

Pilot Study

Urban Versus Rural:

Does Location (Place) affect Environmental Perspective?

An Examination of Primary and Secondary Socializations affects on Environmental Perspective

By Brandon M. Shaffer

December 12, 2008

Dr. Betsy Watson

Introduction:

My research question is does where a person is raised (location) have an effect on their environmental perspective? Examining how the individual is affected by elements of primary and secondary socialization. My population is specifically Humboldt State students ages 18-24. This is important to society and sociology because it is a correlation that has not been fully explored. For this study environmental perspective is defined as individual's ideals about the environment, which include views/opinions on environmental issues, connection to the natural world and the overall state of environment. For example a person's understanding of the environment may be based upon whether he/she was raised in an urban city or a rural farm. It is an interesting topic to approach because people think that their perception of the environment comes from where they were raised. This connection is what I wanted to explore within this pilot study. My own geographical location as a child has affected my perceptions of the environment. I was raised within a rural location and it has had an impact on my conception of the natural world. This provides a basis for the fundamental question that I am asking. The exploration within this pilot study will allow for a basis to see if this is something that can be pursued within a research study. I hope to find a correlation between the various aspects of socialization, differing between primary and secondary socialization elements to see how large an impact location is. The correlation between environmental perspectives and geo location has not been fully explored within the United States. The simple lack of a clear consensus and generalized research on this topic has prompted me to look at various aspects of it for my research. However, the initial literature on environmental perceptions based on a rural or urban location is somewhat limited. Within the exploration of the literature, I found a wide degree of analysis in different constructional arguments towards the perception of the environment.

Literature Review:

The examination of how a child's location affects their environmental perceptions is a relatively new concept within sociological literature. The individual is not normally studied within this concept; however this is often studied within the field social psychology. Social psychology has looked at how an individual constructs his/her environmental perceptions and

how they are developed over time. Environmental Sociology examines the social understanding of the environment and its application within society. However, both fields of Environmental Psychology and Sociology do not look at the application of both location, as well as environmental perspective. Within the aforementioned fields; Specifically in Europe, environmental perspective based around place has been researched and studied. There are many fundamentals that go into establishing ones perceptions of the environment. These perceptions can range from the connection to self, bioregionalism, childhood perception, as well as others.

Self “Sense in Place”

When examining how environmental perspectives are relevant to the development of the self, it is pertinent to look at how the individual establishes a sense of place within his/her environment. A connectedness to their location, allows for the perception of having a self connection to their surroundings. The establishment of self within sense of place gives the individual the ability to create an understanding of the environment. Stedman’s (2003) article “Is it really a Social Construction?: The Contribution of the Physical Environmental to Sense of Place” examines how sense of place is socially constructed. However, it is not the only factor when approaching the establishment of, sense of place. In his survey of 1,000 property owners in Northern Wisconsin, he concluded that the establishment of social sense of place matters far more than the physical environment. Stedman points out how the majority of the literature about sense of place, deals with the physical environment based around the landscape characteristics. Stedman brings up an interesting point. He states that “If the physical environment matters little as a source of attachment, there is wide latitude in which environmental degradation may occur leaving attachment intact”.(Stedman 2003: 683) The extent of which a person is connected to their environment gives them a greater feeling of establishment within their location. Yet if the individual does not establish a connection and degradation does occur, their attitudes towards the environment are not affected. Environmental Meaning has been established and is hard to change once it is created. Stedman’s article gives a look at how sense of place plays a factor later in life. He depicts how sense of place comes to be established through the connectedness to social factors and not necessarily physical environment.¹

Arefi’s (1999) article “Non-place and Placelessness as Narrative of Loss: Rethinking the Notion of Place” also examines the loss of place. The narrative of the individual plays a large

part in the connection of the self. The loss of place can destroy the individual's connection to place. Arefi examines how the establishment of personal narrative is contributed to three factors. Which are; locale, location and sense of place, all create the sense of a personal narrative. Arefi looks at sense of place as being constantly in flux within our own personal narrative. Arefi writes "In other words, places are constantly in tension between what they are, what they ought to become, and what the mediations of global capital and power make of them. Prevented from conceptualizing localities with fixed identity, the social relations of key players who exert power over place become contentious and problematic."(Arefi, 1999: 191) The idea of sense of place being in a continuous state of tension plays a factor in the establishment of place, in terms of an adult. This is not something I thought about when approaching my research and I plan to apply this when examining my findings. True, I am examining the correlation of place as a child and its effect on the adult perspective of environment; but the idea of fluctuation of environmental perspectives as an adult proposes that the sense of place is always changing.

Sense of place is affected by an idea of community attachment. Hummon (1992) looks at how the connection to the community attachment factors into how the individual feels about their environment. This is an important ideal to be examined. If as a child, the individual does not have attachment to their community and thus to the environment, this could play a factor in their environmental perspectives. In his article "Community Attachment: Local Sentiment and Sense of Place", Hummon interviewed several individuals from the same city and each one had a different sense of connectedness to their environment. All of them came from different backgrounds but shared the same experiences of living in the same city. Some of the participants felt that by living within an urban setting, that they did not feel a connection at all to their environment. They felt alienated and as Hummon points to one participant "Barbara feels profoundly estranged from a city she finds dirty, hostile, provincial, uncreative, and lacking in community spirit."(Hummon 1992) In turn this article shows how sense of place and connectedness can create a sense of estrangement and alienation from an urban environment. However at the same time, there were those who believe that within their urban setting there was a sense of place and connection. This is an important point for my research. It shows that an individual's environmental perspective can be positive or negative based on living in an urban setting. It also shows that alienation does not always take place and that living in an urban setting can affect an individual in several different ways. This examination of the urban feeling is

a crucial perspective for my research and how it can be applied. This is something that needs to be examined with my participants.

Along with the attachment to place Cantrill and Senecah; within their article “Using the ‘sense of self-in-place’ construct in the context of environment policy –making and landscape palling” (2004) looks at how having a “self-in-place” perspective affects their behavior with regards to the environment. Examining the differences within the metropolitan area, the authors looked at the perspectives of individuals in regards to various environmental actions taking place. From their findings, it was determined that those who had resided within a particular environmental location for a long amount of time shared relationships with other individuals as well as with the land. Cantrill and Senecah examined an interesting point in how those who establish a long term relationship with their environment create a “self in place” mentality. Since their study only looked at adults within a metropolitan area it alludes to there being a sense of socialization at the adult level. By living in a location for a period of time during your adult life, do you still hold an environmental sense perspective (or self in place) from when you were a child, or does that become neglected once you become re-socialized? It’s hard to tell from Cantrill and Senecah’s article. Within Schultz and Tabanico article “Self, Identity, and the Natural Environment: Exploring Implicit Connections with Nature” (2007) they examined how individuals felt about their connectedness to nature. They look at how the individual associates the self with natural and artificial environments. From the five studies that were performed they saw a common occurrence of a positive association with nature. However, they point out that the connectedness with nature “is a primitive belief, our data suggest that it might be changeable by experience.” It shows how environmental connection is able to be established, but due to experiences can be changed. This allows for a connection to be established within my research that shows how environmental perspectives can be changed.

People often feel a connection to special places within their lives. People develop long-term feelings and attachments based around various activities at these special places. These feelings are often contributed to an individual’s sense of place. The attachments that the individual feels are rooted within a sense of always having a unique place in nature. In a survey based in Utah, it was found that “The primary reasons why places on public lands are regarded as special are because of the environmental features of a place or because of interactions with significant others at the locale.”(Eisenhauer, 2000: 429) The researchers originally presumed that

this special feeling would be determined based on activities, however, it was much more based around the connection with other individuals. This depicts that the establishment of sense of place is much more based around the communal settings, rather than that of the individual. This shows that how people interact with their environment does not necessarily have the same effect as the power of the community. This can be applied to my research in the aspect that it shows how the adult individual develops their perceptions of a natural space. However the research is somewhat limited in how it approaches the various other aspects of the environment because it is focused on southern Utah.

Along the same lines of self in place, the antecedent is an overwhelming feeling of “I”. Within the article “There is no “I” in nature”, it looks at how an overwhelming feeling of “I” leads people to feel less connected to nature. In a study based around altering the individuals perception of objective self-awareness, (Frantz, Mayer, Norton and Rock, 2005) shows how individuals if nurtured correctly show a greater connection to nature than those who were not nurtured. The self-centered attitude in turns focuses on the individuals own attributes and feelings instead of their environmental setting. The whole idea is based around the conceptualization of the self within a cultural setting. This provides a continuing theme of how the environment is effected by those who feel like they have a greater connection to themselves than their natural environment.

Bioregionalism

With the establishment of self in place, Bioregionalism looks at how loyalties are established within an individual’s environmental location. Taylor’s article “Bioregionalism: An Ethics of Loyalty to Place” (Taylor 2000) examines how the ideological nature of bioregionalism creates a fundamental establishment to place. Bioregionalism is a naturally defined area of the environment which affects the political, cultural and environmental system. Taylor writes “Bioregionalization is partly fueled by the accurate perception that the resolution of conflicts related to natural resource regimes will be difficult if not impossible if decisions are not widely perceived as legitimate in the affected regions.”(Taylor 2000:64) Bioregional allows for an interesting construction of how individuals are socialized to their location. However, the majority of Taylor’s article looks at how Bioregionalism is applied to environmental movements within the United States and how they apply their belief systems based on loyalty to their bioregion.

This will provide an interesting analysis of how environmental regions play a factor in establishing an ideology.

Alienation:

It is important to allude to the connection between the urban environment and a sense of alienation. It is often perceived that those from a natural environmental (i.e. rural) setting have a far greater sense of connection to nature, in comparison with those from urban settings. Urban environments often spawn an ideology of alienation within their own setting. The article “A New Look at Urban Alienation: The Effect of Neighborhood Disorder on Perceived Powerlessness” by Geis and Ross (1998) is based on a 1995 survey from a group of Illinois urban community members. It points to those from the ages of 18-34 and how they feel a sense of powerlessness and alienation. This is often due to how the community is considered “disordered” and is attributed to urban environments with high poverty. It states, “For example, individuals who feel powerless may be less likely to form ties with neighbors, and lack of social ties with neighbors may exasperate neighborhood disorder.” (Geis, Ross 1998: 243)ⁱⁱ.

Childhood Perception of Environment

The article entitled “Environmental Perception of Rural and Urban Pupils” by Bogner and Wiseman (1997); examines how secondary school children’s environmental perspectives differed. This study yields different findings that are opposite of what I anticipate to find from my study. Although this article looks at children, it does not examine the correlation between childhood and adulthood environmental perspectives. However this examination can still play a part in my research. Within the study it was found that both urban and rural children shared the same environmental perspectives. An interesting finding that was discovered was that rural children actually described less of a connection and ideals of environmental action than their urban counterparts.

Childhood perspective of the environment is something that is seen throughout the world. Within the article by Petegem and Blicck, entitled “The Environmental Worldview of Children: A Cross-Cultural Perspective” (2006), they examined how the environmental view of children within Belgium and Zimbabwe have substantial differences between one another. Petegem and Blicck see how within children, the environmental view shifts between a dominant perspective

over environment to a much more ecological aspect. Within the two subgroups it was found that within Belgium children ages 13-15 there is a far more concentrated worldwide view of human-nature equality paradigm. However within Zimbabwe, the same age range, children share a view of feeling “more dominant over nature and emphasize a utilitarian view of the environment.”(Petegem and Blicek 2006) This provides an interesting aspect in which children view their environments. This report examines the differences in a far greater scale in looking at childhood perspectives between two separate countries. The findings however, make the greatest impact. One would interpret that children in Zimbabwe in would have a far greater ecological understanding. However, there is a greater ecological understanding within Belgium. This difference may come from a far greater sense of modernity. Belgium is seen as a modern European country versus Zimbabwe which is not as modernized. This shows an interesting perspective in how a sense of a modernized location can play a factor on environmental views.

