



**UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA**

INSTITUTE FOR  
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

**Transportation Issues in Central Florida:  
A Survey of Public Opinion 2013**

ADDENDUM: CROSS TABULATIONS

James D. Wright, Director

Sara M. Strickhouser, Project Manager

July 2013

The following is an addendum to the report “Transportation Issues in Central Florida: A Survey of Public Opinion 2013” distributed to MetroPlan Orlando in June 2013. The analysis reported here focuses on cross-tabulations between various respondent characteristics and particular opinion items from the telephone survey. (No analysis of the internet respondents is included here.) The text describes the statistically significant relationships that were discovered in the analysis. These analyses begin to describe the social contours of transportation opinions across the Central Florida region.

The overall results: (1) There are occasional significant, but relatively small, differences between women and men. (2) There are more regular, and generally larger, differences by age and education; age differences in attitudes towards taking the bus are particularly striking. But (3) by far the largest, most consistent and most interesting differences are by trust in government, with the less trusting by far the least supportive of all transportation initiatives and methods to fund them. Details follow.

### **General opinions on transportation and funding**

*How important are transportation issues to you and your family?*

Residents were asked about how important they feel transportation issues are to them and their families. The initial report explained that a majority (65%) of people feel transportation issues are very important particularly to them and their families. Further analysis here showed that there is a significant difference in how men and women answered this question, as well as how different age groups answered the question. There is a difference of 10.4 percentage points between men and women, with more women (70%) responding that transportation issues are very important to them. Age also played a role in the way people answered. People ages 18-35 had the highest percentage of respondents feeling that transportation issues were very important (68%). People 36-64 reported the next highest percentage (66%) and only 55% of respondents 65 and up reported that transportation issues were very important. These patterns are likely linked to differences by age in labor force participation.

*Would you say that generally, government spends too much, too little, or about the right amount on transportation?*

There are significant differences in the way more and less educated people responded to this question as well as significant differences among those who trust government more and less. Those with more education feel government spends too little 10 percent more often than those with less education. Those with less education, in turn, are more likely to feel that government spends too much on transportation.

As would be expected, those with the lowest trust in government and elected officials have the highest percentage feeling that the government spends too much on transportation. Ironically, this group also has the highest percentage who feel the government spends *too little*. Clearly, for those whose trust in government is low, government can't do *anything* right!

*What is now being done to improve our transportation system is adequate to address our problems.*

Transportation issues are important to residents. Yet, the majority does not feel enough is being done to address the transportation issues that plague the area. Here, there was also a significant difference in responses by both age and education. The youngest respondents, age 18-35, had the highest percent that agreed that, yes, enough is being done (42.9%). Only 22.8% and 25.5% of those 35-64 and 65 and up, respectively, agreed that enough is being done. While 80% of those categorized as more educated answered that not enough is being done to improve transportation issues, only 62% of those less educated answered that not enough is now being done.

And there is again a significant difference across categories of trust. The trust in government categories were calculated using questions that originally asked respondents to rate, on a scale of 1 to 4, how much they trusted local elected officials, state elected officials, federal elected officials and government in general. These four ratings were combined to create one score summing all questions regarding trust in government. This one score is divided into three categories of high, medium, and low levels of trust in government.

Those with a low level of general trust in government disagreed 76% of the time that government is currently doing enough to address transportation issues. Those with high levels of trust in government were split nearly 50-50. Again, those with low trust in government exhibit a generalized feeling that government does nothing right.

### **How best to solve traffic congestion**

Citizens were asked to say if they agreed strongly, agreed, disagreed or disagreed strongly with each of four statements about how to reduce congestion. The characteristics that showed significant differences were age and education. One question also showed significant differences with those at different levels of trust in government.

*1. Some people say the only realistic solution to transportation and congestion issues in the region is to stop building highways and instead invest in public transportation – like passenger rail and bus systems.*

Here, the only characteristic that proved to make a significant difference in how the question was answered was age. Those age 65 and up had the lowest rate who agreed strongly with the statement at 10.7% and highest rate of those who disagreed strongly with the statement at 12.6%. Rather surprisingly, public transportation seems to appeal less to the elderly than to other age groups.

