	I	43.3	I
	I	8.6	I	8.6	I	20.3	I
	I	1.1	I	2.2	I	4.7	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
4.	I	1	I	5	I	6	I
R.CS.T	I	5.0	I	25.0	I	30.0	I
	I	2.9	I	7.1	I	9.4	I
	I	0.4	I	1.8	I	2.2	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
5.	I	5	I	13	I	12	I
CS.T.R	I	8.3	I	21.7	I	20.0	I
	I	14.3	I	18.6	I	18.8	I
	I	1.8	I	4.7	I	4.3	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
6.	I	2	I	9	I	3	I
CS.R.T	I	10.5	I	47.4	I	15.8	I
	I	5.7	I	12.9	I	4.7	I
	I	0.7	I	3.2	I	1.1	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
7.	I	1	I	4	I	6	I
OTHER	I	5.3	I	21.1	I	31.6	I
	I	2.9	I	5.7	I	9.4	I
	I	0.4	I	1.4	I	2.2	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN		35		70		64	
TOTAL		12.6		25.3		23.1	
						88	
						31.8	
						20	
						7.2	
						277	
						100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 35.02463 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.17779

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.33504

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.06853

TABLE 67									
Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About by Approximate Annual Income									
Like to Know More About	Approximate Annual Income								
	Less Than \$1,000	\$1,000 to \$1,999	\$2,000 to \$2,999	\$3,000 to \$3,999	\$4,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$5,999	\$6,000 to \$6,999	\$7,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 and Over
Yes	10.0	12.0	15.0	18.0	20.0	22.0	24.0	26.0	28.0
No	90.0	88.0	85.0	82.0	80.0	78.0	76.0	74.0	72.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 67

Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About
by Approximate Annual Income

VAR010											ROW TOTAL										
COUNT	I																				
ROW PCT	I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000											
COL PCT	I																				
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I											
VAR037	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I											
T.R.CS	1.	I	15	I	7	I	12	I	5	I	4	I	16	I	13	I	12	I	3	I	87
	I	17.2	I	8.0	I	13.8	I	5.7	I	4.6	I	18.4	I	14.9	I	13.8	I	3.4	I	36.7	
	I	44.1	I	28.0	I	40.0	I	38.5	I	33.3	I	42.1	I	37.1	I	34.3	I	20.0	I		
	I	6.3	I	3.0	I	5.1	I	2.1	I	1.7	I	6.8	I	5.5	I	5.1	I	1.3	I		
T.CS.R	2.	I	2	I	1	I	6	I	0	I	2	I	4	I	2	I	9	I	1	I	27
	I	7.4	I	3.7	I	22.2	I	0.0	I	7.4	I	14.8	I	7.4	I	33.3	I	3.7	I	11.4	
	I	5.9	I	4.0	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	16.7	I	10.5	I	5.7	I	25.7	I	6.7	I		
	I	0.8	I	0.4	I	2.5	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	1.7	I	0.8	I	3.8	I	0.4	I		
R.T.CS	3.	I	0	I	2	I	3	I	4	I	1	I	5	I	6	I	1	I	2	I	24
	I	0.0	I	8.3	I	12.5	I	16.7	I	4.2	I	20.8	I	25.0	I	4.2	I	8.3	I	10.1	
	I	0.0	I	8.0	I	10.0	I	30.8	I	8.3	I	13.2	I	17.1	I	2.9	I	13.3	I		
	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	1.3	I	1.7	I	0.4	I	2.1	I	2.5	I	0.4	I	0.8	I		
R.CS.T	4.	I	4	I	3	I	1	I	0	I	3	I	2	I	1	I	3	I	0	I	17
	I	23.5	I	17.6	I	5.9	I	0.0	I	17.6	I	11.8	I	5.9	I	17.6	I	0.0	I	7.2	
	I	11.8	I	12.0	I	3.3	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	5.3	I	2.9	I	8.6	I	0.0	I		
	I	1.7	I	1.3	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	1.3	I	0.8	I	0.4	I	1.3	I	0.0	I		
CS.T.R	5.	I	9	I	9	I	5	I	1	I	1	I	6	I	10	I	6	I	6	I	53
	I	17.0	I	17.0	I	9.4	I	1.9	I	1.9	I	11.3	I	18.9	I	11.3	I	11.3	I	22.4	
	I	26.5	I	36.0	I	16.7	I	7.7	I	8.3	I	15.8	I	28.6	I	17.1	I	40.0	I		
	I	3.8	I	3.8	I	2.1	I	0.4	I	0.4	I	2.5	I	4.2	I	2.5	I	2.5	I		
CS.R.T	6.	I	1	I	3	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	3	I	2	I	2	I	1	I	15
	I	6.7	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	13.3	I	6.7	I	20.0	I	13.3	I	13.3	I	6.7	I	6.3	
	I	2.9	I	12.0	I	0.0	I	15.4	I	8.3	I	7.9	I	5.7	I	5.7	I	6.7	I		
	I	0.4	I	1.3	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.4	I	1.3	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.4	I		
OTHER	7.	I	3	I	0	I	3	I	1	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	2	I	2	I	14
	I	21.4	I	0.0	I	21.4	I	7.1	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	7.1	I	14.3	I	14.3	I	5.9	
	I	8.8	I	0.0	I	10.0	I	7.7	I	0.0	I	5.3	I	2.9	I	5.7	I	13.3	I		
	I	1.3	I	0.0	I	1.3	I	0.4	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.4	I	0.8	I	0.8	I		
COLUMN		34		25		30		13		12		38		35		35		15		237	
TOTAL		14.3		10.5		12.7		5.5		5.1		16.0		14.8		14.8		6.3		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 60.38498 WITH 48 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.20607
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.45061
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.01558

CHI SQUARE = 28.50584 WITH 30 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CRAMER'S V = 0.14321
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.30496
KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01592

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01592

		VAR012							
		COUNT	I						
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER				ROW	
COL	PCT	IAN						TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR037		I	I	I	I	I			
T.R.CS	1.	I	42	I	40	I	16	I 98	
		I	42.9	I	40.8	I	16.3	I 35.5	
		I	38.9	I	32.3	I	36.4	I	
		I	15.2	I	14.5	I	5.8	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
T.CS.R	2.	I	14	I	15	I	4	I 33	
		I	42.4	I	45.5	I	12.1	I 12.0	
		I	13.0	I	12.1	I	9.1	I	
		I	5.1	I	5.4	I	1.4	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
R.T.CS	3.	I	8	I	21	I	2	I 31	
		I	25.8	I	67.7	I	6.5	I 11.2	
		I	7.4	I	16.9	I	4.5	I	
		I	2.9	I	7.6	I	0.7	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
R.CS.T	4.	I	12	I	7	I	1	I 20	
		I	60.0	I	35.0	I	5.0	I 7.2	
		I	11.1	I	5.6	I	2.3	I	
		I	4.3	I	2.5	I	0.4	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
CS.T.R	5.	I	19	I	27	I	11	I 57	
		I	33.3	I	47.4	I	19.3	I 20.7	
		I	17.6	I	21.8	I	25.0	I	
		I	6.9	I	9.8	I	4.0	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
CS.R.T	6.	I	8	I	7	I	4	I 19	
		I	42.1	I	36.8	I	21.1	I 6.9	
		I	7.4	I	5.6	I	9.1	I	
		I	2.9	I	2.5	I	1.4	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
OTHER	7.	I	5	I	7	I	6	I 18	
		I	27.8	I	38.9	I	33.3	I 6.5	
		I	4.6	I	5.6	I	13.6	I	
		I	1.8	I	2.5	I	2.2	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
COLUMN			108		124		44	276	
TOTAL			39.1		44.9		15.9	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 17.78999 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.17952
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.24608
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.06871

Table 69

Crosstabulation of Like to Know More About
 by Political Party Preference

Table 70

Question 31.

Were you aware of events on the U.N.M. campus May 9 - 13, 1972?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	338	89.9
No	<u>38</u> 376	<u>10.1</u> 100.0

Since such a large majority of the sample was aware of the campus disturbance in May 1972, a crosstabulation was deemed useless in analyzing the dependent variables.

Conclusions to be drawn from these responses are that news events worthy enough of mass media coverage will reach the greater population of voters in the state. It should not be presumed, however, that the news reaches everybody as 1 in 10 reported that they were not aware of the events.

ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONS.

The following questions were designed to measure opinions of the public toward U.N.M. Their intent was to give an indication of the image which U.N.M. projects to the public. Some questions were designed to evoke rational, objective responses; others for more emotional reactions. Questions with a response distribution of better than 70 - 30% were analyzed in comparison to the dependent variables of demographics.

Table 71

Question 19.

Do you feel that U.N.M. provides adequate service to the State with regard to teaching?

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	242	68.8
No	<u>110</u> 352	<u>31.2</u> 100.0

While this shows the sample generally supportive of U.N.M. teaching, crosstabulations were conducted to define any possible negative factions of the sample.

The NEWSOCO crosstabulation was not significant. Responses from each of the areas were close to the proportions for the sample. Response from NEWSOCO-8 (Colfax, Union) was 100% positive. Favorable response from NEWSOCO-13 (San Juan) was particularly low - 41%. (See Table 72).

Those in the 21 - 30 age group appraised the University's teaching service most positively. Those over 50 held the most negative estimation. However, the chi square analysis showed that the variance between groups was not significant. (See Table 73.)

Sex, also, was not a significant factor for analysis on this item. (See Table 74.)

Level of education completed did prove to be a significant factor in analyzing the public's attitude toward U.N.M.'s teaching service ($p < .05$). University and high school graduates held the highest estimate while those with advanced degrees held the lowest. (See Table 75.)

A chi square analysis of the crosstabulation of Question 19 and Hollingshead index was not significant. The middle social class (III) held the highest opinion (73%, yes), the lowest classes (IV, V) were next most favorable (70%) and the highest classes (I, II) least favorable (64%). (See Table 76.)

Income was a significant ($p < .05$) factor for crosstabulation. However clearly established patterns were not observed. Respondents in income brackets 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 were above average in their appraisal while those in 2, 4, 6, 8 were below average. The \$10,000 - \$12,000 and \$15,000 - \$25,000 were the most negative brackets. (See Table 77.) Direct connection with U.N.M. was not a considered significant factor in crosstabulation with Question 19. Employees and parents of students were highly supportive (100% and 83%) of the teaching service. Students and alumni were more critical (71% and 68% positive) and those with "no" or "other" connection ranked it lowest (63% positive). (See Table 78.) Crosstabulation with political party did not approach significance although the sample showed Democrats to be seemingly more supportive (73%, yes) than Republicans (63%, yes). Those of "other" political preference were 69% supportive of U.N.M.'s teaching. (See Table 79.)

111

11/21/2002 10:00 AM

CHI SQUARE = 2.99536 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CRAMER'S V = 0.09238
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.09199
KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.06925
KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.07932
GAMMA = 0.12111
SOMER'S D = 0.05178

SOMER'S D = 0.05178

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

		VAR003					
		COUNT	I				
		ROW PCT	IMALE	FEMALE		ROW	
		COL PCT	I			TOTAL	
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I		
VAR019		-----	I	-----	I	-----	I
	1.	I	166	I	76	I	242
YES		I	68.6	I	31.4	I	68.9
		I	67.8	I	71.7	I	
		I	47.3	I	21.7	I	
		-I	-----	-I	-----	-I	
	2.	I	79	I	30	I	109
NO		I	72.5	I	27.5	I	31.1
		I	32.2	I	28.3	I	
		I	22.5	I	8.5	I	
		-I	-----	-I	-----	-I	
COLUMN			245		106		351
TOTAL			69.8		30.2		100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 0.36889 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.03242
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.03240
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.03912
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.03325
 GAMMA = -0.09323
 SOMER'S D = -0.03943

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

Table 74

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service
 by Sex of Respondent

VAR008										
COUNT		I								
ROW	PCT	I HIGH	SCH	TWO	YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW	
COL	PCT	I OOL		OLLEGE		TY				TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I				
VAR019		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	66	I	42	I	68	I	48	I 224
YES		I	29.5	I	18.8	I	30.4	I	21.4	I 67.7
		I	70.2	I	61.8	I	78.2	I	58.5	I
		I	19.9	I	12.7	I	20.5	I	14.5	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.	I	28	I	26	I	19	I	34	I 107
NO		I	26.2	I	24.3	I	17.8	I	31.8	I 32.3
		I	29.8	I	38.2	I	21.8	I	41.5	I
		I	8.5	I	7.9	I	5.7	I	10.3	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN		94		68		87		82		331
TOTAL		28.4		20.5		26.3		24.8		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.86555 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.16366

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.16151

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04471

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.05111

GAMMA = 0.07733

SOMER'S D = 0.03423

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 57

Table 75

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service
by How Much Education Completed

VAR009

		COUNT	I										
		ROW	PCT	I								ROW	
		COL	PCT	I								TOTAL	
		TOT	PCT	I		1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I			
VAR019		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
YES	1.	I	35	I	57	I	54	I	75	I	17	I	238
		I	14.7	I	23.9	I	22.7	I	31.5	I	7.1	I	68.6
		I	64.8	I	63.3	I	73.0	I	72.1	I	68.0	I	
		I	10.1	I	16.4	I	15.6	I	21.6	I	4.9	I	
NO		I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td></td></td>	I <td></td>	
	2.	I	19	I	33	I	20	I	29	I	8	I	109
		I	17.4	I	30.3	I	18.3	I	26.6	I	7.3	I	31.4
		I	35.2	I	36.7	I	27.0	I	27.9	I	32.0	I	
	I	5.5	I	9.5	I	5.8	I	8.4	I	2.3	I		
		I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td>I<td></td></td></td>	I <td>I<td></td></td>	I <td></td>	
COLUMN			54		90		74		104		25		347
TOTAL			15.6		25.9		21.3		30.0		7.2		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.77530 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.08943

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.08908

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.05806

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.06681

GAMMA = -0.10052

SOMER'S D = -0.04349

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 41

TABLE 77									
CROSSTABULATION OF ADEQUACY OF TEACHING SERVICE BY APPROXIMATE ANNUAL INCOME									
WENDALL'S TAU C = 0.71006									
SAMPLING = 0.30579									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									
TOTAL									

VAR010																
COUNT	I															
ROW PCT	I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000	ROW TOTAL					
COL PCT	I															
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I						
VAR019	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I						
YES	1.	I 29	I 20	I 32	I 12	I 12	I 25	I 36	I 28	I 15	I 209					
	I	I 13.9	I 9.6	I 15.3	I 5.7	I 5.7	I 12.0	I 17.2	I 13.4	I 7.2	I 71.3					
	I	I 78.4	I 66.7	I 86.5	I 70.6	I 85.7	I 62.5	I 78.3	I 54.9	I 71.4	I					
	I	I 9.9	I 6.8	I 10.9	I 4.1	I 4.1	I 8.5	I 12.3	I 9.6	I 5.1	I					
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I					
NO	2.	I 8	I 10	I 5	I 5	I 2	I 15	I 10	I 23	I 6	I 84					
	I	I 9.5	I 11.9	I 6.0	I 6.0	I 2.4	I 17.9	I 11.9	I 27.4	I 7.1	I 28.7					
	I	I 21.6	I 33.3	I 13.5	I 29.4	I 14.3	I 37.5	I 21.7	I 45.1	I 28.6	I					
	I	I 2.7	I 3.4	I 1.7	I 1.7	I 0.7	I 5.1	I 3.4	I 7.8	I 2.0	I					
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I					
COLUMN		37	30	37	17	14	40	46	51	21	293					
TOTAL		12.6	10.2	12.6	5.8	4.8	13.7	15.7	17.4	7.2	100.0					

TABLE 78									
CROSSTABULATION OF ADEQUACY OF TEACHING SERVICE BY DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH U.N.M.									
TOTAL									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									

VAR011

		COUNT												ROW TOTAL	
ROW		PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT		O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO CONNE		OTHER				
COL		PCT	I	F		STUDEN									
TOT		PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I						
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		I
VAR019															
YES	1.	I	10	I	26	I	8	I	25	I	159	I	12	I	240
		I	4.2	I	10.8	I	3.3	I	10.4	I	66.3	I	5.0	I	68.6
		I	71.4	I	81.3	I	100.0	I	67.6	I	66.5	I	60.0	I	
		I	2.9	I	7.4	I	2.3	I	7.1	I	45.4	I	3.4	I	
NO	2.	I	4	I	6	I	0	I	12	I	80	I	8	I	110
		I	3.6	I	5.5	I	0.0	I	10.9	I	72.7	I	7.3	I	31.4
		I	28.6	I	18.8	I	0.0	I	32.4	I	33.5	I	40.0	I	
		I	1.1	I	1.7	I	0.0	I	3.4	I	22.9	I	2.3	I	
COLUMN			14		32		8		37		239		20		350
TOTAL			4.0		9.1		2.3		10.6		68.3		5.7		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.26908 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.14411

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.14264

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.09678

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.09064

GAMMA = 0.21210

SOMER'S D = 0.08908

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 38

VAR012									
COUNT		I							
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER	ROW				
COL	PCT	IAN	TOTAL						
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR019		I-----I-----I-----I							
	1.	I	78	I	126	I	34	I	238
YES		I	32.8	I	52.9	I	14.3	I	69.0
		I	63.4	I	72.8	I	69.4	I	
		I	22.6	I	36.5	I	9.9	I	
		I-----I-----I-----I							
	2.	I	45	I	47	I	15	I	107
NO		I	42.1	I	43.9	I	14.0	I	31.0
		I	36.6	I	27.2	I	30.6	I	
		I	13.0	I	13.6	I	4.3	I	
		I-----I-----I-----I							
COLUMN			123		173		49		345
TOTAL			35.7		50.1		14.2		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.98441 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.09301
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.09261
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.06864
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.06963
 GAMMA = -0.13347
 SOMER'S D = -0.05790

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 43

Table 79

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Teaching Service
 by Political Party Preference

Table 80

Question 20.

Do you feel that U.N.M. provides adequate service to the State with regard to research?

	_____ Yes	_____ No
Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	204	62.6
No	<u>122</u>	<u>37.4</u>
	326	100.0

While these returns show the majority of the sample to be satisfied with U.N.M. research services, crosstabulations were necessary to indicate significant areas of discontent in the population.

NEWSCO was a significant factor for analysis ($p < .05$). Crosstabulation shows NEWSCO's 10, 11, 13 to be particularly negative (55% - 63%, no). These include the counties: Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, San Juan. NEWSCO's that were particularly supportive were 2, 5, 9 (73% - 80%). These include Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Catron, Grant, Socorro, Sierra, Lincoln, Otero. The remainder of the NEWSCO areas were in close relation to the overall percentages. (See Table 81.)

Age was found not to be a significant factor in crosstabulation with this item. (See Table 82.)

Sex was also considered to be not significant as the distribution of responses did not vary widely from male to female. (See Table 83.)

The level of education completed was shown not to be a significant variable. It was the University graduates who responded most positively and two-year college or technical school graduates who responded most negatively. (See Table 84.)

Crosstabulation of Question 20 with the Hollingshead index was not significant. (See Table 85.)

Income was also not a significant variable for crosstabulation with this item. (See Table 86.)

Direct contact with the University was not a significant factor and no trends could be observed. Employees were most supportive (100%) of the research service at the University but students felt least satisfied with it. (See Table 87.)

Political party preference also proved to be a non-significant variable for crosstabulation with Question 20. (See Table 88.)

Table 81

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service
by Newsco

NEWSCD																			
COUNT	I																		
ROW PCT	I	BERN	SAN	LOS	ALOM	MORA	RIO	DEB	GUAD	CAT	GRAN	DONA	HID	CHAVES	E	COLFAX	U	LINCOLN	ROW
COL PCT	I	VAL	OS	SANTA	SAN	M	T	HARD	QU	SOC	SIE	AL	LUNA	DDY	NION	OTERO	TOTAL		
TOT PCT	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I								
VAR020	I	-----I																	

NEWSCD										
COUNT	I									
ROW PCT	ICURRY	RD	LEA	MCKINLEY SAN JUAN					ROW	
COL PCT	IDSEVELT									
TOT PCT	I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I					
VAR020	I									
1.	I	3	I	9	I	0	I	6	I	204
YES	I	1.5	I	4.4	I	0.0	I	2.9	I	62.6
	I	37.5	I	45.0	I	0.0	I	37.5	I	
	I	0.9	I	2.8	I	0.0	I	1.8	I	
	I									
2.	I	5	I	11	I	4	I	10	I	122
NO	I	4.1	I	9.0	I	3.3	I	8.2	I	37.4
	I	62.5	I	55.0	I	100.0	I	62.5	I	
	I	1.5	I	3.4	I	1.2	I	3.1	I	
	I									
COLUMN		8		20		4		16		326
TOTAL		2.5		6.1		1.2		4.9		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.50446 WITH 13 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.27970
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.26937
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.09030
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.10930
 GAMMA = 0.14883
 SOMER'S D = 0.06988

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 62

		VAR003			
		COUNT	I		
ROW	PCT	IMALE		FEMALE	ROW
COL	PCT	I			TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.1	2.1	
VAR020		-----I-----I-----I			
	1.	I	145	I	59
YES		I	71.1	I	28.9
		I	63.6	I	60.8
		I	44.6	I	18.2
		-I-----I-----I			
	2.	I	83	I	38
NO		I	68.6	I	31.4
		I	36.4	I	39.2
		I	25.5	I	11.7
		-I-----I-----I			
	COLUMN		228		97
	TOTAL		70.2		29.8
					100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 0.12082 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.01928
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.01928
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.02624
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.02321
 GAMMA = 0.05890
 SOMER'S D = 0.02772

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 63

Table 83

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service
by Sex of Respondent

VAR 008										
COUNT		I								
ROW	PCT	I	HIGH	SCH	TWO	YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW
COL	PCT	IOOL	COLLEGE				TY			TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.1		2.1		3.1		4.1	
VAR020		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	1.	I	56	I	33	I	56	I	44	I 189
		I	29.6	I	17.5	I	29.6	I	23.3	I 61.8
		I	63.6	I	53.2	I	69.1	I	58.7	I
		I	18.3	I	10.8	I	18.3	I	14.4	I
YES		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.	I	32	I	29	I	25	I	31	I 117
		I	27.4	I	24.8	I	21.4	I	26.5	I 38.2
		I	36.4	I	46.8	I	30.9	I	41.3	I
		I	10.5	I	9.5	I	8.2	I	10.1	I
NO		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN			88	62	81	75	306			
TOTAL			28.8	20.3	26.5	24.5	100.0			

CHI SQUARE = 4.21313 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.11734
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.11654
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.00317
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.00376
 GAMMA = 0.00530
 SOMER'S D = 0.00252

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 82

Table 84

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service
 by How Much Education Completed

TABLE 85									
CROSSTABULATION OF ADEQUACY OF RESEARCH SERVICE									
BY HOLLINGSHEAD'S INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS									
TOTAL									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.0000									
1.									