This is also seen within Kahn’s article “Children’s Affiliations with Nature” (2002) which looks at how children construct a wide variety of values with the natural world. Kahn sees how this can even flourish within a harsh urban environment. However at the same time, humans still proceed to destroy the environment at an alarming rate. This is pointed to in the ideology of environmental, generational amnesia. Khan states “To restate the basic idea: People take the natural environment they encounter during childhood as the norm against which they measure the environmental degradation later in life.”(Kahn 2002, 110) This continues as generations persist with environmental degradation, which becomes normalcy. Kahn points out that as adults, we return to our former environmental outdoor location only to find that it has been destroyed. Kahn alludes that the only way to stop environmental amnesia is by redesigning our conception of cities and urban settings. This article brings up an interesting point in how as humans we interpret and continue our environmental values. As children we adopt perspectives that have become engrained within our values, only to have our childhood locations suffer the same fate as our parents before. The aspect of environmental generational amnesia could explain how children’s environmental perspectives change and adapt to locations. Kahn however does not go into detail about the shift between childhood and adulthood, but simply offers an explanation to how these ideologies are constantly engrained throughout environment. Pointing out that even within the urban setting, a deep connection can be established to the environment.

“The Childhood Factor” by Thompson, Aspinall and Montarzino (2007), examines as how children visit natural places, which play a factor in our perspectives as an adults. It is based on a study which took place in Britain. This study asks adults, how often they visited “green places” in relationship to their childhood. The majority of the article points to how their perspectives changed from adolescence to adults. Within the article it states “Frequency of childhood visits not only predicts frequency of adult visits to woodlands and green places in general but also associated with other important attitudes and behavior.”(Thompson, Aspinall, and Montarzino 2007, 123) People often feel a connection to their environment which has carried over from when they were children, into their adult lives. The green environments affect how the individual feels and sees themselves with the natural world. This relationship is an important issue to examine. It shows that there exists a cognitive link between the individual childhood frequencies with the natural environment to their environmental views as an adult. This demonstrates a connection between individuals and their natural environment and how it affects their future viewpoint.

With children, an assessment of the environment allows children a social realm to dominate their conception of place. This is often seen in how children from a lower income neighborhood, have a much harder time understanding the conceptions within the ecological environment. This subsequently causes the child to feel like their environment is that of the urban setting and that they do not have full access to a natural setting. Within “Assessing Children’s Environmental Worldviews” by Manoli, Johnson, and Dunlap (2007), it examines how children from different social backgrounds function within the conceptions of the natural environment. They state “ An alternative hypothesis that is supported by the qualitative data is that children growing up in neighborhoods where they do not feel safe or secure may have more difficulty applying ecological knowledge to their home environments.”(Manoli, Dunlap, Riley, 2007:48) Manoli brings up an interesting point, that the importance of safety and connection to ones environment affects their views of social settings. The role of parents also plays a large factor in the establishment of this idealism. A child’s safety is determined by the parents understanding of their surroundings. If the parents lack the appropriate knowledge or instills a sense of caution and fear within the child of the environment, this is in turn conveyed to the child through their interactions with the environment. This allows for further analysis of how parents can affect their child’s environmental understandings.

A child's understanding of the environment seems to be based around cultural understandings. In Hyuns (2005) article, he details how there are two main cultural forces between the two. One force that he points to is the pattern of linguistic discourse between adults and children. (Hyun 2005) That both have a contextual understanding of the environment, however both convey it in very different means (maybe different meanings – would be better). This shows that both adults and children share a commonality between their environmental beliefs; however as a child it is not always easily expressed in an adult's perception. The other major cultural difference that Hyuns points to, is the idea of stereotypical gender doing. That within a young child's mind, the fundamentals of gender normalcy plays a large role in understanding the environment. The femininity or masculinity of nature allows for a much younger grasp of formulaic roles within the world. Gender ideals are contributed to the masculinity of a lightning strike against that of a feminine idea of a tree.

Ewert (2005) examines a link between current environmental beliefs and early childhood experiences. A study, administered to 533 university undergraduates shows how many factors play into the establishment between childhood and adult perspectives. It states, "Results showed that four of the seven independent variables (appreciative outdoor activities, consumptive outdoor activities, media exposure, and witnessing negative environmental events) explained 14% of the variance in the eco-centric/anthropocentric beliefs."(Ewert, Place, and Sibthorp 2005) This illustrates that the establishment of childhood variations within the environmental perspective, is altered on its process to adulthood. That early life association to nature is vital in establishing a connection to nature. However the majority of the study is based on activities within nature. It assumes that environmental perspectives are gained through individual impressions within nature. It alludes to the affect of family and community, or any other various aspects that play a factor in the consideration of their environmental perspectives.

The edited text *Children and their Environments*, examines the various data that has been gathered on children and their examination of their environment. In one article by Rissotto and Giuliani, "Learning neighborhood environments: the loss of experience in a modern world" (2006) examines how children have begun to lose environmental experiences because of the shift, in living from rural to urban settings. That the spatial setting shifts from much more of a contextual understanding to one based around close body encounters. Those children are only concerned with their own spatial understanding, what directly affects them. This leads to

children only having participation with environments, objects and other things that are deemed by other people as “safe”. Children’s perceptions are based around what their authority figures see as safe. This does not allow for children to go wondering off into the world by themselves in order to establish their own contextual understanding. Instead children are confined to urban settings that are seen as safe. This is also seen in the “urbanization” of rural lifestyles within small towns. The familiarity within the environment then comes from a new media outlet. Along the same lines, Heft and Chawla (2006) within their article “Children as agents in sustainable development: the ecology of competence” looks at how children establish their connection to the environment. It states “From this perspective all animate beings are viewed as agents in the environment, who through their actions, simultaneously learn about their environment and about their own competencies in effecting change.”(Heft and Chawla, 2006: 5) The individuals establish this connection in a commonality to their community. Many people in turn establish their environmental understanding through their connection to the community. This helps create a communal understanding of the environment. The constant theme of the community with regards to children’s establishment of their understanding of the environment plays a large point. The role of the environment gives the ability to feel a connection to something. This is especially important within urban communities where alienation is a common occurrence.

Environmental Education:

Sobel’s (1996) book on environmental education entitled *Beyond Ecophobia*, looks at how a child’s environmental perspective is dependent on education. It shows that environmental education helps create awareness with the natural world. If children are exposed to the environment at a young age, through careful environmental experiences, it shows that they develop a much larger, overall understanding of their situation within the world. Sobel points to how animals play a role in the environment. If a child has a pet, it allows for them to take on the personality and attributes of that animal. This gives the child the perspective from that particular creature. Sobel alludes specifically to birds, and the sense of freedom that birds have. Their ability to be free, yet when put in a cage their world and perceptions become much smaller. The basic premise behind Sobel’s book is that in order for children to appreciate nature they need to experience it firsthand. It’s much more of a guide than anything. Sobel does not really focus on the sociological explanations behind his theory. He fails to look at why or how children may not

be able to encounter the environment. He does give a good theory behind how children should be exposed to the environment, because without exposure they do not have an in-depth understanding of nature.

Along the same lines to Sobel's book, is Orr's book *Ecological Literacy* (1992). Orr looks at how within society there has been a major shift in the education of children in the environment. However Orr looks at environmental education as simply providing the large majority of individuals that are environmentally aware, though they lack the overall understanding of their environmental impact. Orr states "The failure to develop ecological literacy is a sin of omission and of commission. Not only are we failing to teach the basics about the earth and how it works, but we are in fact teaching a large amount of stuff that is simply wrong. By failing to include ecological perspectives in any number of subjects, students are taught that ecology is unimportant for history, politics, economics, society and so forth. And through television, they learn that the earth is theirs for the taking. The result is a generation of ecological yahoos without a clue why the color of the water in their rivers is related to their food supply, or why storms are becoming more severe as the planet warms. The same persons as adults will create businesses, vote, have families, and above all, consume"(Orr, 1992: 24) People who are exposed to environmental education typically become more aware. However, they do not have the connection to the environment. This is an important issue to examine within my research; is there such a thing as too much environmental education? Does this create an individual that has the basic understanding of their environmental situation, yet fails to see how sustainability is put into play?

In the same aspect, Orr's book *Earth in Mind* (1994) looks not only at the problem of education, but the entire aspect of environmental education. Within an educational situation, the individual can only gain so much. Education has been misguided and damaged, due to the human's connection to the environment. This is furthered by what Orr states as an "over simplified" view of the environmental world. Orr reveals that this is due to an over commercialization of the youth within America. That television, video games and various other media forms, make it much more difficult for environmental education to take hold within the youth. Like Orr's other book, it looks prudently at the aspect of sustainability within environmental education. That education promotes a basic, simplistic understanding; however it fails to capture the sustainable aspects that are required within a grander understanding of the

environment. This analysis of environmental education is an important aspect to look at. I will look at my subjects and how their environmental education played a factor in how they established their perspectives.

Role of the Rural Community:

Halting Degradation of Natural Resources: Is there a Role for Rural Communities? By Baland and Platteau (1996) examines how rural communities play a factor in the establishment of idealism behind the environment. Specifically within the book, the conclusion is based around the constant theme of community against the state doctrine. It looks at the power an individual community has, within the establishment of the view of natural environment. The urbanization of cities does not allow for a cognitive sense of community to be established on the same scale that rural communities do. This study was put out by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; it examines the prospects that affect rural communities on a world wide scale. It however points to an economic basis under Game Theory, in which the basis for much of the environmental degradation is based on. Poorer communities have far harsher and over exploited resources on a wider scale, than those with a strong economic base. This study is fairly old in its application of an understanding of the role of the rural community. Though it does not have the greatest application to my research, it can still be applied within the contextual understanding of the relationship between the individual and rural community.ⁱⁱⁱ The role of the rural community plays a large factor in the creation of an understanding of the environment in a child. Within the community this is often seen as a resource for a wide degree of knowledge on the environment, as well as other facets of life.

Gibson makes the argument that these beliefs and structures are formed based on traditional or indigenouness cultural production.(Gibson, 2006: 189) Within her article “Community in Resources, Tradition in Knowledge”, she points to this connection of how indigenous and traditional cultures still have an effect on a contemporary culture. However within Gibson’s article she only examines this to a minimal extent. Instead she looks at the use of traditional knowledge within the pursuit of intellectual property. Examining how an individual adsorbs this community belief system into their own ideals and creates their own intellectual property.

Cultural Construction of Nature:

Within the Native Mind and the Cultural Construction of Nature by Atran and Medin (2008), they examine how diminishing involvement within the environment has led to diminished environmental protection. The knowledge of the environment that was once prevalent within small indigenous cultures has become a thing of the past. The loss of an understanding within nature is established within a cultural degradation. Altran and Medin examine this loss within cross cultural data, looking specifically at relationships that individuals have with the environment. They primarily look at how they interact with the environment and talk about the environment, and how it differs from each culture. Altran and Medin look at the cultural groups of Mayan Indians and Spanish Speaking individuals within Guatemala and Mexico. They also examine a cross-cultural analysis of Native-Americans and European-American fisherman. How their environmental cultural understandings come from continuing cultural stereotypes and in-group conflicts. Atran and Medin bring up some interesting points and reasons for the cultural construction of nature. It is to a great extent based around the idea behind what they term as “folk biology”, which is folklore that is based around the individual’s biological understanding. This exists in how nature is a reflection of the human body within cultural understanding. The idea of the environment and nature becomes something of an evolutionary process.(Medin 2008)

Connection to Environment:

Along with the conception of sustainability, another study from Europe looks at the how an urban environment promotes different psychological understandings of environmental sustainability. Titled “Preference for Nature in Urbanized Societies: Stress, Restoration, and the Pursuit of Sustainability”, it looks at how people within urban settings need nature in order to feel a connection to their surroundings. The study examines the conception of environmental psychology within Europe. It looks at how people within urban settings thrive and desire contact with nature. I tell us that nature is needed in order to establish a connection to their surroundings. Without this connection, people run the risk of developing serious psychological issues, such as depression and feelings of alienation. The researchers argue that within urban settings there needs to be a balance between nature and urban settings. That nature provides a restorative property to people and that nature also helps promote health. Within the sustainability conception, it examines the ability to promote an urban setting while keeping environmental

sustainability. Within the article it raises some interesting issues that I have never considered, such as the ideal of environmental psychology. The way the environment has an effect on people and how it helps to establish connections to the world.