*2. Others think that the only real solution to congestion is to add lanes to widen the highways.*

Opinions here differed significantly by education and trust in government. 56.1% of the less educated citizens agreed that adding lanes is the only real solution to congestion while only 44.4% of the more educated citizens agreed. And those with the highest levels of trust in

government agreed most often that widening highways is the only real solution. This may indicate that those with high levels of trust in government feel more assured that a project like adding lanes will get done more efficiently and cost-effectively than someone with less trust in government.

*3. Some say that the congestion problem would be largely solved if we did a better job managing traffic emergencies – for example, in clearing accidents, removing debris, and the like.*

Both education and age are significant predictors of opinions on managing traffic emergencies. More educated citizens disagree 45% of the time with this statement while less educated citizens disagree only a quarter of the time (26.4%). Although those in different age categories answered similarly, those with the highest percent agreeing strongly that managing traffic emergencies would solve congestion was the youngest cohort, age 18-35. The age group 65 and up was most likely to disagree strongly with this statement.

*4. Some say the remedy for congestion is to better manage the operations side of the transportation system with technology, such as traffic light timing, variable tolls or electronic message boards and congestion advisories.*

Only age showed a significant difference in how citizens answered. In this case, both younger and older respondents agreed with this statement, but older respondents agreed slightly more often.

## **Taking the bus**

Questions were asked specifically about bus usage and what it would take for citizens to take the bus more often. Education, age and trust in government all showed significant differences in these questions.

*I would be more likely to use the bus system if the service went more places.*

Young people and less educated citizens were significantly more likely to take the bus if it went more places. The group least likely to do so – again, somewhat counter-intuitively – was the elderly. And there were also differences by political trust, with the least trusting less likely to say they would take the bus than the more trusting.

*I would be more likely to use the bus system if wait times were decreased.*

Age and education were, again, the only significant correlates. An enormous majority of 80% of those 18 to 35 agreed with this sentiment. Those 65 and up were least likely to agree. Thus, on both questions included in this survey, elderly people express the least interest in using the bus even if the bus went more places and had lower waiting times. The sources of elderly hesitance call out for further research. Is this mainly an economic issue, a concern for personal safety, an issue of buses being inconvenient for the mobility-limited, or what?

## How to fund transportation

The survey contained an entire battery of items on funding alternatives for transportation projects. There were a few differences by age, education and gender in the responses to these questions, all of which are summarized below. But the big story here is political trust: Those who were least trusting of government were more opposed to or disapproving of *every funding alternative we asked about*. Obviously, if you don't trust government in the first place, then you don't trust them with your money either, no matter how it is raised.

*Toll road revenues should be used to help pay for public transportation like bus and rail?*

Education, age and trust in government were all significantly related to responses to this question. More educated citizens, the elderly, and the politically distrustful were *most* likely to disagree with this statement.

*Improving Central Florida's transportation system means we will have to increase funding, through taxes and/or fees.*

Only trust in government was related to responses to this question, with the least trustful least likely to agree.

*Several funding options are available to address the growing gap between transportation needs and available revenue. I'll read you a list of things that have been suggested to help meet transportation needs and for each one, you tell me whether you would strongly approve, approve, disapprove or strongly disapprove of using that approach to finance transportation solutions.*

As noted, trust in government was a significant predictor of responses to all of the following questions, the least trustful being the least likely to approve of any funding measures.

*Increase the gasoline tax?*

Education, gender, and trust in government were significant. More educated respondents, men, and the more trustful were *more* likely to approve of an increase in the gasoline tax.

*Increase the sales tax?*

Only trust in government predicted the responses. Those with low trust were more likely to disapprove.

*Increase property taxes?*

Increasing property taxes to fund transportation is not very popular with anyone, but the highest disapproval is registered among the elderly and those with the lowest level of trust in the government.

*Increase the number of toll roads?*

Again, only trust in government predicted the responses. Those with the lowest level of trust were, as always, more likely to disapprove.