VAR009

		COUNT	I							ROW			
		ROW PCT	I							TOTAL			
		COL PCT	I										
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I					
VAR020		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----				
YES	1.	I	35	I	49	I	40	I	64	I	14	I	202
		I	17.3	I	24.3	I	19.8	I	31.7	I	6.9	I	62.5
		I	64.8	I	62.8	I	55.6	I	67.4	I	58.3	I	
		I	10.8	I	15.2	I	12.4	I	19.8	I	4.3	I	
		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----				
NO	2.	I	19	I	29	I	32	I	31	I	10	I	121
		I	15.7	I	24.0	I	26.4	I	25.6	I	8.3	I	37.5
		I	35.2	I	37.2	I	44.4	I	32.6	I	41.7	I	
		I	5.9	I	9.0	I	9.9	I	9.6	I	3.1	I	
		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----				
COLUMN			54		78		72		95		24		323
TOTAL			16.7		24.1		22.3		29.4		7.4		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.74777 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.09223

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.09184

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.00312

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.00376

GAMMA = -0.00517

SOMER'S D = -0.00243

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 65

TABLE 86									
CROSSTABULATION OF ADEQUACY OF RESEARCH SERVICE BY APPROXIMATE ANNUAL INCOME									
ADEQUACY	TOTAL	ANNUAL INCOME				TOTAL			
		0-100	100-200	200-300	300-400	0-100	100-200	200-300	300-400
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
32	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
35	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
37	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
39	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
41	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
42	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
43	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
45	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
46	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
47	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
48	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
49	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
51	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
52	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
53	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
54	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
55	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
56	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
57	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
58	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
59	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
60	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
61	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
62	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
63	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
64	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
66	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
67	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
68	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
69	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
70	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
71	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
72	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
73	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
74	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
75	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
76	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
77	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
78	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
79	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
80	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
81	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
82	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
83	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
84	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
85	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
86	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
87	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
88	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
89	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
90	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
91	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
92	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
93	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
94	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
95	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
96	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
97	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
98	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 86

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service
by Approximate Annual Income

COUNT	I																			
ROW PCT	I<\$4000	<\$6000		<\$8000		<\$9000		<\$10,000		<\$12,000		<\$15,000		<\$25,000		>\$25,000		ROW		
COL PCT	I																			
TOT PCT	I	1.I		2.I		3.I		4.I		5.I		6.I		7.I		8.I		9.I		TOTAL
1.	I	27	I	13	I	26	I	12	I	10	I	20	I	27	I	28	I	11	I	174
	I	15.5	I	7.5	I	14.9	I	6.9	I	5.7	I	11.5	I	15.5	I	16.1	I	6.3	I	64.2
	I	79.4	I	52.0	I	70.3	I	70.6	I	71.4	I	55.6	I	64.3	I	60.9	I	55.0	I	
	I	10.0	I	4.8	I	9.6	I	4.4	I	3.7	I	7.4	I	10.0	I	10.3	I	4.1	I	
2.	I	7	I	12	I	11	I	5	I	4	I	16	I	15	I	18	I	9	I	97
	I	7.2	I	12.4	I	11.3	I	5.2	I	4.1	I	16.5	I	15.5	I	18.6	I	9.3	I	35.8
	I	20.6	I	48.0	I	29.7	I	29.4	I	28.6	I	44.4	I	35.7	I	39.1	I	45.0	I	
	I	2.6	I	4.4	I	4.1	I	1.8	I	1.5	I	5.9	I	5.5	I	6.6	I	3.3	I	
COLUMN		34		25		37		17		14		36		42		46		20		271
TOTAL		12.5		9.2		13.7		6.3		5.2		13.3		15.5		17.0		7.4		100.0

SOMER'S D = 0.05739

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 117

VAR011															
COUNT		I													
ROW	PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT	O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO	CONNE	OTHER						ROW
COL	PCT	I	F			STUDEN	CTION								TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I							
VAR020		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
YES	1.	I	7	I	21	I	8	I	21	I	137	I	10	I	204
		I	3.4	I	10.3	I	3.9	I	10.3	I	67.2	I	4.9	I	62.6
		I	50.0	I	67.7	I	100.0	I	60.0	I	62.0	I	58.8	I	
		I	2.1	I	6.4	I	2.5	I	6.4	I	42.0	I	3.1	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
NO	2.	I	7	I	10	I	0	I	14	I	84	I	7	I	122
		I	5.7	I	8.2	I	0.0	I	11.5	I	68.9	I	5.7	I	37.4
		I	50.0	I	32.3	I	0.0	I	40.0	I	38.0	I	41.2	I	
		I	2.1	I	3.1	I	0.0	I	4.3	I	25.8	I	2.1	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN			14		31		8		35		221		17		326
TOTAL			4.3		9.5		2.5		10.7		67.8		5.2		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.31694 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.13920

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.13787

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.02618

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.02571

GAMMA = 0.05354

SOMER'S D = 0.02497

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 62

		VAR012						
		COUNT	I					ROW
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER				
COL	PCT	IAN						
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I			
VAR020		I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	75	I	102	I	25	I
YES		I	37.1	I	50.5	I	12.4	I
		I	67.6	I	62.2	I	54.3	I
		I	23.4	I	31.8	I	7.8	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.	I	36	I	62	I	21	I
NO		I	30.3	I	52.1	I	17.6	I
		I	32.4	I	37.8	I	45.7	I
		I	11.2	I	19.3	I	6.5	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	COLUMN		111		164		46	
	TOTAL		34.6		51.1		14.3	
								321
								100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.51362 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.08849
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.08815
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.08243
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.08715
 GAMMA = 0.15495
 SOMER'S D = 0.07276

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 67

Table 88

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Research Service
 by Political Party Preference

Table 89

Question 21.

Do you feel that U.N.M. provides adequate service to the State with regard to community service?

_____ Yes _____ No

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	143	45
No	<u>175</u> 318	<u>55</u> 100

The question was also crosstabulated with the demographic data to determine if these were specific trends in responses.

Question 21.

Do you feel that U.N.M. provides adequate service to the State with regard to community service?

The chi square analysis of the crosstabulation between this question and NEWSO did not show significance. It should be noted, though, that NEWSO-3 is decidedly more positive than average (74%, yes) and that NEWSO's 11, 13 are more negative than average (70%, 75%). (See Table 90.)

Age was not shown to be a significant variable as the opinions in each age group were consistent with those of the sample. (See Table 91.)

While not statistically significant the crosstabulation with sex showed a tendency for women to respond more positively on this question. (See Table 92.)

The level of education completed was not a significant factor for crosstabulation in this analysis. (See Table 93.)

While the crosstabulation between Hollingshead's index and Question 21 is not significant at the .05 level, a trend seemed to show that the higher social classes had a lower estimate of U.N.M.'s community service than the lower classes. (See Table 94.)

Income was not a statistically significant variable. To verify the trend shown in the Hollingshead crosstabulation, the lowest economic bracket (less than \$4000) held the highest opinion and a high bracket (\$15,000 - \$25,000) was most negative in response to the question. (See Table 95.)

Crosstabulation of Question 21 with the respondent's connection to U.N.M. did not prove to be significant. The responses from parents of students were most positive (55%) while those with "other" connection were most negative. (See Table 96.)

Political party was not a significant factor in a chi square analysis on this question. It can be noted, though, that "other" affiliation is more negative than Republicans or Democrats. (See Table 97.)

NEWSCO						
LN	CURRY	RC	LEA	MCKINLEY	SAN JUAN	ROW
	DOSEVELT					TOTAL
9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I		
V	I	I	I	I	I	
7	I	3	I	6	I	143
9	I	2.1	I	4.2	I	45.0
8	I	37.5	I	30.0	I	
2	I	0.9	I	1.9	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	
9	I	5	I	14	I	175
1	I	2.9	I	8.0	I	55.0
3	I	62.5	I	70.0	I	
8	I	1.6	I	4.4	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	
6		8		20		318
0		2.5		6.3		100.0

(

14.42337 WITH 13 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

0.21297

FICIENT = 0.20830

= 0.08558

= 0.10672

98

.06793

G OBSERVATIONS = 70

Table 90

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service
by Newsco

COUNT	I											
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50				ROW	
COL	PCT	I									TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I					
1.	I	9	I	33	I	31	I	30	I	40	I	143
	I	6.3	I	23.1	I	21.7	I	21.0	I	28.0	I	45.1
	I	50.0	I	45.8	I	50.0	I	42.9	I	42.1	I	
	I	2.8	I	10.4	I	9.8	I	9.5	I	12.6	I	
2.	I	9	I	39	I	31	I	40	I	55	I	174
	I	5.2	I	22.4	I	17.8	I	23.0	I	31.6	I	54.9
	I	50.0	I	54.2	I	50.0	I	57.1	I	57.9	I	
	I	2.8	I	12.3	I	9.8	I	12.6	I	17.4	I	
COLUMN		18		72		62		70		95		317
TOTAL		5.7		22.7		19.6		22.1		30.0		100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 71

		VAR 003			
		COUNT	I		
		ROW PCT	MALE	FEMALE	ROW TOTAL
		COL PCT	I		
		TOT PCT	I	1.1	2.1
VAR021			I	I	I
	1.	I	93	I 50	I 143
YES		I	65.0	I 35.0	I 45.1
		I	41.5	I 53.8	I
		I	29.3	I 15.8	I
			I	I	I
	2.	I	131	I 43	I 174
NO		I	75.3	I 24.7	I 54.9
		I	58.5	I 46.2	I
		I	41.3	I 13.6	I
			I	I	I
COLUMN			224	93	317
TOTAL			70.7	29.3	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 3.50063 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
 PHI = 0.10509
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.10451
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.11205
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.10154
 GAMMA = -0.24182
 SOMER'S D = -0.12246
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 71

Table 92
 Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service
 by Sex of Respondent

VAR008										
COUNT		I								
ROW	PCT	I	HIGH SCH	TWO YR C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW			
COL	PCT	I	COLLEGE	TY	TOTAL					
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I				
VAR021		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	41	I	27	I	36	I	30	I 134
YES		I	30.6	I	20.1	I	26.9	I	22.4	I 44.8
		I	50.0	I	47.4	I	43.9	I	38.5	I
		I	13.7	I	9.0	I	12.0	I	10.0	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.	I	41	I	30	I	46	I	48	I 165
NO		I	24.8	I	18.2	I	27.9	I	29.1	I 55.2
		I	50.0	I	52.6	I	56.1	I	61.5	I
		I	13.7	I	10.0	I	15.4	I	16.1	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN			82		57		82		78	299
TOTAL			27.4		19.1		27.4		26.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.34238 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.08851
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.08817
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.08022
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.09740
 GAMMA = 0.13176
 SOMER'S D = 0.06536

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 89

Table 93

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service
 by How Much Education Completed?

VAR009

	COUNT	I									ROW
	ROW PCT	I									TOTAL
	COL PCT	I									
	TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I				
VAR021		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	1.	I	21	I	32	I	27	I	48	I	141
YES		I	14.9	I	22.7	I	19.1	I	34.0	I	44.8
		I	39.6	I	40.0	I	40.3	I	53.3	I	
		I	6.7	I	10.2	I	8.6	I	15.2	I	
		I		I		I		I		I	
	2.	I	32	I	48	I	40	I	42	I	174
NO		I	18.4	I	27.6	I	23.0	I	24.1	I	55.2
		I	60.4	I	60.0	I	59.7	I	46.7	I	
		I	10.2	I	15.2	I	12.7	I	13.3	I	
		I		I		I		I		I	
	COLUMN		53		80		67		90		315
	TOTAL		16.8		25.4		21.3		28.6		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.04361 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.12654
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.12554
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.09859
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.12199
 GAMMA = -0.15865
 SOMER'S D = -0.07880

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 73

COUNT		I											
ROW	PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT		O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO		CONNE	OTHER	ROW	
COL	PCT	I	F		STUDEN			CTION				TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I		2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I		6.I			
-----I-----													

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 70

		VAR012							
		COUNT	I						
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER				ROW	
COL	PCT	IAN						TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR021		-----I-----I-----I-----I							
	1.	I	52	I	73	I	16	I	141
YES		I	36.9	I	51.8	I	11.3	I	45.0
		I	45.6	I	47.4	I	35.6	I	
		I	16.6	I	23.3	I	5.1	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
	2.	I	62	I	81	I	29	I	172
NO		I	36.0	I	47.1	I	16.9	I	55.0
		I	54.4	I	52.6	I	64.4	I	
		I	19.8	I	25.9	I	9.3	I	
		-I-----I-----I-----I							
	COLUMN		114		154		45		313
	TOTAL		36.4		49.2		14.4		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.99764 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.07989
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.07964
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.03817
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.04177
 GAMMA = 0.06982
 SOMER'S D = 0.03454

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 75

Table 97

Crosstabulation of Adequacy of Community Service
 by Political Party Preference

Table 98

Question 22.

On the whole, do you believe that U.N.M. provides an education for its graduates which meets the needs of the state?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ No Opinion

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	202	52.4
No	107	27.7
No Opinion	<u>77</u>	<u>19.9</u>
	386	100.0

The sample polled indicated a positive opinion in response to this question. The ratio of yes/no was almost 2:1. It is unfortunate that more of the 20% undecided could not have made a more definitive statement, but this may be an indication of the amount or kind of information that they receive about the University.

Question 22.

On the whole, do you believe that U.N.M. provides an education for its graduates which meets the needs of the state?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ No Opinion

NEWSCO was not found to be significant in a chi square analysis of the crosstabulation. The counties with the highest positive return were Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel and Taos. The counties which reported most negatively were Chaves, Eddy, and San Juan. (See Table 99.)

Age was not found to be a significant variable in this cross-tabulation although a tendency toward curvi-linear relationship was observed. The lower ages and the higher ages were less positive than the middle age groups. (See Table 100.)

Crosstabulation of sex of respondent with this question did not show significance. (See Table 101.)

Level of education completed was a significant factor ($p < .05$). University graduates were much more positive than those with advanced degrees (63% : 46%). Respondent's from two-year colleges or technical schools were most negative. (See Table 102)

The Hollingshead index was not found to be significant in cross-tabulation with this item and no trends were discernable. (See Table 103.)

Income, however, was a significant factor for analysis on this question ($p < .01$). Respondents whose incomes were between \$6000 - \$9000 were most negative in their answers. Most positive were the respondents whose income was between \$10,000 and \$12,000. People with the lowest incomes (less than \$6000) had the highest incidence of indecision. (See Table 104.)

Employees answered most favorably of those connected with U.N.M. (88%, yes). Parents of students were also highly supportive (72.9%, yes). Alumni and students were less enthusiastic in positive response (63%, 57%). Those with "no" or "other" connection (76% of the sample) were only 48% supportive. It should be noted however that these respondents also had a high percentage of "no opinion." This analysis approached significance at the .05 level. (See Table 105.)

Comparison of responses by political party preference showed no significant variance. (See Table 106.)

The only significant relation to be observed in Table 107 is that there is a higher percentage of people in Hollingshead's Class I, in NEWSO-1 that hold a negative attitude in response to this question than there is in the sample ($p < .01$).

Table 108 shows that in Hollingshead Class V NEWSO-3 is significantly more supportive on this question than is the general sample ($p < .01$).

NEWSCO									
ICURRY RD LEA					MCKINLEY SAN JUAN				ROW
IOSEVELT									TOTAL
I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I	I				
I	4	15	3	8	I				202
I	2.0	7.4	1.5	4.0	I				52.3
I	40.0	68.2	50.0	42.1	I				
I	1.0	3.9	0.8	2.1	I				
I	3	4	3	7	I				107
I	2.8	3.7	2.8	6.5	I				27.7
I	30.0	18.2	50.0	36.8	I				
I	0.8	1.0	0.8	1.8	I				
I	3	3	0	4	I				77
I	3.9	3.9	0.0	5.2	I				19.9
I	30.0	13.6	0.0	21.1	I				
I	0.8	0.8	0.0	1.0	I				
I	10	22	6	19					386
	2.6	5.7	1.6	4.9					100.0

(CO 37718 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

1255

IENT = 0.28787

-0.00623

-0.00652

544

BSERVATIONS = 2

Table 99

Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs
by Newsco

NEWSCO																	NEWSCO										ROW TOTAL				
COUNT	I																I														
ROW PCT	I	BERN SAN LOS ALQM MORA RIO DEB GUAD CAT GRAN DONA HID CHAVES E COLFAX U LINCOLN															ICURRY RO LEA	MCKINLEY SAN JUAN													
COL PCT	I	VAL OS SANTA SAN M T HARD QU SOC SIE AL LUNA DDY NION OTERO															JOSEVELT														
TOT PCT	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I																
VAR022	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I															
YES	1.	I	5	I	79	I	28	I	15	I	2	I	9	I	4	I	19	I	3	I	8	I	4	I	15	I	3	I	8	I	202
	I	2.5	I	39.1	I	13.9	I	7.4	I	1.0	I	4.5	I	2.0	I	9.4	I	1.5	I	4.0	I	2.0	I	7.4	I	1.5	I	4.0	I	52.3	
	I	38.5	I	52.3	I	52.8	I	71.4	I	50.0	I	56.3	I	100.0	I	42.2	I	60.0	I	47.1	I	40.0	I	68.2	I	50.0	I	42.1	I		
	I	1.3	I	20.5	I	7.3	I	3.9	I	0.5	I	2.3	I	1.0	I	4.9	I	0.8	I	2.1	I	1.0	I	3.9	I	0.8	I	2.1	I		
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
NO	2.	I	1	I	48	I	15	I	2	I	2	I	2	I	0	I	14	I	0	I	6	I	3	I	4	I	3	I	7	I	107
	I	0.9	I	44.9	I	14.0	I	1.9	I	1.9	I	1.9	I	0.0	I	13.1	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	2.8	I	3.7	I	2.8	I	6.5	I	27.7	
	I	7.7	I	31.8	I	28.3	I	9.5	I	50.0	I	12.5	I	0.0	I	31.1	I	0.0	I	35.3	I	30.0	I	18.2	I	50.0	I	36.8	I		
	I	0.3	I	12.4	I	3.9	I	0.5	I	0.5	I	0.5	I	0.0	I	3.6	I	0.0	I	1.6	I	0.8	I	1.0	I	0.8	I	1.8	I		
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	7	I	24	I	10	I	4	I	0	I	5	I	0	I	12	I	2	I	3	I	3	I	3	I	0	I	4	I	77
	I	9.1	I	31.2	I	13.0	I	5.2	I	0.0	I	6.5	I	0.0	I	15.6	I	2.6	I	3.9	I	3.9	I	3.9	I	0.0	I	5.2	I	19.9	
	I	53.8	I	15.9	I	18.9	I	19.0	I	0.0	I	31.3	I	0.0	I	26.7	I	40.0	I	17.6	I	30.0	I	13.6	I	0.0	I	21.1	I		
	I	1.8	I	6.2	I	2.6	I	1.0	I	0.0	I	1.3	I	0.0	I	3.1	I	0.5	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	1.0	I		
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN		13		151		53		21		4		16		4		45		5		17		10		22		6		19		386	
TOTAL		3.4		39.1		13.7		5.4		1.0		4.1		1.0		11.7		1.3		4.4		2.6		5.7		1.6		4.9		100.0	

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 34.87718 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.21255
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.28787
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.00623
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.00652
 GAMMA = -0.00889
 SOMER'S D = -0.00544

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

VAR002												
		COUNT	I									
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50	ROW				
COL	PCT	I									TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I					
VAR022		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I		
YES	1.	I	8	I	39	I	44	I	45	I	66	I 202
		I	4.0	I	19.3	I	21.8	I	22.3	I	32.7	I 52.5
		I	40.0	I	50.6	I	55.0	I	54.2	I	52.8	I
		I	2.1	I	10.1	I	11.4	I	11.7	I	17.1	I
		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I		
NO	2.	I	4	I	21	I	23	I	26	I	32	I 106
		I	3.8	I	19.8	I	21.7	I	24.5	I	30.2	I 27.5
		I	20.0	I	27.3	I	28.8	I	31.3	I	25.6	I
		I	1.0	I	5.5	I	6.0	I	6.8	I	8.3	I
		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I		
NO OPINION	3.	I	8	I	17	I	13	I	12	I	27	I 77
		I	10.4	I	22.1	I	16.9	I	15.6	I	35.1	I 20.0
		I	40.0	I	22.1	I	16.3	I	14.5	I	21.6	I
		I	2.1	I	4.4	I	3.4	I	3.1	I	7.0	I
		-----I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I		
COLUMN			20		77		80		83		125	385
TOTAL			5.2		20.0		20.8		21.6		32.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.01362 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.10202

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.14279

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.03185

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.03255

GAMMA = -0.04661

SOMER'S D = -0.02846

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

VAR003							
COUNT I							
ROW PCT IMALE				FEMALE		ROW	
COL PCT I						TOTAL	
TOT PCT I				1. I		2. I	
VAR022	-----I-----				I-----		I
YES	1.	I	137	I	65	I	202
		I	67.8	I	32.2	I	52.5
		I	52.1	I	53.3	I	
		I	35.6	I	16.9	I	
	-----I-----				I-----		I
NO	2.	I	78	I	28	I	106
		I	73.6	I	26.4	I	27.5
		I	29.7	I	23.0	I	
		I	20.3	I	7.3	I	
	-----I-----				I-----		I
NO OPINION	3.	I	48	I	29	I	77
		I	62.3	I	37.7	I	20.0
		I	18.3	I	23.8	I	
		I	12.5	I	7.5	I	
	-----I-----				I-----		I
COLUMN		263		122		385	
TOTAL		68.3		31.7		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 2.65353 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.08302
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.08274
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.01411
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.01449
 GAMMA = 0.02739
 SOMER'S D = 0.01674

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

Table 101

Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs
by Sex of Respondent

VAR008										
COUNT I										
ROW	PCT	I	HIGH	SCH	TWO	YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW
COL	PCT	I	COL	COLLEGE	TY					TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I				
VAR022		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
YES	1.	I	56	I	34	I	56	I	40	I 186
		I	30.1	I	18.3	I	30.1	I	21.5	I 51.5
		I	53.8	I	42.5	I	62.9	I	45.5	I
		I	15.5	I	9.4	I	15.5	I	11.1	I
NO	2.	I	24	I	25	I	22	I	32	I 103
		I	23.3	I	24.3	I	21.4	I	31.1	I 28.5
		I	23.1	I	31.3	I	24.7	I	36.4	I
		I	6.6	I	6.9	I	6.1	I	8.9	I
NO OPINION	3.	I	24	I	21	I	11	I	16	I 72
		I	33.3	I	29.2	I	15.3	I	22.2	I 19.9
		I	23.1	I	26.3	I	12.4	I	18.2	I
		I	6.6	I	5.8	I	3.0	I	4.4	I
COLUMN			104		80		89		88	361
TOTAL			28.8		22.2		24.7		24.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.69409 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.13260
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18431
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01416
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.01439
 GAMMA = -0.02077
 SOMER'S D = -0.01283

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 27

Table 102

Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs
 by How Much Education Completed?