Environmental Problems:

Environmental Sociology by Hannigan (2006) examines the ideological nature of environmental problems. Within society different aspects take precedence in regards to environmental problems. Hannigan argues that the location of the individual can dictate their particular concern when faced with environmental issues. When a particular community if individuals were faced with the issue of sewage overflow versus that of deforestation within China, the main concern would lie within the sewage overflow. Society prioritizes environmental problems based on location which dictates these most readily needed for improvement. Hannigan's book shows this connection to location and prioritizing of environmental problems. This aspect should prove true within my own study. A person within an urban setting will not be concerned with environmental issues that affect a rural setting. While at the same time, a person within a rural setting will not be concerned with urban environmental problems.

The same aspects are shared in *Self, Interaction, and Natural Environment* by Weigert (1997). Within Weigert's book, it looks at how we see the environment. Based on our surroundings we perceive the environment in a certain way. Although many of the issues that affect one environment also affect the entire world, people do not realize their place within the world. Weigert uses the example that many people don't realize that operating a car or fertilizing their lawn adds to air pollution. *Eco-Impacts and the Greening of Post modernity* by Jagtenberg and McKie (1996) also looks at the same issues. Asking the central question, can nature survive? Can the amount of damage that has happened to the environment ever be reversed? Jagtenberg and McKie look at how civilizations map out our path to post modernity. That there needs to be an establishment of "Green" understanding, as the way to create an environmental awareness for the future. Our cultures have become reliant on the buzz word of "Green" in order to secure our own environmental foundations for the future.

Deep Ecology is a branch of environmental philosophy that sees humans as an integral part of the natural world. The movement focuses more on the embellishment of ecosystems and the impact of human beings on the natural world. Within Bill Devall's (1988) book *Simple in Means Ends*, it chronicles how people feel like they are a part of something much larger. That this connection to the natural world allows for the individual to feel like they are a part of a much larger system. Devall points to the exploration of the natural world. Individuals look more at the scientific connection and reasoning, rather than the emotional connection to the natural environment. This is seen through a connection that indigenous people share with the environment. That their connection is more founded within a spiritual and emotional level, than a basic physical examination of nature. The most important thing that Devall alludes to is the establishment of mixed communities. He states "We are in service to a place. We serve the needs of the land's community. We receive from that community such services as food, material for clothes, shelter, and fuel. We are not stewards of the place, that we manage a piece of property for sustained yield or highest profit in the shortest time frame. We are attentive to the needs of the whole community. We are students of our place."(Devall 1988) This presents a view of the role of the community within the observation of Deep Ecology. The aspects of nature are engrained within every community. It simply depends on how you establish your connection. This influences your view of the natural environment. Devall through the lens of Deep Ecology sees every community as having this connection to nature. I however would argue that this may be present within a rural community, and is often something that is lacking within the urban community. Urban communities do not have a connection to their environment like rural communities do. They do not have a conceptual understanding of where their resources come from. While rural communities, see the exportation within their own setting. Urban communities are often away from the setting of natural resources. Devall however does provide an insight into a connection of the environment in communities. An individual is seen as a protector of the natural world.

Theory:

Shepard's book *Where We Belong* (2003) looks at how humans bond to the environment through their connection to the physical environment. Shepard's book specifically looks at his own analysis of the physical environment and how this has been adapted throughout the course

of his life. He examines the various environmental settings that he has experienced within his life, and looks at them through a historical and cultural perspective. Shepard points out, how this has affected his intellectual ideals with regards to the environment.

In *Sociological Theory and the Environment* by Dunlap (Dunlap et. al 2000), they examine how Sociological Theory is applied to the natural environment. Much of the book is based within classical sociological theory with emphasis on contemporary issues within the natural environment. The book examines classical theorist such as Marx, Durkheim, and Weber and their perspectives on the environment. In the examination of Weber and his theory with regards to the environment, it states “Social action in Weber’s sense goes far beyond face-to-face interaction of the individuals. It includes action that is oriented in its course to previous generations of humans by way of oral traditions, family stories, history and art books, museums, television, and movie documentaries, and so on.” (Dunlap et. al 2000:87) The examination of Weber’s theory looks at how social action can be looked at from the family perspective, or various other interactions that are taken on by the individual. All of these connections have an effect on the individual’s perspective of social action and their understanding of their role within the environment. Another examination is the application of consumption based around the creation of the self. Beck (1992), Giddens (1992) and Bauman (1988), they all look at how the individual creates a sense of self based on how they consume. This could be seen in relation to the consumption of green products, as well as the individual’s idealism around the consumption of the environmental standards (i.e. recycling, renewable fuel sources). With these indicators, there does seem to be an effect on individual’s conception of their self, particularly if they consider themselves an environmentalist. This idealism has become engrained within society and that the conception of what makes an individual environmentally conscious drives the creation of their self.

A final overall generalization with regards to many theorists is that they do not consider the examination of the natural environment. They look at a post modernity structure based around industrialism. This is a major flaw within the application of Classical Sociologists. However, many do look at the aspects of the creation and the structures that influence the individual. This applied directly to my study in regards to my original hypothesis, that location plays a factor in the contribution to an individual’s perspectives. That it is an individual’s place within the world that establishes their environmental consciousness. This is furthered by the

societal constructions of what it means to be environmentally consciousness. Does simply recycling make an individual an environmentalist? This is based around the individual's perceptions and their willingness to examine society's constructions about the environment.^{iv}

Methodology:

When examining an individual's concept of their environmental perspectives based on their location as a child, many different methodological approaches could be used. For this study I applied both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Both of these allowed for concise and empirical data to be gathered. My research was more heavily focused on the qualitative method, with a minor addition of quantitative. I felt a mixture of both methods would give me the ability to obtain a basic, overall connection, of the individual's childhood location to their environmental beliefs. As well as gathering the establishment of basic demographic data. A mixed method is not often looked upon as being the most concise way to gather data. However in this case, it provided the most accurate data. Through the application of qualitative research, I was able to gather the necessary correlation.

With my research question there is no one direct theory that provides a causal explanation. However, such literature as *Sociological Theory and the Environment*, allowed for the application of certain theories to be applied to my research question. Theory plays a major part in my study of people's perception of the environment based on their location. I am examining my research question within the context of theory using Symbolic Interactionism. Based on the theories of George Herbert Mead, Symbolic Interactionism looks at how people act (interact) towards objects based on the meanings they contribute within society; these meanings within society are in turn altered through interaction. I am looking at this through the process of how the individual acts towards the environment. Within locations in society, people obtain different ideals about their environment. A rural person may have a completely different ideal of the environment than a person from an urban setting. This could also apply to how an individual's perspective changes based on their location. The other theory I am applying is Ethnomethodology. Ethnomethodology was coined by Harold Garfinkel. Ethnomethodology looks at how people make sense of their world and how they display their understandings on others while developing a mutually shared understanding. I am looking at how social elements about the environment are shared based on location, and then are shared between individuals. An example

would be a large degree of people coming from a rural setting and how their understanding of the environment is shared and similar. Investigation of George Simmel's and Max Weber examinations of face to face interactions within small groups will also be used. Using Simmel's theory, I will be specifically looking at in and out groups. I will develop an understanding to the questions of; if a person engages within the same ideological base of a particular group does that determine the individual's conceptions of their setting? With the agreement, that an individual bases their social constructions on small concise groups. This can be related to family interaction or on a small community level. And, that these interactions effect the perception of their environmental perspective. The individual then creates their idealism based on others and structures within their location. By looking at the creation of the individual, through the means of consumption of "Green" ideology, this in turn creates a sense of what environmentalism is. This is an investigatory study, so the establishment of these allow for a generalized understanding. The basis in which will give the ability to pursue this topic more thoroughly.

The basis of conception of socialization, specifically primary and secondary socialization, is what is provided for the correlation between environmental perspectives. Socialization was examined by George Simmel, in which he saw how individuals acquire terms and ideals during certain developmental stages within their lives. Socialization being divided up into different, it stages shows in how the individual can acquire, strengthen, or resist idealisms established from socialization. Such elements as family, education, peer groups, media, as well institutions all provide agents of socialization. These elements can affect the individual in the construction of individuals' perspective and ideological beliefs system. Erving Goffman, examined the construction of "total institutions", in which they are isolated from societal forms, and can be provided socializations. This is done in either a voluntary or involuntary fashion. This is seen within certain examples such as prison, the military, or convents. This can also be applied to schools, especially higher education institutions. This in turn brings up the conceptions of resocialization, that an individual through the process is retrained by an intuitional construction. This allows for them to fit into a newly acquired environment and situation, thus operating as a part of the system.

My qualitative research was based our establishing a real connection between an individual's location (place) as a child and their environmental beliefs as an adult. The use of qualitative research will give me the ability to examine the human connection to the environment

through the subjects own beliefs and feelings towards the questions asked. This will allow an understanding of what elements from their childhood location contributed to their environmental beliefs as adults. For my questionnaire, I developed questions not only from the literature review but also utilized some questions taken from other sources. One such source are the questions taken from the Yale Environmental Survey^v, conducted in 2007. However in the survey, I used general questions which pertained to the overall data collection. This allowed for an overall generalized method in comparison to a completely quantitative method. This was due to the limitations that statistical data can afford to my research due to the small sample size.

Quantitative data gathering would only allow for the basic statistical data to be gathered. It would not allow for the in-depth human answers to be contributed. However in this case, the quantitative data gathering method proved useful for the pursuit of collecting demographic data.

In utilizing the qualitative method for questions and quantitative methods for gathering data, I was able to collect the basic demographic data, along with asking some fundamental questions that would be pertinent for my research. The application of quantitative data collection, gave the ability to establish a demographic basis in which my research will be examined. The use of this collection method will provide for basic demographic data, along with answering other fundamental questions, which will be used in my research. This will be conveyed through the application of a survey administered to the participants. They will be asked to fill out vital demographic information; such as gender, age, class standing, major, location (allowing the individual to convey their definition of where they spent the majority of their time at as a child) and other questions that apply.^{vi} This information will allow for the basic demographic data to be gathered and applied as a basis for my research in general. The information that the participants provide will enable me to examine if there is a major difference within the age groups that I have defined. Also, the collection of information regarding their majors, class standing, as well as looking at the individual's environmental background on a liker scale will also be studied. The survey is my own creation, with questions I created that would allow for the establishment of this data gathering.

In creating concepts for my research proposal it is difficult to establish a unified definition for arbitrary concepts such as urban and rural. The particular geographic location may differ; also it may differ based on the participant. This did pose a difficult problem in establishing a concise understanding of what an urban and rural setting entails. It is important to

point out that this is an investigatory study, so this does allow for conception to be changed and altered. From what I can establish thus far, an urban setting is densely populated with a large diverse population, and is highly developed (i.e. economic, social, diverse various systems). While a rural setting is sparsely populated, often remote, not highly developed (i.e. limited/lack of systems, economically based on agriculture or other means). These conceptions are fairly generic in their presentation and allow for a generalized view of what each setting entails. Within the questions that I asked in my survey, the individual indicated whether they came from a rural or urban setting. This question was based around where the individual spent the majority of his/her childhood (ages 0-15). This will allow for the individual to establish where they come from and what their perception of this setting was. By allowing for their own conceptions of their location, I was able to see if they fit into the generalized categories that I have established. Another conception used was, environmental perceptions, which is based around the individual's ideals about the environment, which include views/opinions on environmental issues, connection to the natural world and the overall state of environment. It is a difficult process to distinguish a conception of what environmental perception is. It is fairly arbitrary and like rural and urban, varies from participant to participant. The idea of environmental perception, it allows for a wide range of different elements to make up the basic principles in which I am trying to measure. I established these principles through asking the participants how they felt about current environmental issues (i.e. global warming, deforestation, renewable energy, etc.)^{vii} I want to study if the participants' current locations play a factor in the establishment of their environmental perspectives. All of the elements that make up environmental perspectives will allow for a measurable concept. Location of a person's childhood is the other conception which I plan to identify for this study. Since I'm looking at how location affected their establishment and perception of the environment, I think it's important to define their childhood location as an indicator. This gives the ability to get a stratified result of how an individual's environmental perceptions have changed, stayed the same, or have not been affected at all by location.