*Raise tolls on existing toll roads to pay for other types of transportation such as bus or rail projects?*

The highest rate of approval here comes from the youngest category (18-35) while the highest rate of disapproval comes from the oldest category (65+). And those with the lowest level of trust in the government were more likely to disapprove than those with medium or high levels of trust.

*Increase tag, title and registration fees?*

This is the only question where employment status (being in or out of the labor force) showed a significant difference. 60% of those in the labor force disagreed with increasing tag, title and registration while among those not in the labor force, 71% disagree. And true to form, government distrusters were more likely to disapprove.

## Cross Tabulations

**Q1 - How important are transportation issues to you and your family? Would you say these issues are: \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Very important	67.0%	59.1%	64.5%
Somewhat important	24.9%	29.4%	26.3%
Not too important	6.5%	7.9%	7.0%
Not important at all	1.7%	3.6%	2.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.209 <sup>a</sup>	3	.102
Likelihood Ratio	6.009	3	.111
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.605	1	.018
N of Valid Cases	791		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.73.

**Q1 - How important are transportation issues to you and your family? Would you say these issues are: \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Very important	65.5%	63.6%	64.5%
Somewhat important	25.3%	27.3%	26.3%
Not too important	6.8%	7.1%	7.0%
Not important at all	2.4%	2.0%	2.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.581 <sup>a</sup>	3	.901
Likelihood Ratio	.581	3	.901
Linear-by-Linear Association	.071	1	.790
N of Valid Cases	787		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.21.



**Q1 - How important are transportation issues to you and your family? Would you say these issues are: \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

		age recoded into three groups			Total
		18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
	Very important	67.6%	65.6%	54.5%	64.6%
	Somewhat important	27.2%	25.6%	28.2%	26.4%
	Not too important	4.7%	7.1%	10.0%	6.8%
	Not important at all	0.5%	1.7%	7.3%	2.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.109 <sup>a</sup>	6	.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.316	6	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.100	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	791		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.36.

**Q1 - How important are transportation issues to you and your family? Would you say these issues are: \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

	rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
	Male	Female	
Very important	59.5%	69.9%	64.7%
Somewhat important	31.4%	21.3%	26.3%
Not too important	7.3%	6.3%	6.8%
Not important at all	1.8%	2.5%	2.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.808 <sup>a</sup>	3	.008
Likelihood Ratio	11.862	3	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.737	1	.053
N of Valid Cases	790		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.50.

**Q1 - How important are transportation issues to you and your family? Would you say these issues are: \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

	trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Very important	67.1%	63.8%	65.1%	64.5%
Somewhat important	28.6%	27.0%	24.5%	26.4%
Not too important	2.9%	7.5%	7.3%	6.9%
Not important at all	1.4%	1.8%	3.1%	2.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.100 <sup>a</sup>	6	.663
Likelihood Ratio	4.513	6	.639
Linear-by-Linear Association	.648	1	.362
N of Valid Cases	792		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.50.

**Q4 - Would you say that generally, government spends too much, too little, or about the right amount on transportation? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

		employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
		in labor force	not in labor force	
	Too much	10.4%	16.4%	12.3%
	Too little	65.4%	62.1%	64.4%
	About right	24.2%	21.5%	23.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.307 <sup>a</sup>	2	.070
Likelihood Ratio	5.090	2	.078
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.427	1	.064
N of Valid Cases	702		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.83.

**Q4 - Would you say that generally, government spends too much, too little, or about the right amount on transportation? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Too much	15.1%	9.7%	12.3%
Too little	59.8%	68.6%	64.3%
About right	25.1%	21.7%	23.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.101 <sup>a</sup>	2	.029
Likelihood Ratio	7.119	2	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	.180	1	.672
N of Valid Cases	698		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.64.

**Q4 - Would you say that generally, government spends too much, too little, or about the right amount on transportation? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Too much	14.3%	10.8%	15.4%	12.3%
Too little	58.7%	68.8%	56.0%	64.4%
About right	27.0%	20.4%	28.6%	23.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.993 <sup>a</sup>	4	.061
Likelihood Ratio	8.925	4	.063
Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.891
N of Valid Cases	706		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.21.