TABLE 103			
Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs			
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status			
Education Offered	Meets State Needs	Hollingshead's Index of Social Status	
		Low	High
Elementary	Yes	100	100
Elementary	No	0	0
High School	Yes	100	100
High School	No	0	0
College	Yes	100	100
College	No	0	0
Postgraduate	Yes	100	100
Postgraduate	No	0	0
Total	Yes	100	100
Total	No	0	0
Total		100	100

Table 103

Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

		TOT PCT I					ROW TOTAL		
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.			
VAR022	YES	I	33	I	I	I	I	200	
		I	16.5	I	46	I	56	I	52.5
		I	57.9	I	23.0	I	28.0	I	13
		I	8.7	I	47.9	I	26.0	I	6.5
		I		I	12.1	I	57.8	I	46.4
NO	2.	I	17	I	I	I	I	106	
		I	16.0	I	31	I	22	I	27.8
		I	29.8	I	29.2	I	20.8	I	8.5
		I	4.5	I	32.3	I	24.4	I	24.5
		I		I	8.1	I	5.8	I	7.1
NO OPINION	3.	I	7	I	19	I	16	I	27
		I	9.3	I	25.3	I	21.3	I	36.0
		I	12.3	I	19.8	I	17.8	I	24.5
		I	1.8	I	5.0	I	4.2	I	7.1
		I		I		I		I	1.6
COLUMN TOTAL		57	96	90	110	28	381		
		15.0	25.2	23.6	28.9	7.3	100.0		

CHI SQUARE = 6.29802 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.09091

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.12752

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04366

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.04481

GAMMA = 0.06373

SOMER'S D = 0.03881

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

7

VAR011

		COUNT											ROW
ROW PCT		ISTUDENT	FARENT O		EMPLOYEE		ALUMNUS		NO CONNE		OTHER		ROW TOTAL
COL PCT		I	F STUDEN						CTION				
TOT PCT		I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I					
VAR022		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
YES	1.	I	8	I	23	I	7	I	24	I	129	I	202
		I	4.0	I	11.4	I	3.5	I	11.9	I	63.9	I	52.6
		I	57.1	I	71.9	I	87.5	I	63.2	I	48.0	I	
		I	2.1	I	6.0	I	1.8	I	6.3	I	33.6	I	
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	
NO	2.	I	5	I	4	I	1	I	11	I	80	I	107
		I	4.7	I	3.7	I	0.9	I	10.3	I	74.8	I	27.9
		I	35.7	I	12.5	I	12.5	I	28.9	I	29.7	I	
		I	1.3	I	1.0	I	0.3	I	2.9	I	20.8	I	
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	1	I	5	I	0	I	3	I	60	I	75
		I	1.3	I	6.7	I	0.0	I	4.0	I	80.0	I	19.5
		I	7.1	I	15.6	I	0.0	I	7.9	I	22.3	I	
		I	0.3	I	1.3	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	15.6	I	
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	
COLUMN			14		32		8		38		269		384
TOTAL			3.6		8.3		2.1		9.9		70.1		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.36795 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.15038

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.20802

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.14837

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.12107

GAMMA = 0.28197

SOMER'S D = 0.16568

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

4

VAR012									
		COUNT		I					
ROW		PCT		IREPUBLIC		DEMOCRAT		OTHER	
COL		PCT		IAN				ROW	
TOT		PCT		I		1.I		2.I	
								3.I	
VAR022		-----I-----		I-----		I-----		I-----	
YES	1.	I	69	I	103	I	30	I	202
		I	34.2	I	51.0	I	14.9	I	53.3
		I	52.3	I	54.8	I	50.8	I	
		I	18.2	I	27.2	I	7.9	I	
		-I-----		I-----		I-----		I-----	
NO	2.	I	39	I	47	I	17	I	103
		I	37.9	I	45.6	I	16.5	I	27.2
		I	29.5	I	25.0	I	28.8	I	
		I	10.3	I	12.4	I	4.5	I	
		-I-----		I-----		I-----		I-----	
NO OPINION	3.	I	24	I	38	I	12	I	74
		I	32.4	I	51.4	I	16.2	I	19.5
		I	18.2	I	20.2	I	20.3	I	
		I	6.3	I	10.0	I	3.2	I	
		-I-----		I-----		I-----		I-----	
COLUMN		132		188		59		379	
TOTAL		34.8		49.6		15.6		100.0	

TABLE 106									
Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Approximate Annual Income									
EDUCATION OFFERED	MEETS STATE NEEDS	APPROXIMATE ANNUAL INCOME							
		LESS THAN \$1,000	\$1,000 TO \$1,499	\$1,500 TO \$1,999	\$2,000 TO \$2,499	\$2,500 TO \$2,999	\$3,000 TO \$3,499	\$3,500 TO \$3,999	\$4,000 AND OVER
Elementary	Yes	10.0	15.0	18.0	22.0	25.0	28.0	30.0	32.0
Elementary	No	90.0	85.0	82.0	78.0	75.0	72.0	70.0	68.0
High School	Yes	12.0	18.0	22.0	28.0	32.0	35.0	38.0	40.0
High School	No	88.0	82.0	78.0	72.0	68.0	65.0	62.0	60.0
College	Yes	15.0	22.0	28.0	35.0	40.0	45.0	48.0	50.0
College	No	85.0	78.0	72.0	65.0	60.0	55.0	52.0	50.0
Postgraduate	Yes	18.0	25.0	32.0	40.0	48.0	55.0	60.0	65.0
Postgraduate	No	82.0	75.0	68.0	60.0	52.0	45.0	40.0	35.0
Total	Yes	15.0	22.0	28.0	35.0	40.0	45.0	48.0	50.0
Total	No	85.0	78.0	72.0	65.0	60.0	55.0	52.0	50.0

Table 106

Crosstabulation of Education Offered Meets State Needs by Approximate Annual Income

		VAR010																				
		COUNT	I																			
		ROW PCT	I	<\$4000	I	<\$6000	I	<\$8000	I	<\$9000	I	<\$10,000	I	<\$12,000	I	<\$15,000	I	<\$25,000	I	>\$25,000	I	ROW TOTAL
		COL PCT	I																			
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	I	2.I	I	3.I	I	4.I	I	5.I	I	6.I	I	7.I	I	8.I	I	9.I	I	
VAR022			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
YES	1.	I	24	I	12	I	22	I	8	I	7	I	29	I	31	I	29	I	15	I	177	
		I	13.6	I	6.8	I	12.4	I	4.5	I	4.0	I	16.4	I	17.5	I	16.4	I	8.5	I	55.0	
		I	57.1	I	37.5	I	56.4	I	40.0	I	50.0	I	61.7	I	62.0	I	54.7	I	60.0	I		
		I	7.5	I	3.7	I	6.8	I	2.5	I	2.2	I	9.0	I	9.6	I	9.0	I	4.7	I		
NO			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	2.	I	5	I	5	I	12	I	7	I	4	I	13	I	12	I	20	I	4	I	82	
		I	6.1	I	6.1	I	14.6	I	8.5	I	4.9	I	15.9	I	14.6	I	24.4	I	4.9	I	25.5	
		I	11.9	I	15.6	I	30.8	I	35.0	I	28.6	I	27.7	I	24.0	I	37.7	I	16.0	I		
NO OPINION		I	1.6	I	1.6	I	3.7	I	2.2	I	1.2	I	4.0	I	3.7	I	6.2	I	1.2	I		
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	3.	I	13	I	15	I	5	I	5	I	3	I	5	I	7	I	4	I	6	I	63	
		I	20.6	I	23.8	I	7.9	I	7.9	I	4.8	I	7.9	I	11.1	I	6.3	I	9.5	I	19.6	
		I	31.0	I	46.9	I	12.8	I	25.0	I	21.4	I	10.6	I	14.0	I	7.5	I	24.0	I		
		I	4.0	I	4.7	I	1.6	I	1.6	I	0.9	I	1.6	I	2.2	I	1.2	I	1.9	I		
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
COLUMN			42		32		39		20		14		47		50		53		25		322	
TOTAL			13.0		9.9		12.1		6.2		4.3		14.6		15.5		16.5		7.8		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 36.33519 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.23753

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.31843

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.09463

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.10234

GAMMA = -0.13012

SOMER'S D = -0.07805

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 66

		NEWSCO																					
		COUNT	I																				
		ROW PCT	IBERN	SAN	LOS	ALOM	MORA	RIO	CAT	GRAN	CHAVES	E LINCOLN	CURRY	RO LEA	MCKINLEY			SAN JUAN	ROW				
		COL PCT	I VAL	CS	SANTA	SAN M	T	SOC	SIE	DDY	OTERO	OSEVELT											
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	5.I	7.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I						TOTAL				
VAR022			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I					
YES	1.	I	9	I	8	I	0	I	1	I	5	I	1	I	2	I	6	I	1	I	0	I	33
		I	27.3	I	24.2	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	15.2	I	3.0	I	6.1	I	18.2	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	57.9
		I	52.9	I	57.1	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	50.0	I	100.0	I	100.0	I	100.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	15.8	I	14.0	I	0.0	I	1.8	I	8.8	I	1.8	I	3.5	I	10.5	I	1.8	I	0.0	I	
NO			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	2.	I	8	I	3	I	0	I	0	I	5	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	17
		I	47.1	I	17.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	29.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.9	I	29.8
		I	47.1	I	21.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	
NO OPINION		I	14.0	I	5.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	8.8	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.8	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	3.	I	0	I	3	I	2	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	7
		I	0.0	I	42.9	I	28.6	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	12.3
		I	0.0	I	21.4	I	100.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	5.3	I	3.5	I	1.8	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.8	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
		COLUMN	17	14	2	2	10	1	2	6	1	2	57										
		TOT AL	29.8	24.6	3.5	3.5	17.5	1.8	3.5	10.5	1.8	3.5	100.0										

CHI SQUARE = 36.08090 WITH 18 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.56258

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.62260

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.07979

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.08033

GAMMA = -0.11523

SOMER'S D = -0.06667

NEWSCO																	
COUNT																	
ROW	PCT	I	BERN SAN LOS ALOM MORA RIO CHAVES E LINCOLN MCKINLEY														ROW
COL	PCT	I	VAL		OS		SANTA		SAN		M		T		DDY		TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	0.I		1.I		2.I		3.I		7.I		9.I		12.I		
VAR022		I	I		I		I		I		I		I		I		
YES	1.	I	0	I	8	I	0	I	5	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	13
		I	0.0	I	61.5	I	0.0	I	38.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	46.4
		I	0.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	28.6	I	0.0	I	17.9	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	I		I		I		I		I		I		I		
NO	2.	I	0	I	6	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	1	I	9
		I	0.0	I	66.7	I	11.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	11.1	I	11.1	I	32.1
		I	0.0	I	37.5	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	100.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	21.4	I	3.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.6	I	3.6	I	
		I	I		I		I		I		I		I		I		
NO OPINION	3.	I	3	I	2	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	6
		I	50.0	I	33.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	16.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	21.4
		I	100.0	I	12.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	10.7	I	7.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	I		I		I		I		I		I		I		
COLUMN		3		16		1		5		1		1		1		28	
TOTAL		10.7		57.1		3.6		17.9		3.6		3.6		3.6		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 27.55122 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.70142

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.70424

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.26317

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.24872

GAMMA = -0.37572

SOMER'S D = -0.26531

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

Table 109

Question 24.

If you have had an opportunity to evaluate the work of U.N.M. graduates, how would you rate their capability on this scale? (If no contact, leave blank.)

Very low 1 2 3 4 5 Very high

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage*
Very low 1	10	7.5
2	17	12.8
3	55	41.4
4	33	24.8
Very high 5	18	13.5
No contact	<u>255</u> 388	<u>(65.7)</u> 100.0

*Percentages shown, with the exception of (65.7), were calculated only on those who had had an opportunity to evaluate U.N.M. graduates in a work situation.

This question was designed to reflect the image that U.N.M. projects through the success of its graduates. The fact that 2/3 of the public claim not to have had contact with U.N.M. graduates emphasizes the importance of information releases in establishing an image to the public.

A chi square analysis showed the distribution of responses on this scale significant in relation to NEWSO. However, the frequencies

expected in nearly all the cells were too low to be conclusive. In NEWSO-1, (Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia) which was the only area with enough returns to analyze, 84% of the sample rated the graduates 3, 4, or 5. Forty-one percent ranked them 4 or 5. (See Table 110) Age was not considered to be a significant factor although a slight trend was observed where those over 50 would most often rate the graduates highest. The 30 - 40 age group ranked them lowest. (See Table 111.) Sex of respondent was found to be not significant. Women, however, had a greater propensity to rate the graduates more highly. (See Table 112.) Level of education completed was not a significant factor according to the chi square analysis. (See Table 113.)

Hollingshead index was proven to be a significant factor ($p < .05$). The middle social class (III) most often ranked the graduates highest. Class II most often ranked the graduates lowest. (See Table 114.)

Income was not found to be a significant variable for crosstabulation. (See Table 115.)

Analyzed in relation to direct affiliation to the school, cross-tabulation of this question was significant ($p < .01$). Twenty-seven percent of those with no connection ranked the graduates "low" (1 or 2). Twenty-three percent ranked them high (4 or 5) while the remainder (50%) evaluated them in the middle, at 3. Only 45% of the alumni ranked themselves as "high" and another 45% chose the middle ranking. Ten percent ranked the graduates "low" (2). Parents of students were generally satisfied with the quality of the graduates. (See Table 116.) Analysis by political party preference was not significant. Republicans appeared to be most critical and "other" most favorable. (See Table 117.) A further crosstabulation showed significance ($p < .05$). It showed that

100% of the respondents in Hollingshead's Class I, who reside in Los Alamos - Santa Fe counties and have no connection with the University, rate the U.N.M. graduates 3. (See Table 118.) Eighty percent of the people in those same counties, who have no connection with U.N.M. and are in Hollingshead's Class II rate the graduates 2 ($p < .05$). (See Table 119.) Ninety percent of the respondents from NEWSO-1 who have no connection with the University and comply with Hollingshead's Class V ranked U.N.M. graduates as either a 3 or 4 ($p < .01$). (See Table 120.)

NEWSCO

	RRY RO LEA		MCKINLEY		SAN JUAN		ROW
	EVELT						TOTAL
	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I			
VA	I	I	I	I	I	I	
1	I	I	I	I	0	I	10
10.0	I	10.0	I	10.0	I	0.0	7.5
14.3	I	25.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I
0.8	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.0	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	
3	I	0	I	0	I	2	17
17.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	11.8	12.8
42.9	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	22.2	I
2.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.5	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	
2	I	0	I	0	I	1	55
3.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.8	41.4
28.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	11.1	I
1.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.8	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	
1	I	3	I	0	I	6	33
3.0	I	9.1	I	0.0	I	18.2	24.8
14.3	I	75.0	I	0.0	I	66.7	I
0.8	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	4.5	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	
0	I	0	I	0	I	0	18
0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	13.5
0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	
7		4		1		9	133
5.3		3.0		0.8		6.8	100.0

(1) 69.68979 WITH 48 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
0.36193

EFFICIENT = 0.58637

B = -0.06017

C = -0.05540

08046

-0.05940

SING OBSERVATIONS = 255

Table 110

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by Newsco

NEWSCO																						ROW	
COUNT	I																	CURRY	RO	LEA	MCKINLEY	SAN JUAN	TOTAL
ROW PCT	I	BERN	SAN	LOS	ALON	MORA	RIO	CAT	GRAN	DONA	HID	CHAVES	E	COLFAX	U	LINCOLN		OSEVELT					
COL PCT	I	VAL	OS	SANTA	SAN	MT	SOC	SIE	AL	LUNA	DDY	NION											
TOT PCT	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I									
VAR024	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	10	
VERY LOW	1.	I	0	I	3	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	2	I	1	I	1	I	7.5
	I	0.0	I	30.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	20.0	I	10.0	I	10.0	I	0.0	I
	I	0.0	I	4.9	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	12.5	I	0.0	I	28.6	I	14.3	I	25.0	I	100.0	I
	I	0.0	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	1.5	I	0.0	I	1.5	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.8	I
	2.	I	0	I	7	I	4	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	3	I	0	I	17
	I	0.0	I	41.2	I	23.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.9	I	17.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
	I	0.0	I	11.5	I	23.5	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	42.9	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
	I	0.0	I	5.3	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
	3.	I	3	I	26	I	11	I	0	I	1	I	1	I	7	I	1	I	2	I	0	I	55
	I	5.5	I	47.3	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	1.8	I	1.8	I	12.7	I	1.8	I	3.6	I	3.6	I	0.0	I
	I	75.0	I	42.6	I	64.7	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	50.0	I	43.8	I	100.0	I	28.6	I	28.6	I	0.0	I
	I	2.3	I	19.5	I	8.3	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	5.3	I	0.8	I	1.5	I	1.5	I	0.0	I
	4.	I	1	I	15	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	0	I	4	I	0	I	1	I	3	I	33
	I	3.0	I	45.5	I	3.0	I	3.0	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	12.1	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	9.1	I	0.0	I
	I	25.0	I	24.6	I	5.9	I	50.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	75.0	I	0.0	I
	I	0.8	I	11.3	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	2.3	I	0.0	I
VERY HIGH	5.	I	0	I	10	I	1	I	1	I	0	I	1	I	3	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	18
	I	0.0	I	55.6	I	5.6	I	5.6	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	16.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
	I	0.0	I	16.4	I	5.9	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	18.8	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
	I	0.0	I	7.5	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I
COLUMN		4		61		17		2		2		2		16		1		7		7		4	
TOTAL		3.0		45.9		12.8		1.5		1.5		1.5		12.0		0.8		5.3		5.3		3.0	

10070 WITH 48 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 69.68979 WITH 48 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.36193
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.58637
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.06017
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.05540
 GAMMA = -0.08046
 SOMER'S D = -0.05940

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 255

TABLE III									
CROSSTABULATION OF THE RATED CAPABILITY OF U.N.M. GRADUATES BY AGE OF RESPONDENT									
AGE	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75-84	85-94	TOTAL
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
32	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
35	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
37	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
39	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
41	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
42	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
43	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
45	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
46	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
47	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
48	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
49	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
50	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
51	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
52	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
53	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
54	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
55	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
56	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
57	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
58	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
59	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
60	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
61	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
62	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
63	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
64	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
66	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
67	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
68	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
69	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
70	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
71	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
72	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
73	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
74	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
75	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
76	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
77	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
78	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
79	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
80	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
81	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
82	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
83	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
84	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
85	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
86	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
87	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
88	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
89	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
90	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
91	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
92	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
93	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
94	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
95	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
96	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
97	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
98	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8

Table 111
 Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
 by Age of Respondent

VAR002

		COUNT											ROW	
ROW		PCT	1	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50					ROW	
COL		PCT	1											TOTAL
TOT		PCT	1	1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	5.1						
VAR024			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
VERY LOW	1.	I	0	I	1	I	4	I	3	I	2	I	10	
		I	0.0	I	10.0	I	40.0	I	30.0	I	20.0	I	7.5	
		I	0.0	I	5.0	I	18.2	I	8.1	I	4.4	I		
		I	0.0	I	0.8	I	3.0	I	2.3	I	1.5	I		
	2.	I	1	I	0	I	3	I	8	I	5	I	17	
		I	5.9	I	0.0	I	17.6	I	47.1	I	29.4	I	12.8	
		I	11.1	I	0.0	I	13.6	I	21.6	I	11.1	I		
		I	0.8	I	0.0	I	2.3	I	6.0	I	3.8	I		
	3.	I	4	I	12	I	10	I	13	I	16	I	55	
		I	7.3	I	21.8	I	18.2	I	23.6	I	29.1	I	41.4	
		I	44.4	I	60.0	I	45.5	I	35.1	I	35.6	I		
		I	3.0	I	9.0	I	7.5	I	9.8	I	12.0	I		
VERY HIGH	4.	I	3	I	6	I	3	I	10	I	11	I	33	
		I	9.1	I	18.2	I	9.1	I	30.3	I	33.3	I	24.8	
		I	33.3	I	30.0	I	13.6	I	27.0	I	24.4	I		
		I	2.3	I	4.5	I	2.3	I	7.5	I	8.3	I		
	5.	I	1	I	1	I	2	I	3	I	11	I	18	
		I	5.6	I	5.6	I	11.1	I	16.7	I	61.1	I	13.5	
		I	11.1	I	5.0	I	9.1	I	8.1	I	24.4	I		
		I	0.8	I	0.8	I	1.5	I	2.3	I	8.3	I		
	COLUMN		9		20		22		37		45		133	
	TOTAL		6.8		15.0		16.5		27.8		33.8		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 20.06990 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.19423

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.36210

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.09073

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.08395

GAMMA = 0.12212

SOMER'S D = 0.08912

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 255

VAR003						
COUNT		I		I		
ROW	PCT	IMALE		FEMALE		ROW
COL	PCT	I				TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I		1.I	2.I	
VAR024		I		I		I
	1.	I	8	I	2	I 10
VERY LOW		I	80.0	I	20.0	I 7.5
		I	7.8	I	6.5	I
		I	6.0	I	1.5	I
		I		I		I
	2.	I	15	I	2	I 17
		I	88.2	I	11.8	I 12.8
		I	14.7	I	6.5	I
		I	11.3	I	1.5	I
		I		I		I
	3.	I	45	I	10	I 55
		I	81.8	I	18.2	I 41.4
		I	44.1	I	32.3	I
		I	33.8	I	7.5	I
		I		I		I
	4.	I	21	I	12	I 33
		I	63.6	I	36.4	I 24.8
		I	20.6	I	38.7	I
		I	15.8	I	9.0	I
		I		I		I
	5.	I	13	I	5	I 18
VERY HIGH		I	72.2	I	27.8	I 13.5
		I	12.7	I	16.1	I
		I	9.8	I	3.8	I
		I		I		I
COLUMN			102		31	133
TOTAL			76.7		23.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.48480 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.20307

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.19901

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.14747

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.15038

GAMMA = 0.28310

SOMER'S D = 0.21031

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 255

Table 112

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by Sex of Respondent

VAR008										
COUNT I										
ROW	PCT	I	HIGH	SCH	TWO	YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW
COL	PCT	I	COL		CLLEGE		TY			TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I		1.I		2.I		3.I	4.I	
VAR024										
	1.	I	1	I	3	I	3	I	3	I 10
VERY LOW		I	10.0	I	30.0	I	30.0	I	30.0	I 7.8
		I	4.2	I	9.7	I	9.7	I	7.1	I
		I	0.8	I	2.3	I	2.3	I	2.3	I
		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-
	2.	I	3	I	6	I	1	I	7	I 17
		I	17.6	I	35.3	I	5.9	I	41.2	I 13.3
		I	12.5	I	19.4	I	3.2	I	16.7	I
		I	2.3	I	4.7	I	0.8	I	5.5	I
		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-
	3.	I	5	I	11	I	14	I	23	I 53
		I	9.4	I	20.8	I	26.4	I	43.4	I 41.4
		I	20.8	I	35.5	I	45.2	I	54.8	I
		I	3.9	I	8.6	I	10.9	I	18.0	I
		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-
	4.	I	12	I	6	I	9	I	5	I 32
		I	37.5	I	18.8	I	28.1	I	15.6	I 25.0
		I	50.0	I	19.4	I	29.0	I	11.9	I
		I	9.4	I	4.7	I	7.0	I	3.9	I
		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-
	5.	I	3	I	5	I	4	I	4	I 16
VERY HIGH		I	18.8	I	31.3	I	25.0	I	25.0	I 12.5
		I	12.5	I	16.1	I	12.9	I	9.5	I
		I	2.3	I	3.9	I	3.1	I	3.1	I
		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-		-I-
	COLUMN		24		31		31		42	128
	TOTAL		18.8		24.2		24.2		32.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.03966 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.22267

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.35984

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.14400

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.14079

GAMMA = -0.19244

SOMER'S D = -0.14272

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 260

Table 113

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by How Much Education Completed?