In order to gather my data, I needed to establish a basis for my research participants. My basis is Humboldt State Students age 18 to 24. I was looking specifically at this particular population. I began by gathering names and finding out who would be willing to be a participant. I approached individuals on a personal basis, or I asked individuals from my classes if they would be willing to take part in my research. Once I made contact, I arranged for a

location in which we could meet and take part in the interview process. This location was to be quiet (however this was not always the case) to allow for optimal data collection. I began the session with administering my consent form, in which participants signed and dated. This allowed for a contract to be established between myself and the participant. The consent form stated that I would not use their real name or any identification within my writing.^{viii} After this, I administered my survey in which the participant's answered the questions to the best of their ability. Following this, I recorded all my interviews to provide a reference later on. I asked the individuals the questions^{ix}, approved by the Humboldt State University Institutional Review Board. The interview process took 15-30 minutes. At the conclusion, I thanked my participants and asked if they had any questions or if they wished to be contacted later regarding the final product of my research.

When looking at the ethical implications, I did not anticipate many issues. However, when doing research of this type there are always ethical implications, such as providing my participants a quiet and secure environment in which they felt they would be able to speak openly. I counteracted this issue, through the ability of having a location selected in advance. This gave assurance that the location would be a secure and quiet environment. Another ethical concern was if someone should confide in me, any illicit activities or deviant behavior. The contract promised confidentiality and the assurance that any information given would not be presented to anyone other than me. I will be using pseudo names in the presenting of my data, thus providing the subjects my full compliance that their information was not given to anyone else.

I foresaw several complications within my research plan. One of which, was the gathering of subjects for my research. It is difficult to be able to gather random individuals who are willing to sit down and take part in a short interview. I was able to counter this through the application of looking towards my fellow class mates and by having participant's voluntarily sign up for the study. This made the ability to locate and obtain participants fairly easy. One other problem was the injection of personal biases within the interview process. I noted within one my interviews; I interjected my own personal ideals. Although, my personal beliefs did present themselves only once, this did not affect the results of my data. I will go into further detail within my synthesis, by elaborating on this more within the particular cases that I chose to interject my personal bias. I do not believe that it harmed the interview process. Plausibly, it

allowed for my participants to feel at ease with the interview and to open up about their environmental perceptions.

Discussion of Data:

The following was gathered using the survey administered to each participant from my sample population. It came out of demographic questions that were gathered from the individuals. The population was equal to sixteen Humboldt State Students from the ages of 18-24. This data represents the demographic information that I gathered followed by the interview data.

Survey and Environmental Demographic Data:

The age range was picked to show the elements of secondary socialization (specifically at the higher education level)

Age Range * Largest Percentage of Time Spent in Location Cross tabulation

Count		Largest Percentage of Time Spent in Location		
		Urban	Rural	Total
Age Range	18-19	2	3	5
	20-22	3	2	5
	23-24	3	3	6
	Total	8	8	16

In regards to age, it was spread fairly evenly across the spectrum of those who came from Urban and Rural settings. The age range allowed for an analysis to be gathered in order to determine if there was any sort of outlier within the study population. For the age groups of 18-19 years old and 20-22, the difference was only seen in one participant claiming location difference. For 18-19, two participants indicated they came from an urban location, while three

indicated they came from a rural location. For the age group 20-22, it was the opposite. I attempted to get an even number of participants from each age range.

Gender * Largest Percentage of Time Spent in Location Cross tabulation

Count				
		Largest Percentage of Time Spent in Location		
		Urban	Rural	Total
Gender	Male	3	3	6
	Female	5	5	10
	Total	8	8	16

For the sample population, it was spread evenly across both urban and rural with regards to the participant's locations. However in the study, there was a difference in female participants verses male participants.

Environmental Beliefs Like Families * Gender Cross tabulation

Count				
		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total
Environmental Beliefs Like Families	No Answer	0	1	1
	Strongly Disagree	2	1	3
	Disagree	1	2	3
	Neutral	0	2	2
	Agree	0	1	1
	Strongly Agree	3	2	5
	Completely Agree	0	1	1
	Total	6	10	16

Within the survey portion of the study, the participants were asked if their environmental beliefs were similar to their families. In the distinction between males and females, there is a noticeable difference between both gender groups. Males chose to answer that they strongly agreed with their family's environmental beliefs than did the females. Only three men chose to answer that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The female participants

answers ranged more on the negative spectrum of the scale. Four choose to either not answer the question or to disagree with the statement. Also, there was a much larger proportion that chose to indicate neutral as their answer choice in regards to their environmental beliefs being similar to their families. However, there was one female participant that chose to indicate that they completely agreed with their family’s environmental beliefs.

Environmental Beliefs Like Families * Age Range Cross tabulation

Count		Age Range			
		18-19	20-22	23-24	Total
Environmental Beliefs Like Families	No Answer	0	1	0	1
	Strongly Disagree	0	1	2	3
	Disagree	1	1	1	3
	Neutral	1	0	1	2
	Agree	0	0	1	1
	Strongly Agree	3	2	0	5
	Completely Agree	0	0	1	1
	Total	5	5	6	16

When looking at the environmental beliefs being like the participants families, age seemed to play a correlation with the association of beliefs. The participants within the 18-19 age range tended to agree with the statement. However, those within the older age range were the opposite. Except for three individuals, the majority chose to see their environmental beliefs different from their families. This could be in relation to the how individuals change their ideals when they are exposed to secondary socialization elements.

Environmental Beliefs Like Families * Largest Percentage of Time Spent in Location Cross tabulation

Count		Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location		
		Urban	Rural	Total
		Environmental Beliefs Like Families	No Answer	1
	Strongly Disagree	1	2	3
	Disagree	2	1	3
	Neutral	2	0	2
	Agree	0	1	1
	Strongly Agree	2	3	5
	Completely Agree	0	1	1
	Total	8	8	16

Those from a rural setting chose to say their environmental beliefs were most like their families, while those from an urban setting stated that their environmental beliefs were different from their families. Individuals that chose to indicate they came from a rural location agreed with their families’ environmental beliefs. Those participants from an urban location instead saw the statement in much more disagreement

A generalization taken from the data collected shows that those who most felt like their environmental beliefs were like their families came from a rural setting and ranged from 18-19 years old. This in turn shows a correlation between the ages of secondary socialization and the interpretation of the individual’s family’s environmental beliefs. This also shows the elements of family within the correlation to environmental beliefs. It indicates that the family has an effect on the individual within socialization, specifically from those within a self described rural setting. The correlation between these factors shows the effect that family has, yet it does not initially show the effects of secondary socialization of the participants. There are two ways that this data could be perceived. Either those within the age range of 18-19 have not been affected or they have been affected by secondary socialization. Meaning they already shared similar beliefs about the environment when being immersed in a secondary socialization environment such as higher education (in this case Humboldt State University). However secondary socialization could also have served as a way to reinforce their belief system about the environment, instilled by their family during primary socialization.

Many People I Know Share the same Environmental Beliefs * Gender Cross tabulation

Count					
		Gender			
		Male	Female	Total	
Many People I Know Share the same Environmental Beliefs	Completely Disagree	1	0	1	
	Strongly Disagree	0	1	1	
	Neutral	0	1	1	
	Agree	2	2	4	
	Strongly Agree	3	4	7	
	Completely Agree	0	2	2	
	Total	6	10	16	

When examining the peer groups of the individuals, they were asked if there were many people they know who share the same environmental beliefs. Overwhelming, the female participants responded that they were in agreement. However they also represented the neutral and strong disagreement responses. While male participants, were either in agreement or strongly agreed. Only one participant chose to indicate that they completely disagreed with the statement. Once again the population is heavily tilted towards female participants, so this does not provide an equal spectrum. However, it does allow for an analysis of the few participants and their answers towards the statement.

Many People I Know Share the same Environmental Beliefs * Age Range Cross tabulation

Count					
		Age Range			
		18-19	20-22	23-24	Total
Many People I know Share the same Environmental Beliefs	Completely Disagree	0	0	1	1
	Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	1
	Neutral	0	1	0	1
	Agree	2	0	2	4
	Strongly Agree	1	3	3	7
	Completely Agree	2	0	0	2
	Total	5	5	6	16

Examining the age range of the participants, the table shows that within the two age ranges of 20-22 and 23-24, there was only one participant who chose to disagree with the statement. The largest majority, who only stated that they were in agreement with the statement, were within the 18-19 age range. An assumption can be made that within this age range and within their peer groups (friends), they share the same basic environmental beliefs. The other age ranges also share the same connection to a peer group, but they also have the outliers within the groups. What could be assumed is that within the 20-24 age ranges they have already established a sense of secondary socialization within their peer group.

Many People I know Share the Same Environmental Beliefs * Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location Cross tabulation

Count		Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location		
		Urban	Rural	Total
Many People I Know Share the same Environmental Beliefs	Completely Disagree	1	0	1
	Strongly Disagree	1	0	1
	Neutral	1	0	1
	Agree	3	1	4
	Strongly Agree	2	5	7
	Completely Agree	0	2	2
	Total	8	8	16

Within the sample population it is further broken up into rural and urban locales. The overwhelming majority within the rural subset agrees with the statement that many people they know share the same environmental beliefs. Urban individuals also shared a degree of agreement within the statement, however three choose to respond as neutral, strongly disagree and completely disagree. These findings may represent a common theme that was featured within the literature; the rural community. Does coming from a rural community affect your environmental perspective? It makes the assumption that groups within the rural community have an effect on the association within primary socialization.

Taken from the data, it shows that often the age range of 18-19 and those from a rural setting have a connection to others who share the same environmental beliefs. Maybe this can be contributed to the aspect previously mentioned; rural community. The rural community plays a factor in the establishment of the environmental beliefs. Those within the community also share the same belief patterns and ideals when it comes to the environment. However, a problem lies within the question. I did not indicate what type of people share the same particular belief system. To some individuals this could indicate family, to others this could indicate a peer group, or some other group all together. This does allow for some interpretation on the part of the participants. When I wrote this question I was looking specifically for peer group interaction, but upon further examination I realize it could be misinterpreted. However, I still believe it provides a valid look at the sample population within the aspect of the participant’s views of the environmental beliefs of others around them.

Environmental Beliefs Change Over Time * Gender Cross tabulation

Count		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total
Environmental Beliefs change Over Time	Strongly Disagree	0	1	1
	Neutral	0	1	1
	Agree	1	2	3
	Strongly Agree	2	2	4
	Completely Agree	3	4	7
	Total	6	10	16

The majority of the participants indicated that they had seen their environmental beliefs change over time. All of the males that were interviewed indicated that they were in agreement to the statement. The majority of females also indicated this; however two, also indicated that they strongly disagreed or were neutral to the statement.

Environmental Beliefs Change Over Time * Age Range Cross tabulation

Count					
		Age Range			
		18-19	20-22	23-24	Total
Environmental Beliefs Change Over Time	Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	1
	Neutral	0	1	0	1
	Agree	2	1	0	3
	Strongly Agree	0	2	2	4
	Completely Agree	3	1	3	7
	Total	5	5	6	16

As with the last table, the overall participants indicated in they were in agreement. The two that indicated neutral and disagree with their environmental beliefs, were within two older age ranges. The interesting thing that can be taken from this analysis is that the two participants indicated that their environmental beliefs had not changed over time. Does this indicate that their environmental beliefs were not affected by the elements of secondary socialization? It would suggest that they have, however it could mean that the participant’s beliefs have not been changed since primary socialization.

Environmental Beliefs Change Over Time * Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location Cross tabulation

Count				
		Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location		
		Urban	Rural	Total
Environmental Beliefs Change Over Time	Strongly Disagree	0	1	1
	Neutral	1	0	1
	Agree	2	1	3
	Strongly Agree	2	2	4
	Completely Agree	3	4	7
	Total	8	8	16

With the continuing of the previous tables, the majority in both categories of Rural and Urban indicated that their environmental beliefs had changed over time. However what is interesting is that within the urban and rural category, an individual stated they were neutral or in disagreement. This indicates that the individual either, like previously stated, had not been affected by secondary socialization and that their environmental beliefs had remained the same. Within the rural category an individual stated they were in disagreement to the statement. This could either be interpreted as the individual has developed a keen sense of their environmental beliefs through such aspects as self in place and bioregionalism.