**Q4 - Would you say that generally, government spends too much, too little, or about the right amount on transportation? \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

	rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
	Male	Female	
Too much	12.4%	12.3%	12.3%
Too little	65.3%	63.5%	64.4%
About right	22.3%	24.2%	23.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.359 <sup>a</sup>	2	.836
Likelihood Ratio	.359	2	.836
Linear-by-Linear Association	.221	1	.638
N of Valid Cases	705		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.31.

**Q4 - Would you say that generally, government spends too much, too little, or about the right amount on transportation? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

	trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
	govt			
	High	Medium	Low	
Too much	12.5%	9.2%	17.2%	12.2%
Too little	56.3%	63.7%	68.1%	64.5%
About right	31.3%	27.1%	14.7%	23.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.862 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.457	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.629	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	704		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.82.



**Q11a – Some people say the only realistic solution to transportation and congestion issues in the region is to stop building highways and instead invest in public transportation \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	17.4%	20.1%	18.3%
Agree	44.0%	41.5%	43.2%
Disagree	31.8%	32.6%	32.1%
Disagree strongly	6.7%	5.8%	6.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.029 <sup>a</sup>	3	.794
Likelihood Ratio	1.024	3	.795
Linear-by-Linear Association	.303	1	.582
N of Valid Cases	717		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.37.

**Q11a - Some people say the only realistic solution to transportation and congestion issues in the region is to stop building highways and instead invest in public transportation \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	18.5%	
Agree	45.1%	41.2%	43.1%
Disagree	30.1%	34.4%	32.3%
Disagree strongly	6.4%	6.2%	6.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.695 <sup>a</sup>	3	.638
Likelihood Ratio	1.697	3	.638
Linear-by-Linear Association	.513	1	.474
N of Valid Cases	715		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.78.

**Q11a - Some people say the only realistic solution to transportation and congestion issues in the region is to stop building highways and instead invest in public transportation \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	18.8%	19.8%	10.7%	18.2%
Agree	47.9%	41.0%	44.7%	43.4%
Disagree	28.1%	34.0%	32.0%	32.1%
Disagree strongly	5.2%	5.2%	12.6%	6.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.497 <sup>a</sup>	6	.025
Likelihood Ratio	13.598	6	.034
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.776	1	.016
N of Valid Cases	719		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.45.

**Q11a - Some people say the only realistic solution to transportation and congestion issues in the region is to stop building highways and instead invest in public transportation \* rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

	rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
	Male	Female	
Agree strongly	19.7%	16.9%	18.3%
Agree	43.8%	43.0%	43.4%
Disagree	31.0%	33.1%	32.1%
Disagree strongly	5.5%	7.0%	6.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.681 <sup>a</sup>	3	.641
Likelihood Ratio	1.684	3	.641
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.630	1	.202
N of Valid Cases	717		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.34.

**Q11a - Some people say the only realistic solution to transportation and congestion issues in the region is to stop building highways and instead invest in public transportation \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	25.4%	16.9%	18.7%	18.2%
	Agree	41.3%	45.5%	40.4%	43.5%
	Disagree	30.2%	31.2%	34.0%	32.0%
	Disagree strongly	3.2%	6.4%	6.8%	6.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.717	6	.581
Likelihood Ratio	4.748	6	.577
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.405	1	.236
N of Valid Cases	718		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.58.

**Q11b – Others think that the only real solution to congestion is to add lanes to widen highways. \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	8.4%	8.3%	8.4%
Agree	40.7%	42.9%	41.5%
Disagree	44.4%	39.6%	42.8%
Disagree strongly	6.4%	9.2%	7.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.782 <sup>a</sup>	3	.426
Likelihood Ratio	2.732	3	.435
Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.890
N of Valid Cases	726		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.52.

**Q11b – Others think that the only real solution to congestion is to add lanes to widen highways. \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Agree strongly	10.7%	6.4%	8.4%
Agree	45.4%	38.0%	41.6%
Disagree	37.0%	48.1%	42.8%
Disagree strongly	6.9%	7.4%	7.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.596 <sup>a</sup>	3	.009
Likelihood Ratio	11.642	3	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.678	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	722		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.92.