VAR 009

		COUNT	I						ROW					
		ROW PCT	I						TOTAL					
		COL PCT	I											
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
VAR024			I	I	I	I	I	I						
VERY LOW	1.	I	0	I	7	I	1	I	2	I	0	I	10	
		I	0.0	I	70.0	I	10.0	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	7.6	
		I	0.0	I	15.9	I	3.4	I	6.9	I	0.0	I		
		I	0.0	I	5.3	I	0.8	I	1.5	I	0.0	I		
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	2.	I	2	I	7	I	2	I	6	I	0	I	17	
		I	11.8	I	41.2	I	11.8	I	35.3	I	0.0	I	12.9	
		I	8.3	I	15.9	I	6.9	I	20.7	I	0.0	I		
		I	1.5	I	5.3	I	1.5	I	4.5	I	0.0	I		
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	3.	I	16	I	20	I	7	I	8	I	4	I	55	
		I	29.1	I	36.4	I	12.7	I	14.5	I	7.3	I	41.7	
	I	66.7	I	45.5	I	24.1	I	27.6	I	66.7	I			
	I	12.1	I	15.2	I	5.3	I	6.1	I	3.0	I			
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I			
	4.	I	3	I	8	I	12	I	9	I	1	I	33	
		I	9.1	I	24.2	I	36.4	I	27.3	I	3.0	I	25.0	
		I	12.5	I	18.2	I	41.4	I	31.0	I	16.7	I		
		I	2.3	I	6.1	I	9.1	I	6.8	I	0.8	I		
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	5.	I	3	I	2	I	7	I	4	I	1	I	17	
		I	17.6	I	11.8	I	41.2	I	23.5	I	5.9	I	12.9	
		I	12.5	I	4.5	I	24.1	I	13.8	I	16.7	I		
		I	2.3	I	1.5	I	5.3	I	3.0	I	0.8	I		
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	COLUMN			24		44		29		29		6		132
	TOTAL			18.2		33.3		22.0		22.0		4.5		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 30.13155 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.23889

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.43110

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.11867

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.10991

GAMMA = 0.15774

SOMER'S D = 0.11611

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 256

K
 G
 SC
 NU

Table 115

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by Approximate Annual Income

VAR 010

COUNT		I																		
ROW	PCT	I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000		ROW							
COL	PCT	I																		TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I									
-----I																				

CHI SQUARE = 18.24075 WITH 32 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.19913

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.37000

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.09707

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.09357

GAMMA = -0.12541

SOMER'S D = -0.08912

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 273

TABLE 116									
CROSSTABULATION OF THE RATED CAPABILITY OF U.N.M. GRADUATES BY DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH U.N.M.									
TOTAL									
VAR 024	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
01	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
02	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
03	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
04	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
05	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
06	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
07	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
08	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
09	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
23	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
26	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
28	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
29	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
30	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
31	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
32	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
34	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
35	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
36	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
37	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
38	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
39	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
40	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
41	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
42	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
43	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
44	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
45	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
46	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
47	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
48	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
49	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
51	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
52	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
53	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
54	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
55	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
56	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
57	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
58	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
59	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
60	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
61	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
62	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
63	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
64	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
65	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
66	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
67	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
68	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
69	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
70	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
71	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
72	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
73	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
74	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
75	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
76	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
77	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
78	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
79	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
80	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
81	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
82	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
83	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
84	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
85	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
86	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
87	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
88	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
89	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
90	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
91	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
92	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
93	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
94	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
95	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
96	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
97	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
98	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
99	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
100	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 116

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by Directly Connected with U.N.M.

VAR011															
COUNT		I													
ROW	PCT	ISTUDENT	FARENT		O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO CONNE		OTHER			ROW		
COL	PCT	I	F STUDEN					CTION					TOTAL		
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I		3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I						
VAR024															
VERY LOW	1.	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	8	I	2	I	10		
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	80.0	I	20.0	I	7.6		
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	10.8	I	25.0	I			
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	6.1	I	1.5	I			
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I			
	2.	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	12	I	0	I	15		
		I	0.0	I	6.7	I	0.0	I	80.0	I	0.0	I	11.5		
		I	0.0	I	6.7	I	0.0	I	16.2	I	0.0	I			
		I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	9.2	I	0.0	I			
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I			
	3.	I	1	I	2	I	3	I	37	I	3	I	55		
		I	1.8	I	3.6	I	5.5	I	67.3	I	5.5	I	42.0		
	I	14.3	I	13.3	I	42.9	I	50.0	I	37.5	I				
	I	0.8	I	1.5	I	2.3	I	28.2	I	2.3	I				
	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I				
4.	I	5	I	9	I	2	I	4	I	13	I	0	I	33	
		I	15.2	I	27.3	I	6.1	I	12.1	I	39.4	I	0.0	I	25.2
		I	71.4	I	60.0	I	28.6	I	20.0	I	17.6	I	0.0	I	
		I	3.8	I	6.9	I	1.5	I	3.1	I	9.9	I	0.0	I	
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I		
5.	I	1	I	3	I	2	I	5	I	4	I	3	I	18	
		I	5.6	I	16.7	I	11.1	I	27.8	I	22.2	I	16.7	I	13.7
		I	14.3	I	20.0	I	28.6	I	25.0	I	5.4	I	37.5	I	
		I	0.8	I	2.3	I	1.5	I	3.8	I	3.1	I	2.3	I	
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I		
COLUMN			7		15		7		20		74		8		131
TOTAL			5.3		11.5		5.3		15.3		56.5		6.1		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 45.17770 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.29363

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.50639

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.32003

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.27096

GAMMA = -0.45455

SOMER'S D = -0.34135

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 257

		VAR012								
		COUNT	I							
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER					ROW	
COL	PCT	IAN							TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I					
VAR024										
	1.	I	2	I	6	I	1	I	9	
VERY LOW		I	22.2	I	66.7	I	11.1	I	7.0	
		I	4.3	I	9.5	I	5.0	I		
		I	1.6	I	4.7	I	0.8	I		
	2.	I	8	I	6	I	1	I	15	
		I	53.3	I	40.0	I	6.7	I	11.6	
		I	17.4	I	9.5	I	5.0	I		
		I	6.2	I	4.7	I	0.8	I		
	3.	I	20	I	27	I	8	I	55	
		I	36.4	I	49.1	I	14.5	I	42.6	
		I	43.5	I	42.9	I	40.0	I		
		I	15.5	I	20.9	I	6.2	I		
	4.	I	12	I	15	I	6	I	33	
		I	36.4	I	45.5	I	18.2	I	25.6	
		I	26.1	I	23.8	I	30.0	I		
		I	9.3	I	11.6	I	4.7	I		
	5.	I	4	I	9	I	4	I	17	
VERY HIGH		I	23.5	I	52.9	I	23.5	I	13.2	
		I	8.7	I	14.3	I	20.0	I		
		I	3.1	I	7.0	I	3.1	I		
		COLUMN	46		63		20		129	
		TOTAL	35.7		48.8		15.5		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 5.20482 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.14203
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.19693
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.09702
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.09627
 GAMMA = 0.14630
 SOMER'S D = 0.10516

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 259

Table 117

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
 by Political Party Preference

Table 118

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Class I
by No Connection With U.N.M.

Table 119

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
 by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Class II
 by No Connection With U.N.M.

		NEWSCD															
COUNT	I																
ROW PCT	I														ROW		
COL PCT	I														TOTAL		
TOT PCT	I																
	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	6.I	7.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I						
VAR024	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				
VERY LOW	1.	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	2	I	0	I	7
		I	0.0	I	28.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	28.6	I	0.0	I	25.9
		I	0.0	I	28.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	20.0	I	66.7	I	0.0	I	100.0
		I	0.0	I	7.4	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.7	I	7.4	I	0.0	I	3.7
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	2.	I	0	I	1	I	4	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	7
		I	0.0	I	14.3	I	57.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	25.9
		I	0.0	I	14.3	I	80.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	33.3	I	0.0	I	100.0
		I	0.0	I	3.7	I	14.8	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.7	I	0.0	I	3.7
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	3.	I	0	I	3	I	1	I	1	I	4	I	0	I	2	I	11
		I	0.0	I	27.3	I	9.1	I	9.1	I	36.4	I	0.0	I	18.2	I	40.7
		I	0.0	I	42.9	I	20.0	I	100.0	I	80.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	100.0
		I	0.0	I	11.1	I	3.7	I	3.7	I	14.8	I	0.0	I	7.4	I	14.8
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	4.	I	1	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	2
		I	50.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	7.4
		I	100.0	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	14.3
		I	3.7	I	3.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.7
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN		1	7	5	1	5	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	27		
TOTAL		3.7	25.9	18.5	3.7	18.5	11.1	7.4	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	100.0		

CHI SQUARE = 41.16264 WITH 27 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.71287
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.77710
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.25158
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.25606
 GAMMA = -0.30973
 SOMER'S D = -0.22876

Table 120

Crosstabulation of the Rated Capability of U.N.M. Graduates
by Newsco Controlling for Hollingshead's Index of Social Status Class IV
by No Connection With U.N.M.

NEWSCD

		COUNT	I																
		ROW	PCT	I	BERN		SAN	CHAVES	E	COLFAX	U	LINCOLN	CURRY	RO	LEA	SAN JUAN		ROW	TOTAL
		CCL	PCT	I	VAL		DDY	NION	OTERO	OSEVELT									
		TOT	PCT	I	0.I	1.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	13.I							
VAR024				I															
VERY LOW	1.	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.6
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
				I				I				I				I			
	2.	I	0	I	1	I	10	I	0	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	0	I	3
		I	0.0	I	33.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	66.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	16.7
		I	0.0	I	10.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	5.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	11.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
				I				I				I				I			
	3.	I	1	I	5	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	7
		I	14.3	I	71.4	I	0.0	I	14.3	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	38.9
		I	100.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	5.6	I	27.8	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
				I				I				I				I			
	4.	I	0	I	4	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	1	I	6
		I	0.0	I	66.7	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	16.7	I	16.7	I	33.3
		I	0.0	I	40.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	100.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	22.2	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	5.6	I	
				I				I				I				I			
VERY HIGH	5.	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.6
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
				I				I				I				I			
		COLUMN	1		10		1		1		1		2		1		1		18
		TOTAL	5.6		55.6		5.6		5.6		5.6		11.1		5.6		5.6		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 52.97107 WITH 28 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.85773

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.86393

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.00905

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.00772

GAMMA = 0.01176

SOMER'S D = 0.00935

Table 121

Question 25.

Would you attend U.N.M. if you had the opportunity?

	____ Yes	____ No	____ No Opinion
Alternatives	Frequency	Percentage	
Yes	157	40.7	
No	164	42.5	
No Opinion	<u>64</u>	<u>16.6</u>	
	385	100.0	

This question was meant to solicit a reaction as to whether the respondent felt a U.N.M. education were worthwhile or not. In several cases where negative responses were elicited, the respondent stated reasons rather than the University: ("I don't like Albuquerque, and I wouldn't live there." "I could never leave my job now," etc.) Hence, the negative response reported may not truly be indicative of the intended reaction to a hypothetical situation.

Crosstabulation and analysis found NEWSO was a significant variable in relation to Question 25 ($p < .05$). NEWSO's 1, 3, 13 show positive reactions to the questions. NEWSO's 5, 6, 9, 10, 12 report negative responses. (See Table 122.)

Age was not found to be a significant variable for analysis. (See Table 123.)

Sex of the respondent was proven to be a significant variable ($p < .05$). Women were more decisive in their responding; i.e., they selected "no opinion" less often than men did. In their definite

responses women were more prone to attending U.N.M. than men (51%:36%). It should be remembered again that some respondent's reasons for a negative response were not a reflection on the school. (See Table 124.)

Level of education completed was shown to be a significant variable ($p < .01$). Those with advanced degrees (beyond the B.A.) were very negative in response (54%, No). Two-year college graduates were also negative (46%, No) as were high school graduates (41%, No). University graduates were most supportive (54%, Yes). (See Table 125.)

There was a significant relationship between the responses to this question and the level of social status ($p < .01$). The classes at either end (I, V) were most negative in response. Classes II, IV were second most, and Class III, most positive. (See Table 126.)

A further crosstabulation on Table 127 ($p < .01$) showed that the men most likely to attend U.N.M. were in Class III.

Table 128 shows that income is a significantly important factor in analyzing this question ($p < .01$). The people who would most like to attend U.N.M. are in the lower incomes (less than \$4000 and \$6000 to \$8000). Those least likely to attend are in the upper brackets (more than \$12,000).

A respondent's affiliation with U.N.M. is significantly ($p < .001$) related to his propensity to attend the institution. One hundred percent of the students and 63% of their parents said they would attend the University. Seventy-five percent of the employees but only 63% of the alumni claimed that they would attend U.N.M. These percentages are all much higher than the sample's distribution. Of those with "no" or "other" connection, only 35% would like to attend U.N.M. (See Table 129.)

Crosstabulation of Question 25 by political party preference showed a significant relationship ($p < .01$). As many Republicans would attend as would not. However a significantly higher proportion of "other" would attend U.N.M. than would not (49%:31%). Less Democrats would attend the University in proportion to those who would not attend. (See Table 130.)

VAR025

YES

NO

NO OPINION

COLUMN
TOTAL

(CONTINUED)

		NEWSCO													NEWSCO																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
COUNT	I																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
ROW PCT	I																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
COL PCT	I																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
TOT PCT	I																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
		0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									

CHI SQUARE = 68.11491 WITH 39 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CRAMER'S V = 0.24253
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.38729
KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.10584
KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.09998
GAMMA = 0.14793
SOMER'S D = 0.09360

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 123				
CROSSTABULATION OF THE RESPONDENT'S DISPOSITION TO ATTEND U.N.M. BY AGE OF RESPONDENT				
AGE	DISPOSITION TO ATTEND U.N.M.	PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT
18-24	1	100	100	100
25-34	1	100	100	100
35-44	1	100	100	100
45-54	1	100	100	100
55-64	1	100	100	100
65-74	1	100	100	100
75-84	1	100	100	100
85-94	1	100	100	100
95-104	1	100	100	100
105-114	1	100	100	100
115-124	1	100	100	100
125-134	1	100	100	100
135-144	1	100	100	100
145-154	1	100	100	100
155-164	1	100	100	100
165-174	1	100	100	100
175-184	1	100	100	100
185-194	1	100	100	100
195-204	1	100	100	100
205-214	1	100	100	100
215-224	1	100	100	100
225-234	1	100	100	100
235-244	1	100	100	100
245-254	1	100	100	100
255-264	1	100	100	100
265-274	1	100	100	100
275-284	1	100	100	100
285-294	1	100	100	100
295-304	1	100	100	100
305-314	1	100	100	100
315-324	1	100	100	100
325-334	1	100	100	100
335-344	1	100	100	100
345-354	1	100	100	100
355-364	1	100	100	100
365-374	1	100	100	100
375-384	1	100	100	100
385-394	1	100	100	100
395-404	1	100	100	100
405-414	1	100	100	100
415-424	1	100	100	100
425-434	1	100	100	100
435-444	1	100	100	100
445-454	1	100	100	100
455-464	1	100	100	100
465-474	1	100	100	100
475-484	1	100	100	100
485-494	1	100	100	100
495-504	1	100	100	100
505-514	1	100	100	100
515-524	1	100	100	100
525-534	1	100	100	100
535-544	1	100	100	100
545-554	1	100	100	100
555-564	1	100	100	100
565-574	1	100	100	100
575-584	1	100	100	100
585-594	1	100	100	100
595-604	1	100	100	100
605-614	1	100	100	100
615-624	1	100	100	100
625-634	1	100	100	100
635-644	1	100	100	100
645-654	1	100	100	100
655-664	1	100	100	100
665-674	1	100	100	100
675-684	1	100	100	100
685-694	1	100	100	100
695-704	1	100	100	100
705-714	1	100	100	100
715-724	1	100	100	100
725-734	1	100	100	100
735-744	1	100	100	100
745-754	1	100	100	100
755-764	1	100	100	100
765-774	1	100	100	100
775-784	1	100	100	100
785-794	1	100	100	100
795-804	1	100	100	100
805-814	1	100	100	100
815-824	1	100	100	100
825-834	1	100	100	100
835-844	1	100	100	100
845-854	1	100	100	100
855-864	1	100	100	100
865-874	1	100	100	100
875-884	1	100	100	100
885-894	1	100	100	100
895-904	1	100	100	100
905-914	1	100	100	100
915-924	1	100	100	100
925-934	1	100	100	100
935-944	1	100	100	100
945-954	1	100	100	100
955-964	1	100	100	100
965-974	1	100	100	100
975-984	1	100	100	100
985-994	1	100	100	100
995-1004	1	100	100	100
1005-1014	1	100	100	100
1015-1024	1	100	100	100
1025-1034	1	100	100	100
1035-1044	1	100	100	100
1045-1054	1	100	100	100
1055-1064	1	100	100	100
1065-1074	1	100	100	100
1075-1084	1	100	100	100
1085-1094	1	100	100	100
1095-1104	1	100	100	100
1105-1114	1	100	100	100
1115-1124	1	100	100	100
1125-1134	1	100	100	100
1135-1144	1	100	100	100
1145-1154	1	100	100	100
1155-1164	1	100	100	100
1165-1174	1	100	100	100
1175-1184	1	100	100	100
1185-1194	1	100	100	100
1195-1204	1	100	100	100
1205-1214	1	100	100	100
1215-1224	1	100	100	100
1225-1234	1	100	100	100
1235-1244	1	100	100	100
1245-1254	1	100	100	100
1255-1264	1	100	100	100
1265-1274	1	100	100	100
1275-1284	1	100	100	100
1285-1294	1	100	100	100
1295-1304	1	100	100	100
1305-1314	1	100	100	100
1315-1324	1	100	100	100
1325-1334	1	100	100	100
1335-1344	1	100	100	100
1345-1354	1	100	100	100
1355-1364	1	100	100	100
1365-1374	1	100	100	100
1375-1384	1	100	100	100
1385-1394	1	100	100	100
1395-1404	1	100	100	100
1405-1414	1	100	100	100
1415-1424	1	100	100	100
1425-1434	1	100	100	100
1435-1444	1	100	100	100
1445-1454	1	100	100	100
1455-1464	1	100	100	100
1465-1474	1	100	100	100
1475-1484	1	100	100	100
1485-1494	1	100	100	100
1495-1504	1	100	100	100
1505-1514	1	100	100	100
1515-1524	1	100	100	100
1525-1534	1	100	100	100
1535-1544	1	100	100	100
1545-1554	1	100	100	100
1555-1564	1	100	100	100
1565-1574	1	100	100	100
1575-1584	1	100	100	100
1585-1594	1	100	100	100
1595-1604	1	100	100	100
1605-1614	1	100	100	100
1615-1624	1	100	100	100
1625-1634	1	100	100	100
1635-1644	1	100	100	100
1645-1654	1	100	100	100
1655-1664	1	100	100	100
1665-1674	1	100	100	100
1675-1684	1	100	100	100
1685-1694	1	100	100	100
1695-1704	1	100	100	100
1705-1714	1	100	100	100
1715-1724	1	100	100	100
1725-1734	1	100	100	100
1735-1744	1	100	100	100
1745-1754	1	100	100	100
1755-1764	1	100	100	100
1765-1774	1	100	100	100
1775-1784	1	100	100	100
1785-1794	1	100	100	100
1795-1804	1	100	100	100
1805-1814	1	100	100	100
1815-1824	1	100	100	100
1825-1834	1	100	100	100
1835-1844	1	100	100	100
1845-1854	1	100	100	100
1855-1864	1	100	100	100
1865-1874	1	100	100	100
1875-1884	1	100	100	100
1885-1894	1	100	100	100
1895-1904	1	100	100	100
1905-1914	1	100	100	100
1915-1924	1	100	100	100
1925-1934	1	100	100	100
1935-1944	1	100	100	100
1945-1954	1	100	100	100
1955-1964	1	100	100	100
1965-1974	1	100	100	100
1975-1984	1	100	100	100
1985-1994	1	100	100	100
1995-2004	1	100	100	100
2005-2014	1	100	100	100
2015-2024	1	100	100	100
2025-2034	1	100	100	100
2035-2044	1	100	100	100
2045-2054	1	100	100	100
2055-2064	1	100	100	100
2065-2074	1	100	100	100
2075-2084	1	100	100	100
2085-2094	1	100	100	100
2095-2104	1	100	100	100
2105-2114	1	100	100	100
2115-2124	1	100	100	100
2125-2134	1	100	100	100
2135-2144	1	100	100	100
2145-2154	1	100	100	100
2155-2164	1	100	100	100
2165-2174	1	100	100	100
2175-2184	1	100	100	100
2185-2194	1	100	100	100
2195-2204	1	100	100	100
2205-2214	1	100	100	100
2215-2224	1	100	100	100
2225-2234	1	100	100	100
2235-2244	1	100	100	100
2245-2254	1	100	100	100
2255-2264	1	100	100	100
2265-2274	1	100	100	100
2275-2284	1	100	100	100
2285-2294	1	100	100	100
2295-2304	1	100	100	100
2305-2314	1	100	100	100
2315-2324	1	100	100	100
2325-2334	1	100	100	100
2335-2344	1	100	100	100
2345-2354	1	100	100	100
2355-2364	1	100	100	100
2365-2374	1	100	100	100
2375-2384	1	100	100	100
2385-2394	1	100	100	100
2395-2404	1	100	100	100
2405-2414	1	100	100	100
2415-2424	1	100	100	100
2425-2434	1	100	100	100
2435-2444	1	100	100	100
2445-2454	1	100	100	100
2455-2464	1	100	100	100
2465-2474	1	100	100	100
2475-2484	1	100	100	100
2485-2494	1	100	10	