Environment has Played an Important Role * Gender Cross tabulation

Count		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total
		Environment has played an important Role Neutral	0	2
	Agree	1	2	3
	Strongly Agree	2	0	2
	Completely Agree	3	6	9
	Total	6	10	16

Even though females represented a higher portion of my population, within the statement “The environment has played an important role in my life” more choose to completely agree with the statement. While males, either chose to say they agreed or strongly agreed. However, no one within the population chose to disagree with the statement of the environment playing an important role in their life. Instead all stated they were in agreement. Also, only the female participants responded neutral when it came to statement of the environment playing an important role.

Environment has Played an Important Role * Age Range Cross tabulation

Count					
		Age Range			
		18-19	20-22	23-24	Total
Environment has Played an Important Role	Neutral	1	0	1	2
	Agree	1	1	1	3
	Strongly Agree	0	0	2	2
	Completely Agree	3	4	2	9
	Total	5	5	6	16

Within the younger (18-19) and older (23-24) age spectrums, there were only two who indicated a neutral response to the statement “The Environment has played an Important Role in my life”. What is interesting is that it occurred within the younger, and older age ranges, and not in the middle (20-22) spectrum. However in the middle age range they represented the largest number of participants who completely agreed to the statement.

Environment has Played an Important Role * Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location Cross tabulation

Count				
		Largest Percentage of time Spent in Location		
		Urban	Rural	Total
Environment has played an important Role	Neutral	1	1	2
	Agree	3	0	3
	Strongly Agree	1	1	2
	Completely Agree	3	6	9
	Total	8	8	16

The rural population results represent what I originally hypothesized. That a closer physical connection to nature, leads to the natural environment playing a larger role in the individual’s life. The rural setting allows for a closeness to be established with nature. Some urban locale individuals also stated they were in agreement, but not in the same amount as

individuals from a rural setting. This shows that within an urban setting, there is a lesser attachment to nature, and in a lesser degree it has not played a pivotal role within their life.

In analysis of the data collected, the results represent what I originally suspected. That those individuals who came from a rural setting would represent the largest majority who would be in agreement that the environment played a role in their life. However, what stood out was the correlation between gender and age. With such a high number of females instead of males stating that they were neutral to the statement about the environment, I wonder if this plays into some kind of indication about the natural environment. Does gender role play a factor in the establishment of a connection to nature? The stereotypical view of nature is masculine, something untamed and wild, while females are confined to the house in the role of women. I did not take this into consideration, but it does allow for a correlation to the establishment of gender roles and the perceptions to the connection with the environment. The age correlation aspect is an aspect that should be examined further.

Interview Data:

I began my interviews with the question “What is your oldest memory of nature?”. Many participants alluded to childhood experiences in nature. Many of the participants pointed to playing within nature. For those who indicated an urban setting, they stated that they played in parks, yards, or other structurally contained constructions within society. Those who indicated that they came from a rural setting stated that they were out in nature. They were engaged in such activities as climbing trees, building forts, walking on the beach. The majority stated a correlation to nature and a family interaction. This activity was often stated with either a father or other male figure, though some did participate in nature with a female figure. Paul stated he remembered nature as his Grandmother’s house in Columbia, California. However, Marion stated at the age of three, she would go mud bogging in her Grandfathers Land Cruiser, which Carly stated she would play in the tide pools with her father. Other participants stated a structured environmental outing, such as Christopher, who stated he was a member of the “Y-Indian Guides” or like Macey’s statement, that she remembered going to preschool at four years old and cloud watching. Timothy however would go into nature, near his house at a young age

where he would talk to bugs, in order to gain an understanding of them. Adam indicated that he would be in his yard, which had large grape vines and he remembers picking fruit. There is a correlation between those who grew up within an urban environment and those from a rural location with the idea of structure. Those within an urban location have their earliest childhood memories of nature, confined to structured outings and environmental safe havens. Those raised within an urban location, also appeared to lack a sort of structured situation in which to engage nature in. The majority of those who indicated they came from an urban location stated a park or their backyard was their earlier conceptions of nature.^x

When asked if “How much, if any time did you spend in nature as a child”, all except for two participants, stated that they spent the majority of their time outdoors. Participants stated they would go to parks, or they “were” in nature (insinuating that they were constantly surrounded by the natural world). Alyssa stated that she spent at least 75 percent of her time outdoors, while Christopher stated that he did not spend much time in nature, maybe once a year he would go to a beach or go camping. Alyssa came from what she described as a rural setting, while Christopher stated he came from an urban setting. Timothy stated at least once a week he would go to a park instead of the mall. He said, because it was free and fun and described his childhood location as rural. The statement of funding only came up once during the course of my interviews, though I did find it an interesting statement. The amount of time spent in nature as a child also had a direct correlation to the location in which the participants grew up. Individuals from a rural location stated they spent the majority of their time outside within nature. While individuals from an urban location spent a much smaller amount of time within nature compared to those from a rural location.^{xi}

Each participant was asked what their environmental conditions were like as a child. This question posed some problems for some of the participants. Some indicated that they were unsure how to answer the question. What was meant by the environmental condition question was trying to determine what their natural environment was like as a child. I was trying to examine how certain natural elements came into play within their natural environment as a child. I followed this question, with asking what types of activities they participated in. The majority of participants indicated that there was some kind of tree or forested area in which they would play in. In many cases as well, individuals indicated some kind of water source. This was seen in a creek, the ocean, or a river. Phillip stated “There were willows, trees, poison oak, black berries,

swampy areas, pasture lands all surrounded by a highway. There was a large degree of wild life, farming lots in which we grew beans and tomatoes. We went hunting and when I was older I went fishing”. From two participants, Paul and Jasmine, they indicated that they both came from the Los Angeles area and remember a large degree of trash in their environment. Paul specifically stated that this is why he picks up trash today, he still feels effected by the amount of waste he saw as a child. Timothy’s statement also stood out, he said he grew up within the central valley region of Southern California. His immediate surroundings were mostly farm lands. However, this led to a large degree of pesticide spray within his living area. Carly, stated “Awesome, we did everything, hiked, boated, fished, all of the above, we lived right next to the ocean and lakes. Our location was right in the middle of the redwoods.” The environmental conditions were very different as well between the two groups of rural and urban. The participants from an urban setting stated there was a large amount of trash and concrete around their location. Other individuals indicated a large degree of “man-made” features in their urban location. The participants from a rural location did not indicate these factors at all. They stated that their natural environmental conditions were often trees, mountains, wildlife, and plant life, to name a few.

There was a difference in how close or how far nature was from the individual within an urban and rural location. I specified within my question that it had to not be man-made. I defined man-made as a park or other natural setting, set aside within a man-made designated zone. However the answers given to this question indicated some kind of non-consensus to what I was trying to convey. I asked this question in order to gain an understanding of how close the natural environment was from their childhood location. Those within an urban setting stated that they were pretty far from almost any natural locations except for the ocean. Paul stated that it was almost a 45 minute drive to the beach (that was without traffic), while access to a national forest was close to an hour and half away. Macy stated it was a 40 minute drive to any sort of national forest and two hours to the ocean, she indicated she came from a rural setting. While Carely stated it was only a couple blocks to the ocean or a forest. The majority of urban participants indicated a closeness to the ocean while their ability to access a national forest or park, ranged from 45 minutes to a two hour drive. The rural participants stated that their location was fairly close to nature. Timothy for example stated he came from the rural central valley, and in turn was fairly close in location to everything.

In order to gauge how parents affected environmental beliefs during primary socialization, I asked the question what were your parent's environmental beliefs like? This was important in order to see how much environmental beliefs of the participants are like their parents through the conveyance of primary socialization. Three participants indicated that they were unsure what their parents environmental ideals were like. Of these participants, the majority came from urban locations and only one, came from a rural location. They stated that their parents never really conveyed what their beliefs about the environment were like. However they did indicate that they don't litter and they do recycle. For example Sharon indicated that she was unsure about her parent's environmental beliefs. Her mother stated that they were not to litter, but she saw a countered belief system between her mother and father. Within the rest of the participants there was a wide spectrum of parent's environmental beliefs. Individuals from a rural location indicated their parent's beliefs were either a "conservationist" approach, or that they did not care about the environment, or that they cared very much about the environment. Timothy stated "I saw a lack of care from my parents they did not seem worried about their environmental impact. We used paper plates and Styrofoam, as well as not recycling." While Marion stated "My parents were slightly, conversationalists. They agreed with logging but not clear cutting. They saw recycling as stupid and global warming as stupid." Daniel indicated his parent's environmental beliefs were "Liberal", Green party, Environmentalist, tree huggers and hippies. From an urban location, many indicated their parents had beliefs about recycling, but nothing really beyond that. Lacy indicated that her parents were pro environment; they simply like the environment, but were not active in any sort of movement. The parents for both rural and urban location individuals represented an odd spectrum within their beliefs. The urban location parents did not have anything in particular that their environmental beliefs focused on. Either they primarily focused on saving water, not littering and recycling. Or they indicated that their parents did not make their environmental beliefs known.

Along these same lines, I asked how the individual's parent's environmental beliefs were like theirs. I wanted to find out how other elements affected the participants environmental beliefs. I asked the question, if they established their environmental beliefs system from their parents, peer groups (friends) or teachers. This allowed establishing a wide variety of different things that people could indicate what elements had the greatest effect on their environmental beliefs. The majority of the participants indicated that their parents had the greatest affect on

their environmental beliefs. Specifically within the urban location, individuals indicated that it was not so much their entire environmental beliefs, but much more a basic fundamental understanding. Peer groups only seemed to play a factor within those from a rural location. Those from an urban location stated that their peer group mainly did not care about their environmental beliefs. The rural participants stated however many of their peers had an affect or had the greatest amount of affect. Carly stated “All of the above. I grew up in a hippie place, teachers were liberal, and friend’s parent’s beliefs impacted me. I was spoon fed environmental beliefs. Such things as veganism, save the dolphins, those sorts of things.” Teachers also had an impact in both several rural and urban participants. The rural participants indicated that they were home schooled for a portion of their childhood. Therefore, their parents/teachers helped create an understanding. Urban participants such as Paul indicated that as a child in elementary school he could remember having lectures on global warming. One interesting elements that I only witnessed once, was the affect of religion. Lacy indicated that she belonged to the Unitarian Universalism Church, which really affected her childhood beliefs on the environment. Certainly, the many different elements that effect environmental perspectives during primary socialization all play a factor. Urban location individuals all saw their peer group as not having that much of an effect on their perspectives. While in both categories, families (parents) helped, at least establish an understanding.

I began my adult set of questions by asking if the participants spent a lot of time in the environment, and if so what types of activities do they engage in. Many of the participants stated that they spend a lot of time in the environment. They would like to spend more, but unfortunately due to school and other time restraints their time is often limited. If they did spend time in the environment, they stated that they liked to go hiking, walking, surfing and going to the beach. A lot indicated that they do not spend as much time as they would like, and almost presented a sense of guilt about their lack of spending time in the environment. The responses did not differ from urban to rural participants. There was no clear distinction between either of the groups in regards to time spent in the environment. The time restraint however came up a lot among the general population. I contribute this to the sample population being college students. College can take up a large majority of the individual’s time, not allowing for extracurricular activities, such as being involved with nature. The guilt element also is an interesting thing. I did not ask the participants why they felt guilty, none specifically indicated

guilt, and however through their portrayal of body language and inflexion in their voice, it showed a wavering sense about the question.