VAR002

		COUNT						ROW
ROW	PCT	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50	TOTAL	
COL	PCT							
TOT	PCT	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I		
VAR025								
YES	1.	I 9 I	I 34 I	I 39 I	I 35 I	I 40 I	157	
		I 5.7 I	I 21.7 I	I 24.8 I	I 22.3 I	I 25.5 I	40.8	
		I 45.0 I	I 43.6 I	I 48.8 I	I 42.2 I	I 32.3 I		
		I 2.3 I	I 8.8 I	I 10.1 I	I 9.1 I	I 10.4 I		
NO	2.	I 6 I	I 33 I	I 33 I	I 37 I	I 54 I	163	
		I 3.7 I	I 20.2 I	I 20.2 I	I 22.7 I	I 33.1 I	42.3	
		I 30.0 I	I 42.3 I	I 41.3 I	I 44.6 I	I 43.5 I		
		I 1.6 I	I 8.6 I	I 8.6 I	I 9.6 I	I 14.0 I		
NO OPINION	3.	I 5 I	I 10 I	I 8 I	I 11 I	I 30 I	64	
		I 7.8 I	I 15.6 I	I 12.5 I	I 17.2 I	I 46.9 I	16.6	
		I 25.0 I	I 12.8 I	I 10.0 I	I 13.3 I	I 24.2 I		
		I 1.3 I	I 2.6 I	I 2.1 I	I 2.9 I	I 7.8 I		
	4.	I 0 I	I 1 I	I 0 I	I 0 I	I 0 I	1	
		I 0.0 I	I 100.0 I	I 0.0 I	I 0.0 I	I 0.0 I	0.3	
		I 0.0 I	I 1.3 I	I 0.0 I	I 0.0 I	I 0.0 I		
		I 0.0 I	I 0.3 I	I 0.0 I	I 0.0 I	I 0.0 I		
COLUMN TOTAL		20	78	80	83	124	385	
TOTAL		5.2	20.3	20.8	21.6	32.2	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 17.02663 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.12142

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.20580

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.10164

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.09371

GAMMA = 0.14662

SOMER'S D = 0.09213

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

		VAR003					
		COUNT	I				
		ROW PCT	IMALE	FEMALE		ROW	
		COL PCT	I			TOTAL	
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I		
VAR025		-----	I	-----	I	-----	I
YES	1.	I	95	I	62	I	157
		I	60.5	I	39.5	I	40.8
		I	36.1	I	50.8	I	
		I	24.7	I	16.1	I	
		-----	I	-----	I	-----	I
NO	2.	I	119	I	44	I	163
		I	73.0	I	27.0	I	42.3
		I	45.2	I	36.1	I	
		I	30.9	I	11.4	I	
		-----	I	-----	I	-----	I
NO OPINION	3.	I	49	I	15	I	64
		I	76.6	I	23.4	I	16.6
		I	18.6	I	12.3	I	
		I	12.7	I	3.9	I	
		-----	I	-----	I	-----	I
	4.	I	0	I	1	I	1
		I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.3
		I	0.0	I	0.8	I	
		I	0.0	I	0.3	I	
		-----	I	-----	I	-----	I
		COLUMN	263	122		385	
		TOTAL	68.3	31.7		100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 10.24290 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.16311
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.16098
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.12741
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.13274
 GAMMA = -0.24321
 SOMER'S D = -0.15331

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

Table 124

Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
 by Sex of Respondent

VAR008									
COUNT		I							
ROW	PCT	HIGH	SCH	TWO	YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW
COL	PCT	100L		CLLEGE		TY			TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I			
VAR025		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
YES	1.	I	50	I	30	I	48	I	148
		I	33.8	I	20.3	I	32.4	I	41.0
		I	47.6	I	37.5	I	53.9	I	
		I	13.9	I	8.3	I	13.3	I	
NO	2.	I	43	I	37	I	28	I	155
		I	27.7	I	23.9	I	18.1	I	42.9
		I	41.0	I	46.3	I	31.5	I	
		I	11.9	I	10.2	I	7.8	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	12	I	12	I	13	I	57
		I	21.1	I	21.1	I	22.8	I	15.8
		I	11.4	I	15.0	I	14.6	I	
		I	3.3	I	3.3	I	3.6	I	
	4.	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	1
		I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	0.3
		I	0.0	I	1.3	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.0	I	
COLUMN			105		80		89		361
TOTAL			29.1		22.2		24.7		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.14058 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.15236

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.25516

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.12495

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.11365

GAMMA = 0.18091

SOMER'S D = 0.11404

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 27

Table 125

Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
by How Much Education Completed?

Table 126

Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

VAR009

COUNT I
ROW PCT I
COL PCT I
TOT PCT I

ROW
TOTAL

			1.I		2.I		3.I		4.I		5.I	
VAR025			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	1.	I	11	I	39	I	41	I	55	I	9	I 155
YES		I	7.1	I	25.2	I	26.5	I	35.5	I	5.8	I 40.7
		I	19.6	I	40.6	I	45.6	I	49.5	I	32.1	I
		I	2.9	I	10.2	I	10.8	I	14.4	I	2.4	I
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I
	2.	I	30	I	43	I	29	I	46	I	15	I 163
NO		I	18.4	I	26.4	I	17.8	I	28.2	I	9.2	I 42.8
		I	53.6	I	44.8	I	32.2	I	41.4	I	53.6	I
		I	7.9	I	11.3	I	7.6	I	12.1	I	3.9	I
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I
	3.	I	15	I	14	I	20	I	9	I	4	I 62
NO OPINION		I	24.2	I	22.6	I	32.3	I	14.5	I	6.5	I 16.3
		I	26.8	I	14.6	I	22.2	I	8.1	I	14.3	I
		I	3.9	I	3.7	I	5.2	I	2.4	I	1.0	I
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I
	4.	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I 1
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I 0.3
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.9	I	0.0	I
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.0	I
		-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I	-I
	COLUMN		56		96		90		111		28	381
	TOTAL		14.7		25.2		23.6		29.1		7.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 27.01143 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.15373

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.25730

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.12415

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.11474

GAMMA = -0.17733

SOMER'S D = -0.11193

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

7

Table 127

Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status
Controlling for Sex of Respondent - Male

[illegible]

CRAMER'S V = 0.21137

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.14153

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.14769

GAMMA = -0.20068

SOMER'S D = -0.12758

TABLE 128											
CROSSTABULATION OF THE RESPONDENT'S DISPOSITION TO ATTEND U.N.M. BY APPROXIMATE ANNUAL INCOME											
BY SEX											
BY AGE											
BY EDUCATION											
BY OCCUPATION											
BY MARRIAGE											
BY RELIGION											
BY ETHNICITY											
BY REGION											
BY STATE											
BY COUNTY											
BY CITY											
BY ZIP CODE											
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE											
BY HOMEOWNERSHIP											
BY RENT TYPE											
BY TENURE											
BY RACE											
BY SEX											
BY AGE											
BY EDUCATION											
BY OCCUPATION											
BY MARRIAGE											
BY RELIGION											
BY ETHNICITY											
BY REGION											
BY STATE											
BY COUNTY											
BY CITY											
BY ZIP CODE											
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE											
BY HOMEOWNERSHIP											
BY RENT TYPE											
BY TENURE											
BY RACE											

Table 128 .

Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
by Approximate Annual Income

VAR010

COUNT I

ROW PCT I	<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000	ROW TOTAL
COL PCT I										
TOT PCT I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	
VAR025	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
1.	I 26	I 13	I 23	I 6	I 5	I 21	I 21	I 19	I 7	141
YES	I 18.4	I 9.2	I 16.3	I 4.3	I 3.5	I 14.9	I 14.9	I 13.5	I 5.0	43.8
	I 61.9	I 40.6	I 59.0	I 30.0	I 35.7	I 43.8	I 42.0	I 35.8	I 29.2	
	I 8.1	I 4.0	I 7.1	I 1.9	I 1.6	I 6.5	I 6.5	I 5.9	I 2.2	
2.	I 11	I 10	I 12	I 13	I 2	I 20	I 24	I 28	I 10	130
NO	I 8.5	I 7.7	I 9.2	I 10.0	I 1.5	I 15.4	I 18.5	I 21.5	I 7.7	40.4
	I 26.2	I 31.3	I 30.8	I 65.0	I 14.3	I 41.7	I 48.0	I 52.8	I 41.7	
	I 3.4	I 3.1	I 3.7	I 4.0	I 0.6	I 6.2	I 7.5	I 8.7	I 3.1	
3.	I 5	I 8	I 4	I 1	I 7	I 7	I 5	I 6	I 7	50
NO OPINION	I 10.0	I 16.0	I 8.0	I 2.0	I 14.0	I 14.0	I 10.0	I 12.0	I 14.0	15.5
	I 11.9	I 25.0	I 10.3	I 5.0	I 50.0	I 14.6	I 10.0	I 11.3	I 29.2	
	I 1.6	I 2.5	I 1.2	I 0.3	I 2.2	I 2.2	I 1.6	I 1.9	I 2.2	
4.	I 0	I 1	I 0	I 0	I 0	I 0	I 0	I 0	I 0	1
	I 0.0	I 100.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	0.3
	I 0.0	I 3.1	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	
	I 0.0	I 0.3	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	42	32	39	20	14	48	50	53	24	322
	13.0	9.9	12.1	6.2	4.3	14.9	15.5	16.5	7.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 48.71457 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.22456

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.36250

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.09987

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.09809

GAMMA = 0.13442

SOMER'S D = 0.08420

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

66

Table 129

Crosstabulation of the Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
by Direct Connection With U.N.M.

VAR011															
COUNT															
ROW	PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT	O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO	CONNE	OTHER						
COL	PCT	I	F	STUDEN	CTION										
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I							
VAR025		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I			
YES	1.	I	14	I	20	I	6	I	23	I	85	I			
		I	8.9	I	12.7	I	3.8	I	14.6	I	54.1	I			
		I	100.0	I	62.5	I	75.0	I	62.2	I	31.5	I			
		I	3.6	I	5.2	I	1.6	I	6.0	I	22.1	I			
NO	2.	I	0	I	8	I	2	I	9	I	134	I			
		I	0.0	I	4.9	I	1.2	I	5.6	I	82.7	I			
		I	0.0	I	25.0	I	25.0	I	24.3	I	49.6	I			
		I	0.0	I	2.1	I	0.5	I	2.3	I	34.9	I			
NO OPINION	3.	I	0	I	4	I	0	I	5	I	50	I			
		I	0.0	I	6.3	I	0.0	I	7.8	I	78.1	I			
		I	0.0	I	12.5	I	0.0	I	13.5	I	18.5	I			
		I	0.0	I	1.0	I	0.0	I	1.3	I	13.0	I			
	4.	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I			
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I			
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.4	I			
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.3	I			
COLUMN			14		32		8		37		270				
TOTAL			3.6		8.3		2.1		9.6		70.3				
											23				
											6.0				
												384			
												100.0			

CHI SQUARE = 48.50870 WITH 15 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.20520
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.33490
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.24200
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.17777
 GAMMA = 0.43110
 SOMER'S D = 0.27545

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

		VAR012							
		COUNT	I						
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER				ROW	
COL	PCT	IAN							TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR025		I	I	I	I	I	I		
YES.	1.	I	61	I	66	I	29	I 156	
		I	39.1	I	42.3	I	18.6	I 41.2	
		I	46.2	I	35.1	I	49.2	I	
		I	16.1	I	17.4	I	7.7	I	
NO	2.	I	61	I	79	I	18	I 158	
		I	38.6	I	50.0	I	11.4	I 41.7	
		I	46.2	I	42.0	I	30.5	I	
		I	16.1	I	20.8	I	4.7	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	10	I	42	I	12	I 64	
		I	15.6	I	65.6	I	18.8	I 16.9	
		I	7.6	I	22.3	I	20.3	I	
		I	2.6	I	11.1	I	3.2	I	
	4.	I	0	I	1	I	0	I 1	
		I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I 0.3	
		I	0.0	I	0.5	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.0	I	
COLUMN			132		188		59	379	
TOTAL			34.8		49.6		15.6	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 17.35031 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.15129
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.20923
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.07941
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.07364
 GAMMA = 0.12774
 SOMER'S D = 0.08069

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

Table 130

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Disposition to Attend U.N.M.
 by Political Party Preference

Table 131

Question 26.

Would you like your children to attend U.N.M.?

_____ Yes	_____ No	_____ No Opinion
Alternatives	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	156	40.5
No	166	43.1
No Opinion	<u>63</u> 385	<u>16.4</u> 100.0

This question, as the preceding, was designed to solicit over-all reactions from the respondents. However once again verbal responses on the returned questionnaire indicated that some of the sample were answering from their practical position rather than expressing a feeling or attitude. (The most common response was that the respondent had no children.)

NEWSCO was found to be significant ($p < .001$) in crosstabulation with this question. NEWSCO's 1, 3 were significantly more positive in response than any other areas. NEWSCO's 7, 11 reported particularly negative in response to this question. NEWSCO's 2, 3 were the most undecided (answered "No Opinion" most often). (See Table 133.)

Table 134 showed age to be a significant factor ($p < .05$) of analysis. The majority of those under 21 would like their children to attend U.N.M. Most negative were those 41 - 50 years old, and most undecided were those over 50 years. The crosstabulation between sex of respondent and their response on this item did not show a significant relationship. (See Table 135.)

Level of formal education completed was found to be significant ($p < .01$) in relation to the response. High school graduates reacted most positively to the question. People with post-graduate degrees were the most negative respondents (58%, No). While a high percent of university graduates would send their children to U.N.M., a high percentage was also undecided about the school at the time of answering. (See Table 135.)

The Hollingshead index crosstabulated significantly with this question. The lowest social class (V) showed the most decisiveness and positive response. Class I was the most negative. (See Table 136.) Further calculations show that parents of students in Hollingshead's Classes III, IV, V decidedly supported sending their children to U.N.M. ($p < .05$). (See Table 137.)

Of those with no connection with U.N.M. (70% of the sample) there is an inverse relationship between social status and desire to have children attend U.N.M. ($p < .01$) i.e., the lower a respondent's status, the higher his desire to have his children attend the University. (See Table 138.)

Income proved to be a significant factor in analyzing the responses to Question 26 ($p < .001$). Once again, people with the lowest income have the highest desire to send their children to U.N.M. Those with the most negative response were in the \$15,000 - \$25,000 income bracket. (See Table 139.) This is in close correlation to the trends observed in the Hollingshead crosstabulations. (See Table 140.)

Crosstabulation by political party preference proved not to be a significant variable in the analysis. Republicans, once again, were more supportive (42%) than Democrats (40% while "other" was more

positive than either party (44%) but the variance was too slight to note a trend. (See Table 141.)

		NEWSCO						
		CURRY RD LEA		MCKINLEY SAN JUAN			ROW	
		JOSEVELT					TOTAL	
		9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I		
VARO	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	I	2	I	7	I	8	I	156
YE	I	1.3	I	4.5	I	0.6	I	40.5
	I	20.0	I	31.8	I	16.7	I	
	I	0.5	I	1.8	I	0.3	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	I	7	I	11	I	5	I	166
NO	I	4.2	I	6.6	I	3.0	I	43.1
	I	70.0	I	50.0	I	83.3	I	
	I	1.8	I	2.9	I	1.3	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I		
	I	1	I	4	I	0	I	63
NO	I	1.6	I	6.3	I	0.0	I	16.4
	I	10.0	I	18.2	I	0.0	I	
	I	0.3	I	1.0	I	0.0	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I		
		10		22		6		385
		2.6		5.7		1.6		100.0

(CON

5.19136 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

.29319

ICIENT = 0.38302

0.12977

0.13751

11448

OBSERVATIONS = 3

Table 132

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
by Newsco

		NEWSCO															NEWSCO														
		COUNT	I																I												
		ROW PCT	I	EERN SAN LOS ALCM MORA RIO DEB GUAD CAT GRAN DONA HID CHAVES E COLFAX U LINCOLN ICURRY RO LEA															MCKINLEY SAN JUAN				ROW								
		COL PCT	I	VAL OS SANTA SAN M T HARD GU SOC SIE AL LUNA DDY NIDN OTERO IOSEVELT																			TOTAL								
		TOT PCT	I	0.I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I	10.I	11.I	12.I	13.I														
VAR026			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I													
	1.	I	7	I	81	I	17	I	12	I	2	I	2	I	1	I	6	I	4	I	6	I	2	I	7	I	1	I	8	I	156
YES		I	4.5	I	51.9	I	10.9	I	7.7	I	1.3	I	1.3	I	0.6	I	3.8	I	2.6	I	3.8	I	1.3	I	4.5	I	0.6	I	5.1	I	40.5
		I	53.8	I	54.0	I	32.1	I	57.1	I	50.0	I	12.5	I	25.0	I	13.3	I	80.0	I	35.3	I	20.0	I	31.8	I	16.7	I	42.1	I	
		I	1.8	I	21.0	I	4.4	I	3.1	I	0.5	I	0.5	I	0.3	I	1.6	I	1.0	I	1.6	I	0.5	I	1.8	I	0.3	I	2.1	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	2.	I	5	I	47	I	22	I	2	I	2	I	10	I	2	I	33	I	1	I	10	I	7	I	11	I	5	I	9	I	166
NO		I	3.0	I	28.3	I	13.3	I	1.2	I	1.2	I	6.0	I	1.2	I	19.9	I	0.6	I	6.0	I	4.2	I	6.6	I	3.0	I	5.4	I	43.1
		I	38.5	I	31.3	I	41.5	I	9.5	I	50.0	I	62.5	I	50.0	I	73.3	I	20.0	I	58.8	I	70.0	I	50.0	I	83.3	I	47.4	I	
		I	1.3	I	12.2	I	5.7	I	0.5	I	0.5	I	2.6	I	0.5	I	8.6	I	0.3	I	2.6	I	1.8	I	2.9	I	1.3	I	2.3	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	3.	I	1	I	22	I	14	I	7	I	0	I	4	I	1	I	6	I	0	I	1	I	1	I	4	I	0	I	2	I	63
NO OPINION		I	1.6	I	34.9	I	22.2	I	11.1	I	0.0	I	6.3	I	1.6	I	9.5	I	0.0	I	1.6	I	1.6	I	6.3	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	16.4
		I	7.7	I	14.7	I	26.4	I	33.3	I	0.0	I	25.0	I	25.0	I	13.3	I	0.0	I	5.9	I	10.0	I	18.2	I	0.0	I	10.5	I	
		I	0.3	I	5.7	I	3.6	I	1.8	I	0.0	I	1.0	I	0.3	I	1.6	I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.3	I	1.0	I	0.0	I	0.5	I	
			I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	COLUMN		13		150		53		21		4		16		4		45		5		17		10		22		6		19		385
	TOTAL		3.4		39.0		13.8		5.5		1.0		4.2		1.0		11.7		1.3		4.4		2.6		5.7		1.6		4.9		100.0

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 66.19136 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.29319
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.38302
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.12977
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.13751
 GAMMA = 0.18070
 SOMER'S D = 0.11448

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

Table 133

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
by Age of Respondent

VAR002

		COUNT	I										ROW
ROW PCT		I	UNDER 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50						TOTAL
COL PCT		I											
TOT PCT		I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
VAR026		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
YES	1.	I	12	I	24	I	36	I	37	I	47	I	156
		I	7.7	I	15.4	I	23.1	I	23.7	I	30.1	I	40.6
		I	60.0	I	30.8	I	45.0	I	45.1	I	37.9	I	
		I	3.1	I	6.3	I	9.4	I	9.6	I	12.2	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
NO	2.	I	4	I	33	I	35	I	39	I	54	I	165
		I	2.4	I	20.0	I	21.2	I	23.6	I	32.7	I	43.0
		I	20.0	I	42.3	I	43.8	I	47.6	I	43.5	I	
		I	1.0	I	8.6	I	9.1	I	10.2	I	14.1	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	4	I	21	I	9	I	6	I	23	I	63
		I	6.3	I	33.3	I	14.3	I	9.5	I	36.5	I	16.4
		I	20.0	I	26.9	I	11.3	I	7.3	I	18.5	I	
		I	1.0	I	5.5	I	2.3	I	1.6	I	6.0	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN			20	78	80	82	124	384					
TOTAL			5.2	20.3	20.8	21.4	32.3	100.0					

CHI SQUARE = 18.79948 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.15646

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.21604

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01316

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.01361

GAMMA = -0.01900

SOMER'S D = -0.01190

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

		VAR003					
		COUNT	I				
ROW	PCT	IMALE		FEMALE		ROW	TOTAL
COL	PCT	I					
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I			
VAR026							
		1.	I	103	I	53	I
YES			I	66.0	I	34.0	I
			I	39.2	I	43.8	I
			I	26.8	I	13.8	I
		2.	I	118	I	47	I
NO			I	71.5	I	28.5	I
			I	44.9	I	38.8	I
			I	30.7	I	12.2	I
		3.	I	42	I	21	I
NO OPINION			I	66.7	I	33.3	I
			I	16.0	I	17.4	I
			I	10.9	I	5.5	I
	COLUMN		263		121		384
	TOTAL		68.5		31.5		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.23572 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.05673

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.05664

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.02542

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.02637

GAMMA = -0.04876

SOMER'S D = -0.03054

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

Table 134

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
by Sex of Respondent

VAR008										
COUNT		I								ROW TOTAL
ROW PCT	I HIGH	SCH	TWO	YR C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE				
COL PCT	I 100L	CLLEGE		TY						
TOT PCT	I	1.I		2.I		3.I		4.I		
VAR026		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
YES	1.	I	55	I	26	I	38	I	23	I 142
		I	38.7	I	18.3	I	26.8	I	16.2	I 39.4
		I	52.4	I	32.9	I	42.7	I	26.4	I
		I	15.3	I	7.2	I	10.6	I	6.4	I
NO		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	2.	I	40	I	38	I	34	I	50	I 162
		I	24.7	I	23.5	I	21.0	I	30.9	I 45.0
		I	38.1	I	48.1	I	38.2	I	57.5	I
NO OPINION		I	11.1	I	10.6	I	9.4	I	13.9	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
	3.	I	10	I	15	I	17	I	14	I 56
		I	17.9	I	26.8	I	30.4	I	25.0	I 15.6
		I	9.5	I	19.0	I	19.1	I	16.1	I
		I	2.8	I	4.2	I	4.7	I	3.9	I
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN		105		79		89		87		360
TOTAL		29.2		21.9		24.7		24.2		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.27164 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.15930
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.21978
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.13788
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.14051
 GAMMA = 0.20071
 SOMER'S D = 0.12536

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 28

Table 135

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
 by How Much Education Completed?

		COUNT											ROW
		ROW PCT											TOTAL
		COL PCT											
		TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.						
VAR026													
YES	1.	I	16	I	28	I	41	I	52	I	17	I	154
		I	10.4	I	18.2	I	26.6	I	33.8	I	11.0	I	40.5
		I	28.6	I	29.2	I	45.6	I	46.8	I	63.0	I	
		I	4.2	I	7.4	I	10.8	I	13.7	I	4.5	I	
NO	2.	I	30	I	47	I	35	I	45	I	8	I	165
		I	18.2	I	28.5	I	21.2	I	27.3	I	4.8	I	43.4
		I	53.6	I	49.0	I	38.9	I	40.5	I	29.6	I	
		I	7.9	I	12.4	I	9.2	I	11.8	I	2.1	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	10	I	21	I	14	I	14	I	2	I	61
		I	16.4	I	34.4	I	23.0	I	23.0	I	3.3	I	16.1
		I	17.9	I	21.9	I	15.6	I	12.6	I	7.4	I	
		I	2.6	I	5.5	I	3.7	I	3.7	I	0.5	I	
		COLUMN	56	96	90	111	27	380					
		TOTAL	14.7	25.3	23.7	29.2	7.1	100.0					

CHI SQUARE = 18.09877 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.15432

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.21322

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.16474

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.17071

GAMMA A = -0.23711

SOMER'S D = -0.14819

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

		VAR009										ROW TOTAL	
		COUNT	I										
		ROW PCT	I										
		COL PCT	I										
		TOT PCT	I										
			1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
VAR026			1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
YES	1.	I	0	I	2	I	13	I	7	I	6	I	28
		I	0.0	I	7.1	I	46.4	I	25.0	I	21.4	I	90.3
		I	0.0	I	100.0	I	92.9	I	87.5	I	100.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	6.5	I	41.9	I	22.6	I	19.4	I	
NO	2.	I	1	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	0	I	2
		I	50.0	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	6.5
		I	100.0	I	0.0	I	7.1	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
		I	3.2	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	1
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	100.0	I	0.0	I	3.2
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	12.5	I	0.0	I	
		I	0.0	I	0.0	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	0.0	I	
COLUMN TOTAL			1	2	14	8	6	31					
TOTAL			3.2	6.5	45.2	25.8	19.4	100.0					

CHI SQUARE = 18.48531 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.54603
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.61119
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.16621
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.08741
 GAMMA = -0.42424
 SOMER'S D = -0.08485

Table 137

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
 by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status,
 Controlling for Connection With U.N.M., Parent of Student

VA	
CH	
CP	
CO	
KE	
KE	
GA	
SO	

Table 138

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status,
Controlling for Connection of U.N.M., No Connection

VAR009

COUNT	I										ROW TOTAL	
ROW PCT	I											
COL PCT	I											
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I						
-----I-----												

CHI SQUARE = 22.48445 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.20520

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.27869

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.21129

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.21630

GAMMA = -0.30694

SOMER'S D = -0.18787

Table 139

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
by Direct Connection With U.N.M.

COUNT	I	ISTUDENT	PARENT	O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO	CONNE	OTHER	ROW				
COL	PCT	I	F	STUDEN			CTION			TOTAL				
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I						
1.	I	12	I	28	I	7	I	23	I	78	I	8	I	156
	I	7.7	I	17.9	I	4.5	I	14.7	I	50.0	I	5.1	I	40.7
	I	85.7	I	90.3	I	87.5	I	62.2	I	28.9	I	34.8	I	
	I	3.1	I	7.3	I	1.8	I	6.0	I	20.4	I	2.1	I	
2.	I	2	I	2	I	1	I	9	I	141	I	9	I	164
	I	1.2	I	1.2	I	0.6	I	5.5	I	86.0	I	5.5	I	42.8
	I	14.3	I	6.5	I	12.5	I	24.3	I	52.2	I	39.1	I	
	I	0.5	I	0.5	I	0.3	I	2.3	I	36.8	I	2.3	I	
3.	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	5	I	51	I	6	I	63
	I	0.0	I	1.6	I	0.0	I	7.9	I	81.0	I	9.5	I	16.4
	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	0.0	I	13.5	I	18.9	I	26.1	I	
	I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.0	I	1.3	I	13.3	I	1.6	I	
COLUMN		14		31		8		37		270		23		383
TOTAL		3.7		8.1		2.1		9.7		70.5		6.0		100.0

CRAMER'S V = 0.31411

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.40597

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.32860

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.27018

GAMMA = 0.57642

SOMER'S D = 0.37388

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

VAR010																					
COUNT		I																			
ROW	PCT	I<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000										ROW	
COL	PCT	I																		TOTAL	
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I										
VAR026		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
YES	1.	I	30	I	12	I	20	I	6	I	5	I	20	I	20	I	16	I	11	I	140
		I	21.4	I	8.6	I	14.3	I	4.3	I	3.6	I	14.3	I	14.3	I	11.4	I	7.9	I	43.6
		I	73.2	I	37.5	I	51.3	I	30.0	I	35.7	I	41.7	I	40.0	I	30.2	I	45.8	I	
		I	9.3	I	3.7	I	6.2	I	1.9	I	1.6	I	6.2	I	6.2	I	5.0	I	3.4	I	
NO	2.	I	5	I	8	I	10	I	12	I	5	I	20	I	28	I	34	I	10	I	132
		I	3.8	I	6.1	I	7.6	I	9.1	I	3.8	I	15.2	I	21.2	I	25.8	I	7.6	I	41.1
		I	12.2	I	25.0	I	25.6	I	60.0	I	35.7	I	41.7	I	56.0	I	64.2	I	41.7	I	
		I	1.6	I	2.5	I	3.1	I	3.7	I	1.6	I	6.2	I	8.7	I	10.6	I	3.1	I	
NO OPINION	3.	I	6	I	12	I	9	I	2	I	4	I	8	I	2	I	3	I	3	I	49
		I	12.2	I	24.5	I	18.4	I	4.1	I	8.2	I	16.3	I	4.1	I	6.1	I	6.1	I	15.3
		I	14.6	I	37.5	I	23.1	I	10.0	I	28.6	I	16.7	I	4.0	I	5.7	I	12.5	I	
		I	1.9	I	3.7	I	2.8	I	0.6	I	1.2	I	2.5	I	0.6	I	0.9	I	0.9	I	
COLUMN			41		32		39		20		14		48		50		53		24		321
TOTAL			12.8		10.0		12.1		6.2		4.4		15.0		15.6		16.5		7.5		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 57.93742 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.30041

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.39102

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04704

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.05182

GAMMA = 0.06306

SOMER'S D = 0.03954

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 67

VAR012									
		COUNT	I						
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER	ROW				
COL	PCT	IAN	TOTAL						
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR026		I	I	I	I	I			
	1.	I	55	I	74	I	26	I	155
YES		I	35.5	I	47.7	I	16.8	I	41.0
		I	41.7	I	39.6	I	44.1	I	
		I	14.6	I	19.6	I	6.9	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	2.	I	61	I	78	I	21	I	160
NO		I	38.1	I	48.8	I	13.1	I	42.3
		I	46.2	I	41.7	I	35.6	I	
		I	16.1	I	20.6	I	5.6	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	3.	I	16	I	35	I	12	I	63
NO OPINION		I	25.4	I	55.6	I	19.0	I	16.7
		I	12.1	I	18.7	I	20.3	I	
		I	4.2	I	9.3	I	3.2	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN			132		187		59		378
TOTAL			34.9		49.5		15.6		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.94743 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.07226

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.10166

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.02991

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.02767

GAMMA = 0.04840

SOMER'S D = 0.03030

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

Table 141

Crosstabulation of Respondent's Desire for Children to Attend U.N.M.
by Political Party Preference

Table 142

Question 30.

On the whole, how satisfied are you with U.N.M.?

Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Uncertain or No Opinion	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Alternative	Frequency	Percentage		
Very Satisfied	43	11.5		
Fairly Satisfied	118	31.6		
Uncertain, No Opinion	69	18.4		
Somewhat Dissatisfied	74	19.8		
Very Dissatisfied	70	18.7		
	374	100.0		

The purpose of this question was to obtain an overall reading of the public's satisfaction with the University. It was hoped that their general opinion or image of the institution would be reflected and not the impression of a specific aspect or program.

The variable of age was significant ($p < .05$) in crosstabulation with response to satisfaction with U.N.M. The over 50 age group was most satisfied with the University and 31 - 40 age group most dissatisfied, i.e., forty-six percent of those over 50 were satisfied overall with U.N.M. Of those respondents 31 - 40 years old, 47% were dissatisfied overall. (See Table 144.)

Sex also approached significance ($p < .1$) as a variable for analysis. Women were found to be more satisfied with U.N.M. than men (47%:41%) Conversely, men were more critical (40%) than were women (34%). (See Table 145.)

Education was also a significant factor ($p < .05$). Of those who were satisfied overall with U.N.M., University graduates reported most frequently (50%). Of the University graduates, 38% were dissatisfied. The most dissatisfied group, however, was those with advanced degrees (44% negative). (See Table 146.)

Hollingshead index showed significance ($p < .001$) in crosstabulation with satisfaction responses. The lower two classes showed the most satisfaction (50% of each class reported overall satisfaction with U.N.M.). The upper three classes were less satisfied with Class II reporting the least satisfaction (30%). Classes II, III, IV were the most dissatisfied (32% - 55%, negative). (See Table 147.)

Level of income was also a significant factor for analysis ($p < .001$). The lowest and highest income brackets reported the highest response of satisfaction. The \$15,000 - \$25,000 income bracket reported the highest degree of dissatisfaction. (See Table 148.)

Affiliation with U.N.M. was found to be significant ($p < .001$). Parents of students were most satisfied (81%). Students and employees of U.N.M. were next most satisfied (71%). Alumni were even less satisfied (67%). Those with "other" or no connection were most dissatisfied (44% - 36%, negative). (See Table 149.)

Political party affiliation was not significant on this item ($p < .2$). Republicans have the highest percentage of positive responses as well as negative ones. (This is due to their relatively low rate of "uncertain" responses.) They report more satisfaction than dissatisfaction with the school, however. The trend is the same for Democrats and "others." (See Table 150.)

NEWSCO									
CURRY RO LEA		MCKINLEY		SAN JUAN		ROW			
ROSEVELT						TOTAL			
0.1	10.1	11.1	12.1	13.1					
VAR	0	2	0	1				43	
I	0.0	4.7	0.0	2.3				11.5	
V	0.0	9.5	0.0	5.6					
I	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.3					
I	2	4	2	6				118	
I	1.7	3.4	1.7	5.1				31.6	
F	20.0	19.0	33.3	33.3					
I	0.5	1.1	0.5	1.6					
I	3	4	0	3				69	
I	4.3	5.8	0.0	4.3				18.4	
U	30.0	19.0	0.0	16.7					
I	0.8	1.1	0.0	0.8					
I	2	3	2	2				74	
I	2.7	4.1	2.7	2.7				19.8	
I	20.0	14.3	33.3	11.1					
I	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5					
I	3	8	2	6				70	
I	4.3	11.4	2.9	8.6				18.7	
I	30.0	38.1	33.3	33.3					
I	0.8	2.1	0.5	1.6					
	10	21	6	18				374	
	2.7	5.6	1.6	4.8				100.0	

(G.62151 WITH 52 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

.22334

ICIENT = 0.40784

0.14697

0.14479

4

14528

OBSERVATIONS = 14

Table 143

Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.
by Newsco

		NEWSCO																			
COUNT		I																			
ROW	PCT	BERN SAN LOS ALOM MDRA RIO DEB GUAD CAT GRAN DONA HID CHAVES E COLFAX U LINCOLN																			
COL	PCT	VAL OS SANTA SAN M T HARD QU SOC SIE AL LUNA DDY NION OTERO																			
TOT	PCT	I	0.I	I	1.I	I	2.I	I	3.I	I	4.I	I	5.I	I	6.I	I	7.I	I	8.I	I	9
VAR038		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
1.		I	3	I	21	I	8	I	1	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	3	I	0	I	3
VERY SATISFIED		I	7.0	I	48.8	I	18.6	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	2.3	I	0.0	I	7.0	I	0.0	I	7.0
		I	27.3	I	14.2	I	15.4	I	4.8	I	0.0	I	6.3	I	0.0	I	7.3	I	0.0	I	17.6
		I	0.8	I	5.6	I	2.1	I	0.3	I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	0.8
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2.		I	2	I	55	I	16	I	11	I	2	I	4	I	3	I	8	I	0	I	3
FAIRLY SATISFIED		I	1.7	I	46.6	I	13.6	I	9.3	I	1.7	I	3.4	I	2.5	I	6.8	I	0.0	I	2.5
		I	18.2	I	37.2	I	30.8	I	52.4	I	50.0	I	25.0	I	75.0	I	19.5	I	0.0	I	17.6
		I	0.5	I	14.7	I	4.3	I	2.9	I	0.5	I	1.1	I	0.8	I	2.1	I	0.0	I	0.8
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
3.		I	2	I	17	I	13	I	7	I	0	I	6	I	0	I	12	I	2	I	0
UNCERTAIN,NO OPI		I	2.9	I	24.6	I	18.8	I	10.1	I	0.0	I	8.7	I	0.0	I	17.4	I	2.9	I	0.0
		I	18.2	I	11.5	I	25.0	I	33.3	I	0.0	I	37.5	I	0.0	I	29.3	I	40.0	I	0.0
		I	0.5	I	4.5	I	3.5	I	1.9	I	0.0	I	1.6	I	0.0	I	3.2	I	0.5	I	0.0
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
4.		I	2	I	33	I	11	I	0	I	2	I	2	I	1	I	7	I	2	I	5
SOMEWHAT DISSATI		I	2.7	I	44.6	I	14.9	I	0.0	I	2.7	I	2.7	I	1.4	I	9.5	I	2.7	I	6.8
		I	18.2	I	22.3	I	21.2	I	0.0	I	50.0	I	12.5	I	25.0	I	17.1	I	40.0	I	29.4
		I	0.5	I	8.8	I	2.9	I	0.0	I	0.5	I	0.5	I	0.3	I	1.9	I	0.5	I	1.3
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
5.		I	2	I	22	I	4	I	2	I	0	I	3	I	0	I	11	I	1	I	6
VERY DISSATISFIE		I	2.9	I	31.4	I	5.7	I	2.9	I	0.0	I	4.3	I	0.0	I	15.7	I	1.4	I	8.6
		I	18.2	I	14.9	I	7.7	I	9.5	I	0.0	I	18.8	I	0.0	I	26.8	I	20.0	I	35.3
		I	0.5	I	5.9	I	1.1	I	0.5	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	2.9	I	0.3	I	1.6
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN			11		148		52		21		4		16		4		41		5		17
TOTAL			2.9		39.6		13.9		5.6		1.1		4.3		1.1		11.0		1.3		4.5

(CONTINUED)

NEWSCO										
ROW		CURRY	RO	LEA	MCKINLEY SAN JUAN				ROW	
TOTAL		JOSEVELT							TOTAL	
		10.I		11.I		12.I		13.I		
43	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
11.5	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	1	43	
	I	0.0	I	4.7	I	0.0	I	2.3	11.5	
	I	0.0	I	9.5	I	0.0	I	5.6		
	I	0.0	I	0.5	I	0.0	I	0.3		
118	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
31.6	I	2	I	4	I	2	I	6	118	
	I	1.7	I	3.4	I	1.7	I	5.1	31.6	
	I	20.0	I	19.0	I	33.3	I	33.3		
	I	0.5	I	1.1	I	0.5	I	1.6		
69	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
18.4	I	3	I	4	I	0	I	3	69	
	I	4.3	I	5.8	I	0.0	I	4.3	18.4	
	I	30.0	I	19.0	I	0.0	I	16.7		
	I	0.8	I	1.1	I	0.0	I	0.8		
74	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
19.8	I	2	I	3	I	2	I	2	74	
	I	2.7	I	4.1	I	2.7	I	2.7	19.8	
	I	20.0	I	14.3	I	33.3	I	11.1		
	I	0.5	I	0.8	I	0.5	I	0.5		
70	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
18.7	I	3	I	8	I	2	I	6	70	
	I	4.3	I	11.4	I	2.9	I	8.6	18.7	
	I	30.0	I	38.1	I	33.3	I	33.3		
	I	0.8	I	2.1	I	0.5	I	1.6		
374	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
100.0		10		21		6		18	374	
		2.7		5.6		1.6		4.8	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 74.62151 WITH 52 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.22334
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.40784
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.14697
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.14479
 GAMMA = 0.18504
 SOMER'S D = 0.14528

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 14

VAR002

		COUNT										
ROW	PCT	I	UNDER	21	21-30	31-40	41-50	OVER 50	ROW			
COL	PCT	I							TOTAL			
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I					
VAR038		I	I	I	I	I	I	I				
1.	I	2	I	10	I	3	I	6	I	43		
VERY SATISFIED	I	4.7	I	23.3	I	7.0	I	14.0	I	51.2	I	11.5
	I	10.0	I	13.3	I	4.0	I	7.3	I	18.2	I	
	I	0.5	I	2.7	I	0.8	I	1.6	I	5.9	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
2.	I	9	I	24	I	25	I	26	I	34	I	118
FAIRLY SATISFIED	I	7.6	I	20.3	I	21.2	I	22.0	I	28.8	I	31.6
	I	45.0	I	32.0	I	33.3	I	31.7	I	28.1	I	
	I	2.4	I	6.4	I	6.7	I	7.0	I	9.1	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
3.	I	6	I	13	I	11	I	14	I	25	I	69
UNCERTAIN,NO OPI	I	8.7	I	18.8	I	15.9	I	20.3	I	36.2	I	18.5
	I	30.0	I	17.3	I	14.7	I	17.1	I	20.7	I	
	I	1.6	I	3.5	I	2.9	I	3.8	I	6.7	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
4.	I	3	I	14	I	16	I	24	I	17	I	74
SOMEWHAT DISSATI	I	4.1	I	18.9	I	21.6	I	32.4	I	23.0	I	19.8
	I	15.0	I	18.7	I	21.3	I	29.3	I	14.0	I	
	I	0.8	I	3.8	I	4.3	I	6.4	I	4.6	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
5.	I	0	I	14	I	20	I	12	I	23	I	69
VERY DISSATISFIE	I	0.0	I	20.3	I	29.0	I	17.4	I	33.3	I	18.5
	I	0.0	I	18.7	I	26.7	I	14.6	I	19.0	I	
	I	0.0	I	3.8	I	5.4	I	3.2	I	6.2	I	
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN		20		75		75		82		121		373
TOTAL		5.4		20.1		20.1		22.0		32.4		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 27.17966 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.13497

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.26061

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01619

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.01560

GAMMA = -0.02096

SOMER'S D = -0.01636

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 15

VAR003						
	COUNT	I				
	ROW PCT	IMALE	FEMALE		ROW	
	COL PCT	I			TOTAL	
	TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I		
VAR038	-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	
1.	I	26	I	17	I	43
VERY SATISFIED	I	60.5	I	39.5	I	11.5
	I	10.1	I	14.8	I	
	I	7.0	I	4.6	I	
	-I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	
2.	I	81	I	37	I	118
FAIRLY SATISFIED	I	68.6	I	31.4	I	31.6
	I	31.4	I	32.2	I	
	I	21.7	I	9.9	I	
	-I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	
3.	I	47	I	22	I	69
UNCERTAIN,NO OPI	I	68.1	I	31.9	I	18.5
	I	18.2	I	19.1	I	
	I	12.6	I	5.9	I	
	-I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	
4.	I	61	I	13	I	74
SOMEWHAT DISSATI	I	82.4	I	17.6	I	19.8
	I	23.6	I	11.3	I	
	I	16.4	I	3.5	I	
	-I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	
5.	I	43	I	26	I	69
VERY DISSATISFIE	I	62.3	I	37.7	I	18.5
	I	16.7	I	22.6	I	
	I	11.5	I	7.0	I	
	-I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	I-----	
COLUMN		258		115		373
TOTAL		69.2		30.8		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.20135 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.15706
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.15516
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.03666
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.04226
 GAMMA = -0.06313
 SOMER'S D = -0.04954

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 15

Table 145

Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.
 by Sex of Respondent

VAR008									
COUNT		I							
ROW	PCT	I HIGH	SCH	TWO YR	C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW	
COL	PCT	100L	COLLEGE		TY				TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I			
VAR038		I	I	I	I	I	I		
1.	I	16	I	8	I	12	I	3	I 39
VERY SATISFIED	I	41.0	I	20.5	I	30.8	I	7.7	I 11.2
	I	16.0	I	10.3	I	13.8	I	3.6	I
	I	4.6	I	2.3	I	3.4	I	0.9	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2.	I	28	I	27	I	32	I	24	I 111
FAIRLY SATISFIED	I	25.2	I	24.3	I	28.8	I	21.6	I 31.8
	I	28.0	I	34.6	I	36.8	I	28.6	I
	I	8.0	I	7.7	I	9.2	I	6.9	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
3.	I	20	I	11	I	11	I	20	I 62
UNCERTAIN, NO OPI	I	32.3	I	17.7	I	17.7	I	32.3	I 17.8
	I	20.0	I	14.1	I	12.6	I	23.8	I
	I	5.7	I	3.2	I	3.2	I	5.7	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
4.	I	13	I	12	I	20	I	23	I 68
SOMEWHAT DISSATI	I	19.1	I	17.6	I	29.4	I	33.8	I 19.5
	I	13.0	I	15.4	I	23.0	I	27.4	I
	I	3.7	I	3.4	I	5.7	I	6.6	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
5.	I	23	I	20	I	12	I	14	I 69
VERY DISSATISFIE	I	33.3	I	29.0	I	17.4	I	20.3	I 19.8
	I	23.0	I	25.6	I	13.8	I	16.7	I
	I	6.6	I	5.7	I	3.4	I	4.0	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
COLUMN		100		78		87		84	349
TOTAL		28.7		22.3		24.9		24.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.44249 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.14641
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.24580
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.04091
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.04160
 GAMMA = 0.05340
 SOMER'S D = 0.04172

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

Table 146

Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.
 by Level of Education Completed

Table 147

Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

VAR 009

COUNT I
 ROW PCT I
 COL PCT I
 TOT PCT I

ROW
 TOTAL

VAR038		1. I	2. I	3. I	4. I	5. I	
	1. I	8 I	1 I	10 I	19 I	3 I	41
VERY SATISFIED	I	19.5 I	2.4 I	24.4 I	46.3 I	7.3 I	11.1
	I	14.0 I	1.1 I	11.4 I	18.1 I	10.7 I	
	I	2.2 I	0.3 I	2.7 I	5.1 I	0.8 I	
	2. I	17 I	27 I	29 I	34 I	11 I	118
FAIRLY SATISFIED	I	14.4 I	22.9 I	24.6 I	28.8 I	9.3 I	32.0
	I	29.8 I	29.7 I	33.0 I	32.4 I	39.3 I	
	I	4.6 I	7.3 I	7.9 I	9.2 I	3.0 I	
	3. I	13 I	13 I	18 I	15 I	8 I	67
UNCERTAIN, NO OPI	I	19.4 I	19.4 I	26.9 I	22.4 I	11.9 I	18.2
	I	22.8 I	14.3 I	20.5 I	14.3 I	28.6 I	
	I	3.5 I	3.5 I	4.9 I	4.1 I	2.2 I	
	4. I	10 I	33 I	14 I	12 I	5 I	74
SOMEWHAT DISSATI	I	13.5 I	44.6 I	18.9 I	16.2 I	6.8 I	20.1
	I	17.5 I	36.3 I	15.9 I	11.4 I	17.9 I	
	I	2.7 I	8.9 I	3.8 I	3.3 I	1.4 I	
	5. I	9 I	17 I	17 I	25 I	1 I	69
VERY DISSATISFIE	I	13.0 I	24.6 I	24.6 I	36.2 I	1.4 I	18.7
	I	15.8 I	18.7 I	19.3 I	23.8 I	3.6 I	
	I	2.4 I	4.6 I	4.6 I	6.8 I	0.3 I	
COLUMN		57	91	88	105	28	369
TOTAL		15.4	24.7	23.8	28.5	7.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 40.21349 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.16506

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.31348

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.08315

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.08049

GAMMA = -0.10666

SOMER'S D = -0.08344

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 19

VAR010																		
COUNT		I																
ROW	PCT	I<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000							ROW	
COL	PCT	I																TOTAL
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I							
VAR038																		
-----I																		

CHI SQUARE = 77.42732 WITH 32 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.24948

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.44647

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.15491

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.15850

GAMMA = 0.18774

SOMER'S D = 0.14504

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 77

Table 149

Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.
by Direct Connection With U.N.M.