I asked the individuals if they felt a connection to the natural world and how do they feel connected. Almost all stated yes; they do feel a connection. Many of the urban participants stated it was the location of Humboldt County that made them feel connected. That this location in particular, allowed for an overall connection to the natural world. Yolanda stated “Yes I feel connected, living in Humboldt, you see how beautiful the environment can be and through that I have gained more understanding by living up here.” Paul stated he felt connected, but he had never really thought about it before. His connection was based around the ability and through the self-made idealism of not leaving a spot. Being that he does not want his presence to be felt within the natural world. Timothy from a rural location stated “I see the world as a living thing, humans are like weeds, I think there need to be a coexistence (laughs, you know man and fish), I feel like a weed. I’d much rather be a parasite or a complimentary.” Secondary socialization can be attributed to the location of Humboldt County. Being a very rural area that is surrounded by the natural environment seemed to affect almost all the participants in the aspect of proving a connection. However two participants, Sharon and Jennifer, both from an urban location stated that they don’t necessarily feel a connection. Sharon indicated a far greater sense of respect for the natural world, while Jennifer stated she enjoyed nature, she was just more of a “city girl”. Lauren however stated she feels nature is like a spirit. The level of connection seems to differ from rural and urban participants. Urban individuals feel a connection; however it does not seem to be at the same degree of rural individuals.

I began my set of questions about various environmental issues with one, based around the level of waste created by humans. I chose this question because along with the other questions asked, it would gauge a response that would indicate the individual’s environmental perspectives. The first few participants had trouble with this question. After I noticed a trend, I added the distinction of growing or diminishing. This allowed for participants to approach the question in a much better fashion. All of the participants stated that they saw the level of waste as an increasing factor within the environment. Paul stated “It’s a necessity to maintain our quality of life, so I really have no opinion; I think people however are on a general basis more slobs than they have to be.” Timothy stated that he saw a correlation with becoming more harmful through innovation. Phillip brought up an interesting statement; he stated “People are

retarded, I think within society we are separated from our waste. The term “throw away” is a strange idea. Language plays a large part in it.” Urban and rural individuals did not show a difference between their concepts of waste created by humans. Urban individuals seemed to show a little more understanding within their answers, while rural individuals seemed far more upset through their answers.

When asked how they see the loss of wild life within the natural environment, the majority of participants stated they saw it as a “bad” thing. This was another question that posed a problem; I had to add elements to the questions such as extinction. With this additional clarification it allowed for the individuals to develop an answer. When asked, two urban participants, Yolanda and Crystal both indicated seeing television commercials in which arctic animals are being affected by global warming. Yolanda indicated about the polar bears and Crystal said about the emperor penguins. I also noticed several different answers that pointed towards different aspects. Sharon stated how back home, she see how humans have effected wildlife in the aspect of making squirrels who are no longer scared of humans and actually approach them. Paul saw it through humans expanding, creating encroachment, but he indicated that he does not have enough information to know if this is right or wrong. The various perspectives showed a basic understanding of the extinction of species within the natural environment. Those human causes are the basis for many of these factors. Some indicated, specifically Carely that extinction is not natural, simply fluctuating in populations. In either case, the understanding is that humans have a direct impact on the animals within the natural world.

I followed the question of the loss of wildlife within the environment with the question of, should there be environmental protected land? All of the participants indicated that there should be. They indicated this should be a requirement because as the population grows the need to have land that is not touched is imperative. Marion, stated “In some instance yes, because people are dumb, people are stupid, people need to be informed, because what is the point of protecting it if people are not informed. There needs to be happy medium.” The need for education only came up twice during this particular question. That instead there should be a greater common understanding instead of being forced. But the need for enforcement came up several times. Timothy stated “That there should not simply be a fence around 12 million acres and call it nature. This does not make it nature.” Many of the rural participants indicated they did not see a point to environmentally protected lands if there is not ways to really protect it. It

shows that individuals believe there should be environmentally protected land, but however there is not enough being done to protect this. Christopher stated “I do think there should be environmentally protected land, but it needs to be legally protected. It’s in the natural park motto (the land of many uses). It’s very important, instead of selling it to corporations on the cheap.” This is seen specifically within the rural location population with the exception of one, urban location individual. I’m not sure if there is a specific correlation to rural populations and this answer, due to their location. I can make a generalized assumption that maybe they have seen it firsthand.

When asked about the current issue of ozone loss, I received a wide spectrum of answers. The variety was made around the correlation between the conceptions of it being man-made or a natural occurrence. Many expressed that they did not know that much about it, and those individuals who chose to answer, said that it was a man-made occurrence. Others saw it as a natural progression though it has been helped along by humans. This historical perspective provides an interesting medium to the question. Alyssa stated “I see it as a man made occurrence, maybe if we were living our way back in the day it would not be as bad. Through the growing population and meat industry it has increased. But what it ultimately comes down to is making money, and the environment comes last. I think it’s insane that we have to put on sun block when we go outside.” The conception of ozone loss provided an interesting spectrum; those from a rural environment were far more willing to say it was a man-made occurrence, while those from urban locations stated it was much more a medium occurrence of man-made and natural situations. I’m not sure if this represents a difference in education or location differences. Specifically when looking at this question, there does seem to be a difference between rural and urban understandings of this question.

I wanted to understand what the individual’s perspectives on recycling. Specially looking to see if this was something that have they always done or never done, also looking at whether their parents recycled. There was a sharp contradiction between urban and rural populations. Those from urban location stated that they recycled, but in some cases it was only for the monetary consumption, not necessarily for the environmental benefits. This use of recycling in order to gain money was seen on both a rural and urban sub populations. There however was this awareness of recycling, as not necessarily being the best course for the environment. Daniel stated “Most of the time the stuff is not actually recycled, this is bullshit. This could be

something that could be useful and provide unlimited resources. I have always recycled and my family has always recycled, we would go once a week to the recycling plant.” Location also played a large factor in the establishment of the individual’s environmental beliefs on recycling. Many indicated upon moving to Humboldt, they began recycling or increased recycling much more. Some even stated the composting of items also. Those from a rural population all stated they recycled for most of their life. Those from an urban location, stated either they recycled a little bit, but not as much as they do it now. This is also seen within their parent’s standards upon recycling. Those from an urban location stated, their parents either did not recycle at all, or only a little bit. While the rural population parents recycled a lot more frequently.

The concept of global warming is something that is constantly a part of our lifestyles. So I felt it was fitting that I asked individuals about global warming. I asked if they had heard about it and if so, what have they heard and what do they think about it? This allowed for the participants to indicate their personal beliefs on the concept of global warming. When I asked this question, the majority of the participants laughed at the question or gave me a joking response. Carly stated “Yes, and yes it’s real, Thanks Al Gore!” Daniel stated “No I have not heard of it, of course I have, I’m an American”, and Phillip “Oh man what a pain in the ass, I guess we need to grow oranges in Canada.” It seemed as if the majority of the participants felt it was a funny question. I asked it, because it has become such an engrained part of the American society. I think this can be contributed to the initial answers that I received. This received much of the same spectrum that was seen within ozone layer question. Many felt conflicted between it being man-made or a natural progression. Jennifer stated that she had been exposed to it so much, that her view of global warming was conflicted. Paul however stated “I think global warming is a farce, it’s the natural progression of the earth. I have not seen enough evidence that humans exacerbate the problem. We know climate change happens, it is a fact.” There were various elements that affected this perception of global warming. Individuals within this study seemed extremely conflicted through the various elements of secondary socialization which made them unsure of what is really the right choice. However Paul indicated that global warming is simply the natural progression representing one extreme within the subgroup. While Macy, stated she was from an urban location and that, “I think it is manmade, I believe everything is manmade. I mean look at the penguins in Antarctica. We are trying to fix it with machines; however we could be making it worse at the same time. We should just let nature fix itself.”

While everyone indicated knowing something about global warming, no particular subgroup stood out from the other. There simply seemed to be a great deal of conflicting answers, with only a few individuals specifically believing in one extreme over the other.

I then asked the individuals about the question of forest deforestation. I unknowingly worded this question wrong; some individuals needed me to clarify it. This led to me injecting some other words (such as clear cutting) that corresponded to the concept of deforestation that allowed for participants to establish an answer. All except for one individual stated they did not know what deforestation was. All participants also stated that it is a bad thing that could be prevented through various means. Many participants also made reference to the occurrence of deforestation around the world (i.e. rainforest). The major concepts that were presented were ones based around economical and human expansion. Carly stated “Deforestation occurs when we over log a forest and do not allow for it grow back. This can cause large scale problems such as erosion and soil within the water. I have mixed views about this. I’m like hey stop logging, but not until I get my house built. And when people say the last redwood, I ask them which one? This can be a huge problem, but I think it’s based around the economy and the government in the area.” Christopher stated “It occurs constantly, we have fucked everything up. This makes nature less natural. To quote Sing Chew, we are all fucked.” The mixed idealism between the deforestation seems to be rooted within those who have seen it firsthand. The rural participants indicated it was a bad thing; however in some cases they indicated foresting helps individuals. The common theme is that we need to promote sustainable foresting.

When asked about renewable energy, all the participants indicated that they had heard about it. Several participants indicated specific examples such as solar, wind, wave, geothermal and other various types. A common theme is the idea that it needs to be explored more before we make full use of it. Paul stated “I have heard a lot about renewable energy. I believe that’s because of my location. But we have all heard the same thing.” This correlates to what the population has been exposed to through the various media explorations. However in some cases, those from the urban locations stated that they have heard about it, but do not know that much about it. Some examples were, Yolanda stating that she knew about it, but did not know enough about it. Marion represented an extreme in stating “I think some of its bullshit. I don’t agree with ethanol, but solar energy, wind energy, why are we not doing more. It’s a no brainer.” The response seemed to be based around the conception of needing to have a greater amount of

research done concerning renewable energy. However several participants, especially from the rural sub population indicated that it runs the risk of being capitalized upon like any other energy source. Such as Daniel, who indicated that he believed it was being controlled by corporate interest. The theme of location once again came into correlation with this question. That since we live in Humboldt County, individuals feel like they are more aware of certain aspects of renewable energy and see it as something we should focus on. However they agreed that there needs to be much more research done on it.

I felt like I should ask about the depletion of the rainforest, to add a worldwide issue to the environmental perspective. I did this in order to not allow the assumption that every issue is based directly within the United States (because it can seem like that). With the depletion of the rainforest all stated that it should be stopped, but understood why it takes place. The basis seemed to be rooted in an elementary understanding that the rainforest represented the majority of creation of oxygen on the earth. However, certain individuals felt like there was a much greater connection to it being the United States fault for cutting down of the rainforest. Daniel stated “People in poor countries see it as the only way to get money. It’s our fault. IT’S OUR FAULT!”^{xii} Alyssa stated along the same aspects “I’m a vegetarian and I have heard a lot about this; the clear cutting of the rainforest for cattle to be raised for fast food chains. It’s really sad that for poor countries it is the only way to get income and they have to give up one of their natural resources. I need to respect less economically adapt countries and not do it for Americas profits. It’s like any other ecosystem; it contributes to how the world works.” The overall basis is that the rainforest needs to be saved and not to exploit the resources of other countries. Only one individual, Yolanda, indicated that she was not aware of the situation within the rainforest. The response to this question was not different between rural and urban participants; all seemed unanimous in their answers about this topic.

For my last four questions I shifted from environmental perspective based questions to much more personal statements about the environment. I began my set of question with asking, what do they think about the current state of the environment and how does this differ from when they were a child? I specifically was looking at the establishment of a shift from primary socialization to secondary socialization. I wanted to see if their environmental perspectives about the state of the environment had changed at all. All excluding two stated that the environment was in a declining state, and they had witnessed some degree of change from when they were a

child. Paul and Sharon from the urban sub population stated that the environment was the same. Paul stated “I think the environment is fine, I mean we don’t really know how it doing. Through history we have seen shifts in the environment, the mini ice age for example. The biggest thing I have seen since a child is the encroachment of the human population on wildlife.” Sharon stated “I see the environment as getting better since I was a child; however we are making more pollution.” All of the other participants indicated that the environment was in a sort of declining state, almost a dire straits situation. And that something major needs to be done in order to correct the situation. Jennifer stated she would not know about this, if it were not for Humboldt County, because she stated “It’s always in your face”. The common theme of location also plays a factor in their answers. Those from the urban population see the environment as something much less in trouble.