COUNT	I												
ROW PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT	O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO	CONNE	OTHER					ROW
COL PCT	I	F	STUDEN				CTION						TOTAL
TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I						
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
1.	I	2	I	9	I	1	I	6	I	22	I	3	I
SFIED	I	4.7	I	20.9	I	2.3	I	14.0	I	51.2	I	7.0	I
	I	14.3	I	28.1	I	14.3	I	16.7	I	8.5	I	13.0	I
	I	0.5	I	2.4	I	0.3	I	1.6	I	5.9	I	0.8	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
2.	I	8	I	17	I	4	I	18	I	65	I	6	I
ATISFIED	I	6.8	I	14.4	I	3.4	I	15.3	I	55.1	I	5.1	I
	I	57.1	I	53.1	I	57.1	I	50.0	I	25.0	I	26.1	I
	I	2.2	I	4.6	I	1.1	I	4.8	I	17.5	I	1.6	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
3.	I	0	I	1	I	0	I	2	I	59	I	5	I
N,NO OPI	I	0.0	I	1.5	I	0.0	I	3.0	I	88.1	I	7.5	I
	I	0.0	I	3.1	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	22.7	I	21.7	I
	I	0.0	I	0.3	I	0.0	I	0.5	I	15.9	I	1.3	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
4.	I	3	I	3	I	1	I	7	I	58	I	2	I
DISSATI	I	4.1	I	4.1	I	1.4	I	9.5	I	78.4	I	2.7	I
	I	21.4	I	9.4	I	14.3	I	19.4	I	22.3	I	8.7	I
	I	0.8	I	0.8	I	0.3	I	1.9	I	15.6	I	0.5	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
5.	I	1	I	2	I	1	I	3	I	56	I	7	I
SATISFIE	I	1.4	I	2.9	I	1.4	I	4.3	I	80.0	I	10.0	I
	I	7.1	I	6.3	I	14.3	I	8.3	I	21.5	I	30.4	I
	I	0.3	I	0.5	I	0.3	I	0.8	I	15.1	I	1.9	I
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
COLUMN	14	32	7	36	260	23	372						
TOTAL	3.8	8.6	1.9	9.7	69.9	6.2	100.						

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 16

VAR012								
COUNT		I						
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER	ROW			
COL	PCT	IAN	TOTAL					
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I			
VAR038		-----I-----I-----I-----I						
	1.	I	14	I	25	I	4	I 43
VERY SATISFIED		I	32.6	I	58.1	I	9.3	I 11.7
		I	10.9	I	13.8	I	6.9	I
		I	3.8	I	6.8	I	1.1	I
		-----I-----I-----I-----I						
	2.	I	47	I	53	I	18	I 118
FAIRLY SATISFIED		I	39.8	I	44.9	I	15.3	I 32.2
		I	36.7	I	29.3	I	31.0	I
		I	12.8	I	14.4	I	4.9	I
		-----I-----I-----I-----I						
	3.	I	15	I	34	I	17	I 66
UNCERTAIN,NO OPI		I	22.7	I	51.5	I	25.8	I 18.0
		I	11.7	I	18.8	I	29.3	I
		I	4.1	I	9.3	I	4.6	I
		-----I-----I-----I-----I						
	4.	I	23	I	39	I	10	I 72
SOMEWHAT DISSATI		I	31.9	I	54.2	I	13.9	I 19.6
		I	18.0	I	21.5	I	17.2	I
		I	6.3	I	10.6	I	2.7	I
		-----I-----I-----I-----I						
	5.	I	29	I	30	I	9	I 68
VERY DISSATISFIE		I	42.6	I	44.1	I	13.2	I 18.5
		I	22.7	I	16.6	I	15.5	I
		I	7.9	I	8.2	I	2.5	I
		-----I-----I-----I-----I						
	COLUMN		128		181		58	367
	TOTAL		34.9		49.3		15.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.72870 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.13169
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18309
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.00306
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.00316
 GAMMA = -0.00443
 SOMER'S D = -0.00346

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

Table 150

Crosstabulation of Overall Satisfaction With U.N.M.
 by Political Party Preference

Table 151

Question 32.

How has this (campus disturbance of May 1972) affected your response to this questionnaire?

____ Positively ____ Negatively ____ No Effect

Alternative	Frequency	Percentage
Positively	44	11.9
Negatively	113	30.6
No Effect	<u>212</u>	<u>57.5</u>
	369	100.0

While most of the sample reported that their opinion was not altered by the demonstration against the war, most of those who admitted being affected were affected negatively. The chi square analysis was applied to all crosstabulations to determine if there were any trends in the response to this question.

NEWSCO was not a significant factor in crosstabulation with this question. It could be noted, however, that urban NEWSCO's, including Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia, Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Chaves and McKinley counties were the least affected. Those NEWSCO's most negatively affected included Lea and San Juan counties. (See Table 152.)

Age of the respondent was a significant factor ($p < .05$) in analyzing this question. Those under 21 claimed to be positively affected by the demonstrations. However, as many of them were negatively affected according to their responses. Those over 50 were most negatively affected and those 31 - 40 were least affected. (See Table 153.) Sex was not a significant factor as percentages of responses

for male and female were almost identical. (See Table 154). Education was a significant factor ($p < .05$). Those most positively affected were respondents with a high school education. This continues in an inverse relationship as the level of education increases. University graduates were the most negatively affected. Respondents with graduate degrees most often reported "no effect." (See Table 155.)

The Hollingshead index did not attain significance in the chi square analysis. Notable, though, is that the lowest class (Class V) was the most affected (35%, negatively; 19%, positively). The highest social class (Class I) was least affected. (See Table 156.) Income was a significant factor ($p < .05$). Respondents most affected had incomes of \$9,000 - \$10,000. Of the 57% affected, 36% were affected positively. Those affected most negatively (44%) were in the \$10,000 - \$12,000 bracket. (See Table 157) Direct connection to U.N.M. was also a significant variable ($p < .05$). Alumni were the least affected. Those that were, were affected negatively (17%). The most negatively affected (35%) were those with "no connection" to U.N.M. Parents of students were negatively affected also (31%). Most positively affected were those with "other" connection. (See Table 158.) The variable of political party preference approached significance. Democrats were more positively affected than Republicans (14% : 11%). Republicans were most negatively affected (38%) and "other" were least affected of all groups. (See Table 159.)

NEWSCO								
N	CURRY RD LEA		MCKINLEY SAN JUAN		ROW		TOTAL	
	OSEVELT							
9.	10.1		11.1		12.1		13.1	
	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	44
	0.0	1	4.5	1	0.0	1	2.3	11.9
	0.0	1	10.5	1	0.0	1	5.6	
	0.0	1	0.5	1	0.0	1	0.3	
	3	1	10	1	1	1	10	113
	2.7	1	8.8	1	0.9	1	8.8	30.6
	30.0	1	52.6	1	16.7	1	55.6	
	0.8	1	2.7	1	0.3	1	2.7	
	7	1	7	1	5	1	7	212
	3.3	1	3.3	1	2.4	1	3.3	57.5
	70.0	1	36.8	1	83.3	1	38.9	
	1.9	1	1.9	1	1.4	1	1.9	
	10		19		6		18	369
	2.7		5.1		1.6		4.9	100.0

13.33191 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

.21252

ICIENT = 0.28783

-0.09077

-0.09104

8

.07629

OBSERVATIONS = 19

Table 152

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Newsco

NEWSCO

NEWSCO

	COUNT	BERN	SAN	LOS	ALOM	MORA	RIO	DEB	GUAD	CAT	GRAN	DONA	HID	CHAVES	E	COLFAX	U	LINCOLN	CURRY	RO	LEA	MCKINLEY	SAN JUAN	ROW							
	ROW PCT	VAL	OS	SANTA	SAN	M T	HARD	CU	SOC	SIE	AL	LUNA	DDY	NION	OTERO	OSEVELT								TOTAL							
	COL PCT																														
	TOT PCT	0.1	1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	5.1	6.1	7.1	8.1	9.1	10.1	11.1	12.1	13.1																
VAR040																															
POSITIVELY	1.	I	1	I	19	I	5	I	4	I	0	I	3	I	0	I	3	I	1	I	5	I	0	I	2	I	0	I	1	I	44
		I	2.3	I	43.2	I	11.4	I	9.1	I	0.0	I	6.8	I	0.0	I	6.8	I	2.3	I	11.4	I	0.0	I	4.5	I	0.0	I	2.3	I	11.9
		I	8.3	I	12.9	I	9.8	I	19.0	I	0.0	I	20.0	I	0.0	I	7.3	I	20.0	I	31.3	I	0.0	I	10.5	I	0.0	I	5.6	I	
		I	0.3	I	5.1	I	1.4	I	1.1	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.0	I	0.8	I	0.3	I	1.4	I	0.0	I	0.5	I	0.0	I	0.3	I	
NEGATIVELY	2.	I	2	I	36	I	15	I	6	I	3	I	5	I	2	I	12	I	2	I	6	I	3	I	10	I	1	I	10	I	113
		I	1.8	I	31.9	I	13.3	I	5.3	I	2.7	I	4.4	I	1.8	I	10.6	I	1.8	I	5.3	I	2.7	I	8.8	I	0.9	I	8.8	I	30.6
		I	16.7	I	24.5	I	29.4	I	28.6	I	75.0	I	33.3	I	50.0	I	29.3	I	40.0	I	37.5	I	30.0	I	52.6	I	16.7	I	55.6	I	
		I	0.5	I	9.8	I	4.1	I	1.6	I	0.8	I	1.4	I	0.5	I	3.3	I	0.5	I	1.6	I	0.8	I	2.7	I	0.3	I	2.7	I	
NO AFFECT	3.	I	9	I	92	I	31	I	11	I	1	I	7	I	2	I	26	I	2	I	5	I	7	I	7	I	5	I	7	I	212
		I	4.2	I	43.4	I	14.6	I	5.2	I	0.5	I	3.3	I	0.9	I	12.3	I	0.9	I	2.4	I	3.3	I	3.3	I	2.4	I	3.3	I	57.5
		I	75.0	I	62.6	I	60.8	I	52.4	I	25.0	I	46.7	I	50.0	I	63.4	I	40.0	I	31.3	I	70.0	I	36.8	I	83.3	I	38.9	I	
		I	2.4	I	24.9	I	8.4	I	3.0	I	0.3	I	1.9	I	0.5	I	7.0	I	0.5	I	1.4	I	1.9	I	1.9	I	1.4	I	1.9	I	
COLUMN TOTAL		12		147		51		21		4		15		4		41		5		16		10		19		6		18		369	
TOTAL		3.3		39.8		13.8		5.7		1.1		4.1		1.1		11.1		1.4		4.3		2.7		5.1		1.6		4.9		100.0	

(CONTINUED)

CHI SQUARE = 33.33191 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.21252
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.28783
 KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.09077
 KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.09104
 GAMMA = -0.13398
 SOMER'S D = -0.07629

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 19

Table 153

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Age of Respondent

VAR002

		COUNT I										ROW	
		PCT I	UNDER 21		21-30		31-40		41-50		OVER 50		TOTAL
		COL PCT I											
		TOT PCT I	1.I		2.I		3.I		4.I		5.I		
VAR040		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	1.	I	4	I	4	I	4	I	11	I	21	I	44
POSITIVELY		I	9.1	I	9.1	I	9.1	I	25.0	I	47.7	I	12.0
		I	20.0	I	5.3	I	5.5	I	13.4	I	17.9	I	
		I	1.1	I	1.1	I	1.1	I	3.0	I	5.7	I	
		I		I		I		I		I		I	
	2.	I	4	I	24	I	20	I	23	I	41	I	112
NEGATIVELY		I	3.6	I	21.4	I	17.9	I	20.5	I	36.6	I	30.4
		I	20.0	I	31.6	I	27.4	I	28.0	I	35.0	I	
		I	1.1	I	6.5	I	5.4	I	6.3	I	11.1	I	
		I		I		I		I		I		I	
	3.	I	12	I	48	I	49	I	48	I	55	I	212
NO AFFECT		I	5.7	I	22.6	I	23.1	I	22.6	I	25.9	I	57.6
		I	60.0	I	63.2	I	67.1	I	58.5	I	47.0	I	
		I	3.3	I	13.0	I	13.3	I	13.0	I	14.9	I	
		I		I		I		I		I		I	
	COLUMN		20		76		73		82		117		368
	TOTAL		5.4		20.7		19.8		22.3		31.8		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.95742 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.14725

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.20386

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.12831

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.12605

GAMMA = -0.19596

SOMER'S D = -0.10995

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

CHI SQUARE = 0.07925 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CRAMER'S V = 0.01467
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.01467
KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.01276
KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.01241
GAMMA = -0.02614
SOMER'S D = -0.01472

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

Table 154

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Sex of Respondent

VAR008										
COUNT										
ROW	PCT	I	HIGH SCH	TWO YR C	UNIVERSI	GRADUATE	ROW			
COL	PCT	100L	CLLEGE		TY	TOTAL				
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I				
VAR040		I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
POSITIVELY	1.	I	18	I	10	I	8	I	3	39
		I	46.2	I	25.6	I	20.5	I	7.7	11.3
		I	18.4	I	13.2	I	9.2	I	3.6	
		I	5.2	I	2.9	I	2.3	I	0.9	
NEGATIVELY	2.	I	32	I	22	I	29	I	23	106
		I	30.2	I	20.8	I	27.4	I	21.7	30.8
		I	32.7	I	28.9	I	33.3	I	27.7	
		I	9.3	I	6.4	I	8.4	I	6.7	
NO AFFECT	3.	I	48	I	44	I	50	I	57	199
		I	24.1	I	22.1	I	25.1	I	28.6	57.8
		I	49.0	I	57.9	I	57.5	I	68.7	
		I	14.0	I	12.8	I	14.5	I	16.6	
COLUMN			98		76		87		83	344
TOTAL			28.5		22.1		25.3		24.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.86114 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.13672
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18984
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.14359
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.13908
 GAMMA = 0.22164
 SOMER'S D = 0.12398

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 44

Table 155

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
 by Level of Education Completed

Table 156

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Hollingshead's Index of Social Status

VAR009

		COUNT	I										
		ROW PCT	I							ROW			
		COL PCT	I							TOTAL			
		TOT PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I					
VAR040			I										
POSITIVELY	1.	I	3	I	8	I	8	I	19	I	5	I	43
		I	7.0	I	18.6	I	18.6	I	44.2	I	11.6	I	11.8
		I	5.3	I	9.1	I	9.2	I	17.9	I	19.2	I	
		I	0.8	I	2.2	I	2.2	I	5.2	I	1.4	I	
NEGATIVELY	2.	I	14	I	31	I	24	I	33	I	9	I	111
		I	12.6	I	27.9	I	21.6	I	29.7	I	8.1	I	30.5
		I	24.6	I	35.2	I	27.6	I	31.1	I	34.6	I	
		I	3.8	I	8.5	I	6.6	I	9.1	I	2.5	I	
NO AFFECT	3.	I	40	I	49	I	55	I	54	I	12	I	210
		I	19.0	I	23.3	I	26.2	I	25.7	I	5.7	I	57.7
		I	70.2	I	55.7	I	63.2	I	50.9	I	46.2	I	
		I	11.0	I	13.5	I	15.1	I	14.8	I	3.3	I	
COLUMN			57		88		87		106		26		364
TOTAL			15.7		24.2		23.9		29.1		7.1		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.89230 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.13308

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.18495

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.12158

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.11978

GAMMA = -0.18476

SOMER'S D = -0.10370

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 24

Table 157

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Approximate Annual Income

VAR010

COUNT		I															ROW				
ROW	PCT	I<\$4000	<\$6000	<\$8000	<\$9000	<\$10,000	<\$12,000	<\$15,000	<\$25,000	>\$25,000						ROW					
COL	PCT	I															TOTAL				
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I	7.I	8.I	9.I										
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I										
LY	1.	I	5	I	6	I	7	I	2	I	5	I	3	I	1	I	5	I	1	I	35
		I	14.3	I	17.1	I	20.0	I	5.7	I	14.3	I	8.6	I	2.9	I	14.3	I	2.9	I	11.4
		I	12.5	I	19.4	I	18.4	I	11.1	I	35.7	I	6.5	I	2.2	I	10.4	I	4.0	I	
		I	1.6	I	2.0	I	2.3	I	0.7	I	1.6	I	1.0	I	0.3	I	1.6	I	0.3	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I										
LY	2.	I	10	I	8	I	7	I	7	I	3	I	20	I	11	I	20	I	7	I	93
		I	10.8	I	8.6	I	7.5	I	7.5	I	3.2	I	21.5	I	11.8	I	21.5	I	7.5	I	30.4
		I	25.0	I	25.8	I	18.4	I	38.9	I	21.4	I	43.5	I	23.9	I	41.7	I	28.0	I	
		I	3.3	I	2.6	I	2.3	I	2.3	I	1.0	I	6.5	I	3.6	I	6.5	I	2.3	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I										
T	3.	I	25	I	17	I	24	I	9	I	6	I	23	I	34	I	23	I	17	I	178
		I	14.0	I	9.6	I	13.5	I	5.1	I	3.4	I	12.9	I	19.1	I	12.9	I	9.6	I	58.2
		I	62.5	I	54.8	I	63.2	I	50.0	I	42.9	I	50.0	I	73.9	I	47.9	I	68.0	I	
		I	8.2	I	5.6	I	7.8	I	2.9	I	2.0	I	7.5	I	11.1	I	7.5	I	5.6	I	
		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I										
COLUMN		40	31	38	18	14	46	46	48	25	306										
TOTAL		13.1	10.1	12.4	5.9	4.6	15.0	15.0	15.7	8.2	100.0										

CHI SQUARE = 29.61040 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.21996

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.29703

KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.03224

KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.03374

GAMMA = 0.04586

SOMER'S D = 0.02570

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 82

Table 158

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Direct Connection With U.N.M.

VAR011											
COUNT I											
ROW PCT	ISTUDENT	PARENT O	EMPLOYEE	ALUMNUS	NO CONNE	OTHER	ROW				
COL PCT I	F STUDEN				CTION		TOTAL				
TOT PCT I	1.I	2.I	3.I	4.I	5.I	6.I					
VAR040	I	I	I	I	I	I					
1.	I	2 I	5 I	1 I	1 I	28 I	7 I				
POSITIVELY	I	4.5 I	11.4 I	2.3 I	2.3 I	63.6 I	15.9 I				
	I	14.3 I	15.6 I	14.3 I	2.9 I	10.9 I	30.4 I				
	I	0.5 I	1.4 I	0.3 I	0.3 I	7.6 I	1.9 I				
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				
2.	I	1 I	10 I	1 I	6 I	90 I	5 I				
NEGATIVELY	I	0.9 I	8.8 I	0.9 I	5.3 I	79.6 I	4.4 I				
	I	7.1 I	31.3 I	14.3 I	17.1 I	35.2 I	21.7 I				
	I	0.3 I	2.7 I	0.3 I	1.6 I	24.5 I	1.4 I				
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				
3.	I	11 I	17 I	5 I	28 I	138 I	11 I				
NO AFFECT	I	5.2 I	8.1 I	2.4 I	13.3 I	65.7 I	5.2 I				
	I	78.6 I	53.1 I	71.4 I	80.0 I	53.9 I	47.8 I				
	I	3.0 I	4.6 I	1.4 I	7.6 I	37.6 I	3.0 I				
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				
COLUMN	14	32	7	35	256	23	367				
TOTAL	3.8	8.7	1.9	9.5	69.8	6.3	100.0				

CHI SQUARE = 22.59738 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

CRAMER'S V = 0.17546

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.24084

KENDALL'S TAU B = -0.11954

KENDALL'S TAU C = -0.09431

GAMMA = -0.22988

SOMER'S D = -0.12805

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

VAR012									
		COUNT	I						
ROW	PCT	IREPUBLIC	DEMOCRAT	OTHER					
COL	PCT	IAN							
TOT	PCT	I	1.I	2.I	3.I				
VAR040									
POSITIVELY	1.	I	14	I	26	I	4	I	44
		I	31.8	I	59.1	I	9.1	I	12.1
		I	11.3	I	14.4	I	6.9	I	
		I	3.9	I	7.2	I	1.1	I	
NEGATIVELY	2.	I	47	I	48	I	16	I	111
		I	42.3	I	43.2	I	14.4	I	30.6
		I	37.9	I	26.5	I	27.6	I	
		I	12.9	I	13.2	I	4.4	I	
NO AFFECT	3.	I	63	I	107	I	38	I	208
		I	30.3	I	51.4	I	18.3	I	57.3
		I	50.8	I	59.1	I	65.5	I	
		I	17.4	I	29.5	I	10.5	I	
COLUMN			124		181		58		363
TOTAL			34.2		49.9		16.0		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.14926 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 CRAMER'S V = 0.09923
 CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.13898
 KENDALL'S TAU B = 0.08562
 KENDALL'S TAU C = 0.07525
 GAMMA = 0.14603
 SOMER'S D = 0.08235

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

Table 159

Crosstabulation of Effect of Campus Disturbance
by Political Preference

Table 160

Question 23.

If you are in an employer's position (with available jobs), are you interested in interviewing U.N.M. graduates for a job with your company?

_____ Yes	_____ No	_____ Not an Employer	
Alternative		Frequency	Percentage
Yes		40	10.5
No		52	13.6
Not an Employer		<u>290</u>	<u>75.9</u>
		382	100.0

The purpose of this question was to very generally measure the attitude of employers toward U.N.M. graduates. It could not even pretend to be an accurate measurement of employer's attitudes as the greatest percentage of the sample is not in that position. (A separate study would have to be conducted polling primarily employers to determine that information.) The names of those indicating that they would be interested in interviewing U.N.M. graduates have been distributed to the Career Placement Services for further utilization.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

By analysis of the informational questions, it is concluded that U.N.M. effectively communicates itself as an institution of teaching (93%). Ninety-seven percent of the sample believed that U.N.M.

should be a teaching institution. Fewer respondents (75%) conceptualized U.N.M. as a research institution. While 78% believed the University should be an institution of community service only 56% perceived it as such. Forty-seven percent declared that community service was a major area about which they would like to know more. However, only 37% were actually aware of research or service benefits in their community. The area of top priority for the respondents is information on the teaching at U.N.M. (58%).

Newspapers are the medium used most often by the respondents to receive information about the University. Television is the second most effective channel the University has to the public. "UNM Reports" is least effective.

Men were more knowledgeable than women, on the whole. The younger age groups (30 years of age and younger) seemed to be more aware of the various aspects of the University than the older respondents.

An inclusive analysis of all responses to the attitudinal questions demonstrates that the University must communicate a more favorable external image to its supporters. While rarely were the respondents distinctly negative in opinion, they were never overwhelmingly favorable toward the University. The most positive response from the public was in regard to the University's teaching adequacy (62%, positive). The largest negative response (45%) was with regard to the adequacy of community service. The most undecided sample opinion concerned the question, "Do you believe that U.N.M. provides an education for its graduates which meets the needs of the state?" (20%, "No Opinion").