I asked my participants if they consider themselves environmentalists. This is a question that received various degrees of answers due to allowing individuals to assume their own definitions as to what it means to be an environmentalist. Within the entire population there were varying degrees of what it meant to be an environmentalist. A common theme however was the level of “radicalism” or “extremism”. To several individuals within the study population, an environmentalist was seen as an extreme member of society; someone who cares deeply to an obsessive level for the environment. But within the population, there was a sense of being moderate within your environmental actions, while still trying to make a difference. Yolanda stated “I’m not a hardcore environmentalist, not like those people in CCAT^{xiii}; they’re crazy, jumping on a bike to make a smoothie, no thank you. But, as I am somewhat of an environmentalist; I try and keep environmentally friendly through buying organic and buying sweat shop free clothes.” Marion stated “No, I’m not an environmentalist. I would not sit in a tree. An environmentalist is someone who makes the environment their biggest issue. It’s not hugely important to myself establishment. I would side more with the conservationist over the liberals. All I have seen is crap laws passed.” The idea of not being an environmentalist, but rather a conservationist came up several times. Paul also indicated he is much more a conversationalist over an environmentalist. Adam also had a correlation; he stated he was an environmentalist, not an activist. The overall basic establishment about labeling oneself an environmentalist seems to be around the level of degree for the environment. That it simply was not a passion (however some who stated they were an environmentalist, also said it was because

of their passion for the environment), but the active measures that people take for the environment. An element that several of the urban population pointed to was almost a sense of guilt for not doing more. This was seen within their answers, body language and voice. The idealism that they felt guilty for not doing more for the environment and should not therefore, call them an environmentalist. Many stated that they were both too lazy and too busy to put forth effort towards the environment. In turn the individuals indicated to an extreme of what it means to be an environmentalist that they set themselves apart from it, in order to make an establishment of what an environmentalist is.

When I asked the participants if their views on the environment have changed since they were a child and now, they all stated their views of the environment had changed. The overall perception about their environmental views was based on gaining a sense of awareness that was not present when they were a child. As children many indicated that they had rudimentary conceptions about the environment along with their perceptions of the environment. However as adult, they became aware to many problems, their situation within the environment and ways to solve it. It has moved from being a background issue to much more of a foreground issue, as stated by Paul. The overall conception of knowledge is also present. Through the process of learning more based on classes and location; it has made them more aware of the environment. With awareness, Daniel and Lacy indicated that they had become much more extreme in their idealisms about the environment. They stated that their perceptions of the environment have widened and are not as narrow as they were as a child. I have gained the ability to become more conscious and more caring towards the environment, Jennifer stated. The overall conception of awareness has made the greatest shift in the participant's environmental views.

I finished off the interviews with a final question of asking how they (the participant) would prefer to see the environment treated. All stated the generalized answer of, better. Some answers ranged from an increase in education needs to be much more engrained in order to make the environment better; to just letting the environment be treated with respect. The majority stated the word respect within their answers. Meaning, that they felt like the environment had not been treated well and had been abused by humans. There needs to be a much larger degree of love towards the environment, with the idea that humans should come second to the environment. However Paul stated "I think the environment should be treated better but not at the cost of humans. Human life is far more important than the environment." There was also a

feeling that our local area needs to stay the way it is. Daniel stated that Humboldt needed to stay Humboldt, because it represented a way for humans to live with nature.

Summary:

The overall findings from my research showed that between urban and rural participants, their environmental perspectives were changed by secondary socialization. Primary socialization allowed for a basic understanding. It provided a first glance at nature and the conceptual understandings of environmental perspectives. This was reinforced through family, institutions, location elements, peer groups and education. All these elements were seen throughout this pilot study. The effects of the individuals allowed for a groundwork basis for environmental perspectives to be established and made for an understanding connection as a child. As a child, the participants may not have been aware of many environmental issues, however they did have an overall fundamental respect and base line understanding. Through play, outdoor activities and various other nature oriented situations, a child was able to witness nature at their perspective. If nature consisted of a man-made park, back yard, or the woods, it gave the participants as children a conceptualization of the environment. These activities seemed to play a major role in their establishment. In most cases the individuals referred back to these moments when thinking about childhood environmental ideals. With this particular sample population, it seemed as if parents played the largest role in both urban and rural location participants. Through an authoritative figurehead, they passed on basic environmental idealisms through example (such as recycling and not littering). These I think are what really affected the primary socialization as a child. However it seems the majority of these were either strengthened or remained the same when introduced to secondary socialization.

Secondary socialization occurs within the population is the location of Humboldt County and the institution of Humboldt State University. These are the main effects on the environmental perspective of the participants. The location of Humboldt County came up several times throughout the interview process. With regards to the various environmental issues and perspectives, it showed that it had a fairly significant impact on several participants; specifically those from an urban location. The location of Humboldt County played a factor within the establishing of secondary socialization. Many stated that because of Humboldt they had started recycling and being more aware. That the location also provided other various elements that had

increased their environmental perspectives. Classes, peers, and the educational factors that Humboldt State University provided, was associated in their secondary socialization.

Synthesis:

Does rural or urban location (place) affect environmental perspective? Specifically, I was looking at the elements of primary and secondary socialization to see the effects of physical location on perspective. With the examination of Humboldt State Students within the age range of 18-24, this allowed for a captive population that was easily accessible. It provided a wide degree of participants from various locations and backgrounds. In both locations of Urban and Rural participants I wanted to examine the elements that affected their environmental perspectives. With examining the elements of socialization such as family, education, institutions, and other socialization elements; this would show the impact they have on the establishment of the individual within society. But these elements not only affect the conception and beliefs of the individual, but also affect the individual's ideals and ideological understanding about the environment. The theoretical constructs primary and secondary socialization are what allowed for the establishment of the methodological aspects.

The sociological theories of Symbolic Interactionism by George Herbert Mead, Ethnomethodology by Harold Garfinkel, George Simmel and Max Weber examine face to face interactions as well as in and out group interactions. These all helped establish the methodological approach to this entail pilot study. Symbolic Interactionism is of major importance because it is based around people's interaction with objects within their environment and establishes meanings based on community. The application of this theory is used in order to understand how people establish and contribute their environmental perspective (beliefs) based on their community and location. Symbolically an individual from a rural location would approach the natural world differently then someone from an urban location. These both represent different community aspects within the world and how they approach nature. The basis of beliefs and perspectives being is rooted within the community that the individual takes place in. This dictated basis was how I approached my study, in that it allowed for a general overarching theory that could be applied to the research question. Along with Symbolic Interactionism, Ethnomethodology, gave a conscience macro/micro link theory that could be

applied to my research question. Specially looking at how individuals portray their understandings through shared meanings. This looked at a connection the urban and rural communities through shared conceptions about the natural environment. This provided the basis in which there could be established conceptual meanings.

The conception of socialization is specifically what I was trying to examine. Looking at if primary socialization has a much greater hold over secondary socialization based on the individuals location. Socialization based around the agents of education, family, media, and institutions. Simmel looked at this application of how the individual acquires ideological habits, beliefs and values. The aspects of primary socialization allowed for the establishment of a childhood perspective. These provide the basis in which we form the rest of our conceptual working of the world. The basis is helped by the agents within socialization, but I would also argue that location (place) also contributes this overall socialization. These in turn allows for the application of secondary socialization. This often takes place when the individual is older and is introduced to a new social or environmental change. In the case of this pilot study, Humboldt State University. Humboldt State University, along with the societal conception of Humboldt County, provides the agents in which causes secondary socialization. This is also affected by Erving Goffman's theoretical conception of Total Institutions. The Total Institution being an institution that is isolated socially from the majority of the population and provides an element of re-socialization. This could be seen within a prison, the military or religious convent. I also argue that higher educational institutions such as Humboldt State University, provides this agent of re-socialization. The promotion of secondary socialization in turn affects the population that attends a total institution. These elements however were not seen within the literature that surrounded the topics of environmental perspective, urban versus rural, or various other aspects approached in this study.

Within the literature review, there are several things that should be addressed. When examining the literature based around the environment, there is not an exact study that looks at the perception of the natural world between urban and rural locations. Likewise there is no real literature that looks at the correlation between childhood environmental perceptions and adult ideological differences. There is no exact study that is quite like this one. This provided a problem in trying to establish a basis in which to approach this research. The application of the rural and urban locations differentiations is what sets a part this pilot study from any other

literature. There are some that look at the perspectives of the environment from a childhood location of urban and rural, but however these studies don't look at secondary socialization. The basis in which provided a fundamental adherence to my study design. The biggest issue approached by the literature is simply the lack thereof. There is some literature that looks at the different aspects that surrounded my pilot study, but nothing that fit into it exactly. With this, there is also a lack of literature based within America. The most extensive literature is based within a European aspect, which is noted, but I feel they represent a completely different paradigm than what I was trying to accomplish. Within Europe, there is a far greater amount of literature around the children's environmental perspectives and specially looking at urban and rural populations. However, in many cases it is not even rural populations but may simply look at the extent within the urban populous. Within the literature I examined I also noted that a large degree was based around environmental education and other various conceptions about children. These are not rooted within statistical data. Such elements as David Sobel's work, David Orr and various other authors don't appear to have hard evidence to back up their claims. It is much more based around assumptions and correlations. These issues within the literature are what prompted me to approach my methodological study the way I did.

The way I approached this pilot study, methodologically, provided the best capability to examine this research question. Within the examination of the theory involved, it made me realize that the best methodical approach was face to face interviews. The application of another from, such as focus groups, survey, or anything qualitative method would have not yielded the best results. Specifically, I referred to Weber and Mead's approach, which was based on the extension of face to face interactions in order to gather data. The use of qualitative data collection allowed for the gathering of in-depth data that showed a correlation to the secondary and primary socialization aspects. Since there was no real scientific process that could be used with this pilot study, I utilized grounded theory. I started out with a basic research question and in turn focused on trying to find the best possible way to gather the data.

With the agent of socialization being primarily what I was trying to examine, this affected the questions that I asked. I wanted to see how agents of socialization affected primary and secondary socialization. Through the application of the questions within my interview and survey portions, I was able to convey the establishment of socialization within the population. These findings are what led to the basic disagreements within the literature.

The research I found had an element of disagreement within the literature. From what I discovered, urban youth don't seem disconnected from the natural world as much as the literature would suggest. From what I noticed, they may not spend as much time or have the "deepest" connection with the natural world. However they still find a way to spend time within nature. This is seen within the application of visitation to parks, the play within a backyard, or various other aspects. So the massive amount of alienation that is naturally assumed by the literature around urban youth is in disagreement with my research. Simply because a child does not have a location based within a natural setting does not eliminate their environmental perspectives. Often, other forms of agents such as parents, further this understanding of the environment. Such elements such as environmental education, the establishment of self in place, and bioregionalism, all fail to look at the application toward urban establishments. I however would argue that urban establishments provide the same sentiment that rural communities do, just not in the same natural aspect of the environment.

Conclusion:

The pilot study Urban versus Rural: Does locations affect environmental perspective; yielded interesting results. Through the population of Humboldt State Students ages 18-24, showed a basic consensus. Of the total sample population of 16, divided into rural and urban sub populations, there were establishments of environmental understandings between both. It appears that primary and secondary socialization played a large factor within the establishment of environmental ideals. The basic underlying establishments of both sub population allowed for the frame work of environment beliefs to be established. Simply because an individual is raised within an urban population does not mean their location diminishes their environmental perspective. Such agents such as parents, institutions and media all contribute the primary socialization of youth's ideals towards the environment. The biggest agents of socialization within both rural and urban participants were the parents. Parents seemed to provide the construct of the environmental foundations within the participants. This was noticeable through their indication of ideals around recycling, littering, or in their beginning awareness of the environment.

Of the environmental issues, discussed the majority stated that they knew about the various issues posed. All offered answers towards the environment around the basis of at least a

primary understanding of the issues. Many showed a wide and knowledgeable application of understanding towards the issues. The aspect of global warming provided the widest degree of answers towards the application of it being man made or a natural occurrence. Some laughed at the application of this question due to its context within the American culture. However, only in a few instances did any participants not know about the environmental issues I asked them. This in turn shows a large degree of awareness among the individuals that I interviewed. This consequently represented the greatest aspect that many stated had changed from their childhood.

The application of awareness was the greatest aspect that many participants indicated that they had seen change in their environmental perspectives. This was seen in their knowledge of the environmental issues posed. The awareness of their power and ability within the world, that they had the ability to change and help the environment. So that issues of global warming, renewable energy, deforestation, among others, has become much more prevalent within the minds of society.

From the data collected, it showed that between urban and rural individuals, there lied no real difference in environmental perspectives. This is due to secondary socialization. The agents of Humboldt State University and the location of Humboldt County, all provided the establishment of re-socialization. Attending Humboldt State University and its locale, has affected their degree of understanding the environment and their environmental perspectives. The locale was a common theme among many of the answers stated by the participants. This in turn shows the power of socialization. Those from a rural location had their environmental beliefs strengthened by the socialization of Humboldt. While urban individuals, gained or established brand new beliefs based on this socialization. This furthers shows the extent in which secondary socialization takes place.

Recommendations:

My recommendation is that the inference of the childhood location affecting an individual's environmental perspective needs to be further studied. This initial study has shown the degree in which socialization affects individuals. Additional research will show a much greater understanding of the individuals within society, as well as their environmental understandings. However, I would also recommend that the application of the questions used in this survey be altered to account for a broader understanding concerning agents of socialization.

This was a common occurrence within the application of this pilot study. The need to reformulate certain questions within the interview process are needed, in order to improve on the answers. This research has really shown me the power that certain sociological agents have on individuals. I hope that this research has contributed a greater understanding of the individual in regards to environment perspective based on location and that it has had an overall contribution to society.

ⁱ Steadman's article should be pointed out that it does not examine the connection from the childhood perspective of sense of place to the adult perspective. This is relative when examining this source for my research. The adult perspective of sense of place plays a factor in environmental perspectives. It is thus needed in order to make the connection that adults have a sense of place that is relative to the environmental location. In turn Steadman, alludes to the connection being based around a socially constructed sense of place, and does not necessarily have anything to do with the physical locality of place.

ⁱⁱ It is important to point out that within this study, although it has little to do with environment (ecology, it does allow for a perception of an urban environment. Though the environment may be from a natural or built perspective, it is still considered an environment. That in both cases it can affect the individual. For a greater understanding, it would be important to link this sense of alienation not only to an urban setting but to see if within a natural environment alienation along with powerlessness is a theme.

ⁱⁱⁱ For more information see, Baland, Jean-Marie and Jean-Philippe Platteau. 1996. *Halting Degradation of Natural Resources: Is there a Role for Rural Communities?* Oxford: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and Clarendon Press.

^{iv} For more explanations about Theory towards environmental perspective, see my methods section

^v Yale Environmental Perspective Survey www.loe.org/images/070316/yalepole.doc

^{vi} For survey instrument used in research please see Appendix 1

^{vii} The full list can be found within the survey

^{viii} For a copy of consent form see Appendix 3

^{ix} For the list of questions used in research please see Appendix 2

^x This shows the confinement within nature that within an urban setting, children are exposed to. Nature is confined to parks and other man made constructions. This makes the assumption of nature as child, not really "nature". The idea of construction also plays a large factor. Rural participants stated building forts or other structures within nature. This could be almost seen as a domestication of nature. Making it a part of the child's environment, allowing for the child to create their own kind of confines around the natural environment in order to create a connection. The creation of a structure within nature, or nature within a structure is an interesting topic that this should be explored more.

^{xi} An interesting thing that I noticed is that two male participants, Phillip and Daniel, indicated violent activities as children within nature. Both stated that they would play with their friends, army and engage in "killing the enemy". The correlation to violence and nature is an interesting construction. How that nature is associated with activities such as war? This could be assumed through a media portrayal of soldiers within a natural setting engaged in active warfare. The association with nature and violence seems to be one based around gender roles. Boys go out into the forest and play war, while the girls stay close to the house and garden. These basic gender roles are seen within the playing within nature, and could very well effect how individuals as children see the natural environment. This is seen within Richard Louv's book *The Last Child in the Woods*.

^{xii} Capitalization added for the added emotional expression indicated by participants interviewed statement.

^{xiii} CCAT is located on Humboldt State University in Arcata, California. It stands for Campus Center for Applied Technologies. Its focus to the serve the campus as well as the surrounding community with providing human needs with the least impact on the Earth.

7. Many of the same people I know share the same beliefs about the environment

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
Disagree			Neutral			Agree	No Answer

8. I have seen my beliefs on the environment change over time

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
Disagree			Neutral			Agree	No Answer

9. The environment has played an important role in my life

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
Disagree			Neutral			Agree	No Answer

Appendix 2

Questions for interview:

1. What is your oldest memory of the nature?
2. How much, if any time did you spend in nature as a child?
3. What were your environmental conditions like as a child, in an urban or rural setting?
 - a. Did it allow their interactions with nature and the environment as a child (For example hiking, camping, hunting, fishing, farming, etc.?)
4. As a child, how close or how far was your home from a natural environment (not manmade)?
5. As a child what were your parent's environmental beliefs like?
6. Do you feel as a child, you established your environmental ideals/understanding from your parents, peer group (friends) or teachers?
7. As an adult, do you spend a lot of time in the environment?
 - a. If so, what kind's nature oriented activities?
8. As an adult do you feel a connection to the natural world?
 - a. If so, how do you feel connected?
9. How do you see the level of waste created by humans?
10. How do you see the loss of wild life within the natural environment?
11. Do you believe there should be environmentally protected land?
 - a. If so why?
12. What are your current views on ozone loss?
13. What are you current views on recycling?
 - a. Have you always done it or never done it? Did their parents recycle?
14. Have you heard about global warming?
 - a. If so what have you heard and what do you think about it?

15. Have you heard about forest deforestation?
 - a. If so what have you heard and what do you think about it?
16. Have you heard of renewable energy?
 - a. If so what have you heard and what do you think about it?
17. Have you heard about the depilation of the rainforest?
 - a. If so what have you heard and what do you think about it?
18. What do you think about the current state of the environment?
 - a. How does this differ from when you where a child?
19. Do you consider yourself an “environmentalist”?
 - a. If so why and how?
20. As an adult how do you think your views of the environment have changed since you were a child and if so, how?
21. How would you prefer to see the environment treated?

Appendix 3

Consent Form:

Principal Investigator: Brandon M. Shaffer

Title of Study: Urban vs. Rural: Environmental Perspective Based on Location

You are invited to participate in this interview. I am interested in finding out your views about the environment based on where you were raised as a child.

Your participation in this study will require participation in an interview and a small survey. This should take approximately **30 minutes to a 1 hour** of your time. Your participation will be confidential and you will/will not be contacted again in the future. You will not be paid for being in this study. This focused interview does not involve any foreseeable risk to you and there are no direct benefits. However, the benefits of your participation may impact society by helping understand how location plays a factor in environmental perspective.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. I will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact me, at **brandonsha@gmail.com**. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Humboldt State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (707) 826-3949. An IRB is a group of people that reviews research studies to make sure that participant rights and safety are protected.

Thank you in advance for you participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Brandon M. Shaffer

References

- Baland, Jean-Marie and Jean-Philippe Platteau. 1996. *Halting Degradation of Natural Resources: Is there a Role for Rural Communities?* Oxford: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and Clarendon Press.
- Basso, Steven Feld and Keith H. 1996. "Senses of Place." Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Bogner, Franz X. and Michael Wiseman. 1997. "Environmental Perception of Rural and Urban Pupils." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 17:111-122.
- Brody, Samuel D, Sammy Zahran, Arnold Vedlizt and Himanshu Grover. 2008. "Examining the Relationship between Physical Vulnerability and Public Perceptions of Global Climate Change in the United States" *Environment and Behavior* 40.
- Devall, Bill. 1988. *Simple in Means, Rich in Ends: Practicing Deep Ecology*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs-Smith Publisher.
- Dunlap, Riley E., Frederick H. Buttel, Peter Dickens, and August Gijswijt. 2002. "Sociological Theory and the Environment: Classical Foundations, Contemporary Insights." New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Eisenhauer, Brian W. Richard S. Krannich and Dale J. Blahna. 2000. "Attachments to Special Places on Public Lands: An Analysis of Actovotes, Reason for Attachments, and Community Connections." *Society and Natural Resources* 13:421-441.
- Evans, Gary W., Gernot Brauchle, Aliya Haq, Rachel Stecker, Kimberly Wong, and Elan Shapiro. 2007. "Young Children's Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors." *Environment and Behavior* 39:635-659.
- Ewert, A., G. Place, and J. Sibthorp. 2005. "Early Life Outdoor Experiences and an Individual's Environmental Attitudes." *Leisure Sciences* 27:225-239.
- Frantz, Cynathia, F. Stephan Mayer, Chelsey Norton and Mindia Rock. 2005. "There is no "I" in nature: The influence of self-awareness on Connectedness to Nature." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 25:427-436.
- Geis, Karlyn J. and Catherine E. Ross. 1998. "A New Look at Urban Alienation: The Effect of Neighborhood Disorder on Perceived Powerlessness." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61:232-246.
- Gibson, Johanna. 2006. "Community in Resources, Tradition in Knowledge." *Critical Studies* 28:173-206.

- Giuliani, Antonella Rissotto and M. Vittoria. 2006. "Learning neighborhood environments: the loss of experience in a modern world." in *Children and Their Environments: Learning, Using and Designing Spaces*, edited by M. B. C. P. Spencer. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gould, Allan Schnaiberg and Kenneth Alan. 1994. *Environment and Society*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Hannigan, John. 2006. *Environmental Sociology*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Hyun, Eunsook. 2005. "How is young children's intellectual culture of perceiving nature different from adults'?" *Environmental Education Research* 11:199-214.
- Kahn, Jr. Peter H. 2002. "Children's affiliations with Nature: Structure, Development, and the Problem of Environmental Generation Amnesia." *Children and Nature*: 93-116.
- Manoli, Constantinos C., Bruce Johnson, and Riley E. Dunlap. 2007. "Assessing Children's Environmental Worldviews: Modifying and Validating the New Ecological Paradigm Scale for Use With Children." *The Journal of Environmental Education* 36:48.
- Medin, Scott Atran and Douglas. 2008. *The Native Mind and the Cultural Construction of Nature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Michelson, Rieley E. Dunlap and William. 2002. "Handbook of Environmental Sociology." Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Mugerauer, Robert. 1995. *Interpreting Environments: Tradition, Deconstruction, and Hermeneutics*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Orr, David W. 1992. *Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- . 1994. *Earth in Mind: On Education, Environment, and the Human Prospect*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Petegem, Peter Van and An Blicck. 2006. "The Environmental worldview of Children: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Environmental Education Research* 12:625-635.
- Schultz, P. Wesley and Jennifer Tabanico. 2007. "Self, Identity and the Natural Environment: Exploring Implicit Connections with Nature." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 37:1219-1247.
- Sessions, George. 1995. "Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century." Boston: Shambhala.
- Shepard, Paul Shepard and Florence R. 2003. *Where We Belong: Beyond Abstraction in Perceiving Nature*. Athens GA: University of Georgia Press.

- Sobel, David. 1996. *Beyond Ecophobia: reclaiming the heart in nature education*. Great Barrington, MA: Orion Society.
- Taylor, Bron. 2000. "Bioregionalism: An Ethic of Loyalty to Place." *Landscape Journal* 19:50-72.
- Thompson, Catharine Ward, Peter Aspinall, and Alicia Montarzino. 2007. "The Childhood Factor: Adult Visits to Green Places and Significance of Childhood Experience." *Environment and Behavior* 40:111-143.
- Tuan, Yi-Fun. 1990. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perceptions, Attitudes, and Values*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Van den Berg, Agnes E, Terry Hartig, Henk Staats. 2007. "Preference for Nature in Urbanized Societies: Stress, Restorations, and the Pursuit of Sustainability." *Journal of Social Issues* 63.