NEWSCO's 11 and 13 were negative in opinion most often. These include Lea and San Juan counties. NEWSCO-3 (Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel and Taos counties) was generally favorable toward the University. NEWSCO-1 and 2 (Bernalillo and Catron counties) were only mildly supportive (50% - 55%) throughout the survey. Respondents with two-year college and technical school degrees and those with advanced degrees generally reported negative attitudes. High school graduates consistently reported favorable opinions. In most cases the lower classes of the Hollingshead index maintained a higher opinion of the University and its services than the higher classes of the index. While party preference was occasionally significant, no general trend was established.

COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

Although comments were not solicited, about 9% of the respondents (32) used the questionnaire as a means of direct communication with the University. Some respondents commented only on specific questions, while others summarized their opinion of the University and the reasons for these opinions. Considering the Questions,

"Is it your understanding that U.N.M. is an institution of learning" and "Do you feel that U.N.M. should be an institution of learning?",

the comments were:

"suppost to be"
"When classes are held."
"learning, not protest."
"You tell us! You've got to be something."

Two persons felt that the teaching service of the University was impaired because of "Graduate students teaching lower division courses and qualified instructors on research." One of these two respondents further commented, "U.N.M. impresses me as a haven for instructors whose chief concern is not the mass of students but those graduate-students who can contribute to a professor's status."

A student from NMSU addressed herself to the problem of this study in response to the question, "Do you feel U.N.M. provides adequate service to the State with regard to research?" She checked "yes" and commented, "I would not know if I hadn't done an article in Los Alamos on physics research."

The comments most often made, both in reference to specific questions and in general analysis concerned the "radical" element in the student body and the faculty. All observations in this field were unfavorable.

"School is for learning, not protest!"

"I would attend U.N.M. only if rioting was put to a halt."

"U.N.M. is a mess! I think we should refuse funds as taxpayers and close U.N.M. down clean out you messy faculty and start over after a rest of about 5 years."

"A few years ago we were advised to send our children to U.N.M. but the school has changed so drastically since then the same people have advised against U.N.M."

Strong opinions were expressed concerning the University as a breeding ground for revolution. People wrote at great length of the tax payers' money being wasted on developing people "who will not stand up for their country and are intent on being as troublesome as possible and are intent on destroying public property when their country is going through an extremely difficult period as ours is now." This was signed, "With all due respect." then the respondent's name. Five of the 32 commentators signed their name, while only one of those five comments was

favorable. Objections were stated for the lack of discipline on campus and the way "students are allowed to dress and act like a group of bums on campus and the faculty allows such incidents as the "Love Lust" to exist." Another person suggested that the University be closed down for ten years.

The following quote summarizes (in a mild tone) the attitude of 75% of those who wrote comments. "I feel that the University of New Mexico should be active in teaching, research and community services but not in politics by either the students or the faculty. The University of New Mexico is not a political organization -- Thank You!" The other eight responses (25%) dealt with the school and two favorable comments towards the protesters. One suggestion was that all students should have a personal interview before being admitted.

A claims adjuster who was critical of the lack of interest in under-graduate students said, "The Law School is an example of the University's lack of community awareness. No night school courses. The faculty apparently feels that the school should be a Harvard on the Rio Grande." A school teacher described herself as "one of those ~~don't-want-to-get-my-M.A.-but-do-need-to-profit-from-specific-courses~~ people who at the moment are refused admittance (re-admittance for me) to the Graduate School. I feel some provision should be made for us."

One respondent mentioned The Lobo. "It is not the type of publication that enhances U.N.M.'s image or properly prepares students to compete in the field of mass communication. They may be well prepared for yellow or underground or porno journalism."

While these comments do not lend themselves to generalization, it can be noted that those who take time to verbalize their opinions

are mostly negative. This trend was expected from previous experience according to the Office of Public Information.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was three-fold: (1) to construct a channel of feedback from the public to the University; (2) to accurately measure the opinion of the public toward the University of New Mexico; and (3) to analyze the responses of the public by demographic breakdown so that the University can define its priorities to better serve the needs of the public.

The study was designed primarily to be an aid to the Office of Public Information by supplying them with data from which to form their public relations objectives. The research questions which it asked were: which media are the greatest source of U.N.M. information, which geographical areas hold what opinions, what opinions are held by each of the socio-economic levels, age groups, and political parties. This information can be very important in the preparation of information releases.

The method employed for data collection was the mail questionnaire. The instrument was composed of scaled forms of the research questions listed above. The questions were demographic, informational and attitudinal in nature. These questions were important in establishing representativeness of the sample to the population and in analyzing the opinions of the different factions of the population on the basis of age, sex, locale of residence, etc.

A stratified random sample was systematically generated from each of the 32 counties' voting lists. This was done through the use of a

random numbers table. The sample was stratified by county in order to validly represent each region of the state. The percentage of the voters in each county was computed and then multiplied by 3000 to yield the sample for the county.

A "Table of Sample Sizes" was consulted to determine what size of return would be required to yield statistical validity. The 95% level of confidence was considered acceptable by the sponsors. With a standard error unit of ± 5 the table yielded a required sample size of 384.

From previous experience, it was known that the return rate in New Mexico was little more than 10%. This required a minimum of 3000 questionnaires to be sent to the sample. Initially only 283 questionnaires were returned to the Office of Public Information. A second "wave" was then sent to randomly selected names of those who had not yet responded. The return on the second wave was 105, totalling 388.

The questionnaires were coded and transferred to computer cards for data analysis. The chi square analysis was used to determine significance of relationships. Crosstabulations were performed between the attitudes measured (independent variables) and demographic data (dependent variables). Significant relationships between the variables are reported in this chapter as trends, if any. Relationships are interpreted in light of other data given and conclusions drawn. On the basis of the conclusions, recommendations are offered as possible solutions to deficiencies in U.N.M.'s image projection.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this section, the research questions from Chapter I will be presented. Following each question will be the conclusions drawn from the analyzed data and then an interpretation of those conclusions.

1. Which demographic variables significantly alter the perception of U.N.M. as an institution of community service?

NEWSCO is a significant variable affecting the respondent's perception of U.N.M. as a community service institution. Areas significantly low in knowledge of this aspect were NEWSCO's 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. All of these areas, except NEWSCO's 9 and 13, report that they rely heavily on newspapers for their information about U.N.M. NEWSCO's 9 and 13 report television as a prime information source.

Age made a significant difference in the understanding of the community service aspect. There is an inverse relationship between age and the knowledge of any community service of the University, i.e., the older the age group, the lower the percentage who perceived U.N.M.'s image of community service.

Sex of respondents was not a significant variable.

Social status (according to Hollingshead) did not relate to responses significantly.

A respondent's affiliation with U.N.M. was significantly related to his understanding of it as a community service institution. Those directly connected (students, employees, alumni) were very aware of this aspect. Those with "other" or no connection (76% of the sample) were quite unaware (50% of the segment). It is concluded, then, that

those with direct contact with U.N.M. are correct in their perception regarding community services, but half of those with no direct contact may be insufficiently informed.

Political party preference showed no significant relationship to responses of this question.

2. Is the opinion toward the adequacy of U.N.M.'s teaching, research and community service significantly altered by any of the demographic variables?

NEWSCO, age, sex, social status, connection to U.N.M., and political party preference did not show to be significant factors in appraising the teaching adequacy of U.N.M. Two trends were noticed, however, as approaching significance: Those with "no" or "other" connection to U.N.M. were most critical in this respect; those with two-year college and graduate level education also showed a tendency to be critical. Overall, 69% felt that teaching service was adequate.

NEWSCO was a significant factor compared to the respondent's appraisal of U.N.M.'s research adequacy. Curry, Roosevelt, Lea and San Juan counties were most negative in their appraisal. Overall in the state, response was 63% favorable of U.N.M.'s research service. Age, sex, social status, connection to U.N.M., and political party were not significant factors determining the respondent's evaluation of research. Sixty-three percent of the sample thought that U.N.M. provided adequate research service.

NEWSCO, age, social status, affiliation with U.N.M., and political affiliation were not significant variables in determining the response to adequacy of community service. There was a significant

difference however in response to this question by sex. Males were significantly more critical of the University's community service than were females. The entire sample was 55% unfavorable in response to this question.

3. Is public opinion of U.N.M.'s educational worth to the State significantly altered by demographic variables?

Responses were altered significantly when analyzed in comparison to NEWSO. McKinley and San Juan counties were noticeably negative. Two-year college graduates and graduate school level respondents expressed negative opinions also. The way the question was asked, variance in response could be a factor of perception of the needs of the State. Direct connection with U.N.M. was also a significant factor. Those not having contact were not decidedly favorable. Age, sex, social status, and political affiliation were not significant determinants. Overall the response was 53% positive, but there was 20% with no opinion.

4. Is respondent's desire to attend U.N.M. significantly affected by the demographic variables?

NEWSO was a significant variable in determining if a respondent would like to attend U.N.M. Chavez, Eddy, Curry, Roosevelt, and McKinley counties were most negative in response. Sex was significant as males were less likely to attend U.N.M. than females. Once again two-year college and graduate level respondents expressed negative feelings with regard to this question. Social status was also significant as the highest and lowest classes were least interested

in attending the University. Affiliation with U.N.M. was significant as 35% of those with "no" or "other" connection would not like to attend the University if they had the opportunity. Thirty-seven percent of the Alumni would not be interested or have "no opinion" in regard to the question. Seventeen percent of the sample held "no opinion." Twenty-two percent of the Democrats answering held "no opinion" on attending the University.

5. Is desirability to send children to U.N.M. significantly affected by the demographic variables?

NEWSCO was a significant variable in analyzing this question. In Catron, Grant, Socorro, Sierra, Chavez, Eddy, Curry, and Roosevelt counties people did not favor sending their children to U.N.M. Forty percent of those over 21 would not like their children to attend U.N.M. Two-year college graduates and those with degrees higher than a B.A. would also be decidedly against sending their children to U.N.M. The significant relationship with social status is that the higher the class the lower the desirability to have their children attend U.N.M. Those with "no" or "other" connection were highly negative in response and greatly undecided. Political party preference was not significant.

6. Is the rating of capability of U.N.M. graduates significantly affected by the demographic variables?

Most respondents felt that U.N.M. graduates were "average." Two-year college graduates rated them "low" most often. Those with advanced degrees also had a tendency to rate them "low." The middle social classes (II, III, IV) had the greatest tendency to rate graduates lower.

Those with "no connection" tended to rate lower than others. Political party affiliation has no bearing on the appraisal of graduates.

7. Is awareness of U.N.M. research and community service benefits significantly altered by demographic variables?

Analysis showed NEWSO to be significant in relation to this question. Those counties most unaware of any benefits were: Chaves, Eddy, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, San Juan. The middle age groups showed most lack of knowledge when analyzed by age. Those not connected with the University were most often unaware of any benefits. Democrats were mostly unaware of benefits but an additional 20% were uncertain.

8. Are the sources of information about U.N.M. significantly different for any of the demographic categories?

Both newspapers and television were significant factors for analysis by NEWSO. Areas employing newspapers most are NEWSO's-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12. Areas which rely on television the most are NEWSO's-8, 9, 13. Most age groups receive their information more often from newspapers than from television. The exception to this is the 21 - 30 age group. A greater number of males read the newspapers for information about U.N.M. than do watch television. There is no significant difference for females. Newspapers are the primary source of information about U.N.M. for all social classes but V. For those who have no connection with U.N.M. more of them use the newspaper as a source of information than use television. People of all political preferences employ newspapers more than television to receive their information about U.N.M. Democrats use television almost as much, though.

9. Is the overall satisfaction with U.N.M. significantly affected by the demographic variables?

Colfax, Union, Lincoln, Otero, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, and McKinley counties were all more than 50% negative in this response. (The average for the sample is 38% dissatisfied.) Respondents between the ages of 31-50 were over 40% dissatisfied. Men were slightly more dissatisfied than women with the school. Most dissatisfied with the University was Class II of the social index. Respondents with "no" connection to U.N.M. were more than 40% dissatisfied. Republicans were more dissatisfied with the University than either of the other two affiliations.

10. In which demographic areas is information sought about the various aspects of the University?

NEWSCO was not a significant factor in crosstabulation with these alternatives. In every area 1) teaching 2) research 3) community service was the ranking chosen most often. 1) Community service, teaching, research was the second most popular ranking. To those under 21 and over 50 these two rankings were equally popular but those 21 - 50 showed a significant preference for 1) teaching 2) research 3) community service. Two-year college and technical school graduates chose the ranking 1) community service 2) teaching 3) research most often. This is in contrast to all the other levels of education who chose 1) teaching 2) research 3) community service.

Sex, social status, connection with U.N.M. and political party affiliation were all non-significant variables in the determining of choices.

11. Did the recent campus disturbance have a significant effect on the opinions toward U.N.M. in any of the demographic groupings?

The chi square analysis did not show NEWSO to be a significant variable in relation to this question. However, Lee and San Juan counties were noticeably more negatively affected than the other areas. For the most part those under 40 were affected the least. Of those who were affected, respondents over 50 were most negative. High school graduates were most affected by the disturbances. They were mostly affected negatively. University graduates were the most negatively affected. Alumni were least affected by those in connection to the University. However, those alumni affected were negative. Those with "no" or "other" connection were affected the most. "No connection" were mostly negatively affected while "other connection" were mainly positive. Parents of students were greatly affected negatively.

Sex, social status and political party preference were not significant variables for analysis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. If it is the desire of the University of New Mexico to project an image of being a community service institution in addition to teaching and research, more concentrated efforts will have to be made. The public news media will have to be employed as 76% of the sample show no direct contact with U.N.M. Areas which are most deficient in the understanding of this aspect (Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, and McKinley counties) can most effectively be informed through their area's newspaper, according to the data analysis. Lincoln, Otero and San Juan counties report to be most informed by television. News releases concerning any aspect of U.N.M.'s community service should be distributed especially to the media in the counties mentioned. Analysis shows that newspaper coverage is especially effective with the older age groups who show a greater lack of understanding of this facet.
2. It would be to the University's advantage to present a more favorable image to the public. The image of community service is in the most critical state. To alter this, information about programs should be presented in newspapers and on television. Achievements in the areas of research and community service should also be publicized. Any campaigns to enhance the image of U.N.M. in these fields might lend special attention to Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, and San Juan counties. To a slightly greater extent, information and programs of interest to males might be stressed.

3. Efforts to show the value of U.N.M.'s educational contributions to the state should be concentrated in McKinley and San Juan counties. A larger percentage of the sample, however, were those with two-year college and graduate level education. Both of these categories were negative. Attempts should be made to determine the reason for this and then counter the arguments with news which illustrates the value. Public media is necessary to reach the right segment of the population (those with no direct connection).
4. Programs of U.N.M. research and community service in Chaves, Eddy, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, and San Juan counties should be determined and a campaign designed to publicize the benefits. If possible, through the use of social, professional groups, etc., information should be directed at age groups 30 - 50 years. It would also help to reach more Democrats with the information.
5. A subtle informational campaign might be initiated statewide to present a more favorable image of U.N.M. to the public. It is necessary to inform the supporters of the University of the benefits they receive for their tax dollars. The areas where dissatisfaction is greatest, and therefore such a program is needed most, are Colfax, Union, Lincoln, Otero, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea and McKinley counties. It is most important to reach the 31-50 year old group to curtail dissatisfaction.

LIMITATIONS

Inherent in surveys of this type (i.e., mail questionnaire) are limitations that should be defined to place the analysis of the responses in perspective.

Since the most verbal responses to this questionnaire were negative, it may be that the study is limited by the very people it prompts to respond. Although a representative sample of the state's voting lists were randomly taken, a mail questionnaire provides no insurance that the returns will be representative of the people polled. It is possible that the terminology used in devising the questions offends or confuses people. If this is true, and they then fill out the questionnaire, their response will not be authentic. It is also possible for the respondent to answer falsely for other various reasons -- emotional state, bias regarding the institution conducting the poll, etc. Other defects are a lack of response, or the inability to check responses given. The possibility of these problems is heightened when people of a different culture and language are being polled.

In coding the questionnaire it was noted that a high percentage of the respondents were confused by the term, "Native American." This term is not yet universally recognized to mean the North American Indian. From negative notes written concerning Question 32 (the effect of May demonstrations on response to questionnaire), it was obvious that the meaning of "positive" and "negative" was unclear to some of the respondents. A further semantic limitation may have been the term "political preference" as opposed to the more common "political affiliation." (A significantly higher percentage of the sample chose "other"

than was expected from the State's voting lists. This could be because of the election year and the undecided preferences for Presidential candidate.)

It should finally be noted that this survey was conducted within two weeks of campus demonstrations that received international news coverage. Twenty-nine percent of the sample admitted that these events negatively effected their response.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study has initiated a channel of feedback from the public supporters of the University. The rationale for continuing this process has been presented. Practically, annual or bi-annual surveys could indicate trends or directions in public attitude. In terms of experimental design, this survey could be considered a pre-test to any public relations programs that may be initiated now and their effects measured later.

Within the scope of this study itself, further research questions could be asked to obtain more particular results. Crosstabulations could be made between the independent variables (informational questions, attitudinal questions) e.g. "Are respondents who answer negatively regarding U.N.M.'s adequacy of community service aware of any benefits in their area?" "If an employer answered 'no' with regard to interviewing U.N.M. graduates, how did he rate their capability?"

All of the attitudinal questions could be analyzed in relation to information source. The question of teaching, research and community service adequacy might be related to overall satisfaction with the University as well as opinion of its contribution to the State.

This study has only reflected the attitudes of the voters of New Mexico. It has not attempted to offer explanations for the opinions expressed. A further study -- probably through interviewing -- might attempt to probe these reasons.

APPENDIX

RESPONDENTS WILLING TO INTERVIEW U.N.M. GRADUATES FOR EMPLOYMENT

Irwin Pat Murphy
701 Paseo de la Loma
Santa Fe, New Mexico

A. Caballero
318 S. Silver
Deming, New Mexico

Ronald Cass
116 La Placeta
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Paul S. Carpenter
Corrales, New Mexico

F. L. Ribe
1232 41st
Los Alamos, New Mexico

Louis E. DePaul
1610 Red Rock Drive
Gallup, New Mexico

Kenneth T. Stradel
1105 Dakota SE
Albuquerque, New Mexico

L. E. Mathers
10305 Eden NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Arthur W. Marshall, Jr.
1418 Harvard NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Robert Fober
2201 Camino de Los Artesanos
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87107

Neil Hansen
1713 Cagua NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico

J. H. White
Box 34
White City, New Mexico

J. E. Brown
106 E. Curry
Carlsbad, New Mexico

RESPONDENTS WILLING TO INTERVIEW,

HOWEVER, NO JOBS PRESENTLY

AVAILABLE

R. J. Bard
975 Nambe Loop
Los Alamos, New Mexico 48692

F. Gutierrez
1405 Locust
Las Cruces, New Mexico

EXPLANATION OF HOLLINGSHEAD INDEX

The criteria used in establishing social status was derived from the system formulated by August B. Hollingshead.¹ The index takes into account the respondent's level of education completed and his employment.

Level of education was coded into one of these seven categories:

- (1) Five or more years of higher education, with an advanced degree.
- (2) College graduate with Bachelor's degree, including post-graduate work short of an advanced degree.
- (3) Partial college, short of a four-year (Bachelor's) degree, or completion of advanced technical-vocational course.
- (4) High school graduate.
- (5) Partial high school (completed 10th or 11th grade).
- (6) Junior high school (completed 7th to 9th grade).
- (7) Less than seven years of school.

The respondent's occupation was coded into one of these seven categories:

- (1) ___ Executives or proprietors of LARGE concerns and MAJOR professionals.
- (2) ___ Manager or proprietors of MEDIUM-SIZED businesses or organizations and LESSER professionals.
- (3) ___ MIDDLE to LOWER ranking administrative personnel in LARGE concerns; proprietors of SMALL businesses, and SEMI-professionals.
- (4) ___ Proprietors of LITTLE businesses; clerical and sales personnel; lower ranking civil service personnel, etc.
- (5) ___ SKILLED workers, including trained service workers, policemen, firemen, skilled postal workers, etc.
- (6) ___ SEMI-SKILLED workers, production and service.
- (7) ___ UNSKILLED workers; production, service, and agricultural.

From the sum of the weighted scores, the Social Class was then determined according to these divisions by Hollingshead:

Class I (scores 11-17)	Class IV (scores 44-60)
Class II (scores 18-27)	Class V (scores 61-77)
Class III (scores 28-43)	

¹August B. Hollingshead. Elmstown Youth, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1949) pp. 77-78.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Annett, John, Feedback and Human Behavior. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1969.
2. Argyris, Chris, Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.
3. Arkin, Herbert and Colton, Raymond, Tables for Statisticians. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1965.
4. Berelson, Bernard and Janowitz, Morris, ed., Reader in Public Opinion and Communication. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
5. Bernays, Edward L., Crystallizing Public Opinion. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1961.
6. Cantril, Hadley, Gauging Public Opinion. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.
7. Cantril, Hadley, The Human Dimension: Experiences in Policy Research. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1967.
8. Clarke, Robert B.; Coladanci, Arthur P.; and Caffrey, John, Statistical Reasoning and Procedures. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1966.
9. Downie, N.M., and Heath, R.W., Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper S. Row, 1965.
10. Edwards, A.L., Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
11. Emmert, Phillip and Brooks, William D., Methods of Research in Communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
12. Fox, Gary C., "Campus Crisis: A Viewpoint" Journal of Education. Vol. 153 (December 1970) pp. 26-32.
13. Glenny, Lyman A., "The Anonymous Leaders of Higher Education" Journal of Higher Education. Vol. XLIII (January 1962) pp. 9-22.
14. Hall, Ray Ovid, Handbook of Tabular Presentation. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946.
15. Hollander, Edwin P. and Hunt, Raymond G., ed. Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. New York:
16. Hollingshead, August B., Elmtown's Youth The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

17. Jahoda, Marie, ed. Research Methods in Social Relations, Part One: Basic Processes. Vol. I, New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
18. Jahoda, Marie, ed. Research Methods in Social Relations, Part Two: Selected Techniques. Vol. II, New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
19. Kelman, Herbert C., "Processes of Opinion Change" Public Opinion Quarterly. 25 (1961).
20. Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
21. Lawrence, Paul R., and Lorsch, Jay W., Organization and Environment Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1969.
22. Maslow, Abraham, Eupsychian Management. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965.
23. N.A.S.A. Conference on Organizational Communication. Huntsville: N.A.S.A., 1967.
24. Norman, Ralph D., "Review of Some Problems Related to the Mail Questionnaire" Educational and Psychological Measurement.
25. Parten, Mildred, Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
26. Seiler, John A., Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and the Dorsey Press, 1970.
27. Stephan, Frederick F., and McCarthy, Philip J., Sampling Opinions -- An Analysis of Survey Procedure. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1965.
28. The Lobo. November 2, 1971.
29. Toffler, Alvin, Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.
30. U.S. Department of Commerce, General Social and Economic Characteristics -- New Mexico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
31. U.S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States 1970. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
32. Welkowitz, Joan; Ewen Robert B; Cohen, Jacob, Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
33. Young, Pauline V., Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.