**Q11b – Others think that the only real solution to congestion is to add lanes to widen highways. \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	9.3%	8.1%	8.7%	8.5%
Agree	40.4%	41.4%	43.7%	41.5%
Disagree	40.9%	43.3%	43.7%	42.7%
Disagree strongly	9.3%	7.2%	3.9%	7.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.364 <sup>a</sup>	6	.762
Likelihood Ratio	3.607	6	.730
Linear-by-Linear Association	.515	1	.473
N of Valid Cases	728		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.50.



**Q11b – Others think that the only real solution to congestion is to add lanes to widen highways. - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	8.4%	8.3%	8.4%
	Agree	38.4%	44.7%	41.5%
	Disagree	45.5%	40.0%	42.8%
	Disagree strongly	7.6%	6.9%	7.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.145 <sup>a</sup>	3	.370
Likelihood Ratio	3.147	3	.370
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.472	1	.225
N of Valid Cases	727		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.24.

**Q11b – Others think that the only real solution to congestion is to add lanes to widen highways. \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	14.1%	6.7%	9.8%	8.4%
	Agree	45.3%	4.1%	38.1%	41.6%
	Disagree	31.3%	45.0%	42.2%	42.8%
	Disagree strongly	9.4%	5.3%	9.8%	7.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.073 <sup>a</sup>	6	.042
Likelihood Ratio	12.870	6	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.780	1	.182
N of Valid Cases	726		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.58.

**Q11c – Some say that the congestion problem would be largely solved if we did a better job managing traffic emergencies\* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	18.6%	16.3%	17.9%
Agree	44.5%	50.6%	46.4%
Disagree	32.7%	27.9%	31.2%
Disagree strongly	4.1%	5.2%	4.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.364 <sup>a</sup>	3	.339
Likelihood Ratio	3.367	3	.338
Linear-by-Linear Association	.006	1	.941
N of Valid Cases	743		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.35.

**Q11c – Some say that the congestion problem would be largely solved if we did a better job managing traffic emergencies \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	21.6%	
Agree	52.0%	41.6%	46.6%
Disagree	23.9%	38.7%	31.6%
Disagree strongly	2.5%	6.0%	4.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.090 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.512	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.821	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	738		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.44.

**Q11c – Some say that the congestion problem would be largely solved if we did a better job managing traffic emergencies \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	24.2%	16.6%	10.3%	17.9%
Agree	47.8%	44.5%	52.6%	46.5%
Disagree	25.6%	33.0%	35.1%	31.2%
Disagree strongly	2.4%	5.9%	2.1%	4.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.553 <sup>a</sup>	6	.007
Likelihood Ratio	18.238	6	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.704	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	744		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.30.

**Q11c – Some say that the congestion problem would be largely solved if we did a better job managing traffic emergencies \* rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	16.8%	18.9%	17.9%
	Agree	45.5%	47.7%	46.6%
	Disagree	32.9%	29.4%	31.1%
	Disagree strongly	4.8%	4.0%	4.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.615 <sup>a</sup>	3	.656
Likelihood Ratio	1.616	3	.656
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.504	1	.220
N of Valid Cases	745		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.43.

**Q11c – Some say that the congestion problem would be largely solved if we did a better job managing traffic emergencies \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	24.2%	17.7%	16.2%	17.8%
	Agree	47.0%	46.7%	46.2%	46.6%
	Disagree	22.7%	31.9%	32.4%	31.2%
	Disagree strongly	6.1%	3.7%	5.3%	4.5%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.875 <sup>a</sup>	6	.560
Likelihood Ratio	4.852	6	.563
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.072	1	.150
N of Valid Cases	743		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.93.

**Q11d Some say the remedy for congestion is to better manage the operations side of the transportation system with technology \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	20.0%	24.1%	21.3%
Agree	62.3%	62.5%	62.4%
Disagree	15.9%	12.5%	14.8%
Disagree strongly	1.8%	0.9%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.379 <sup>a</sup>	3	.337
Likelihood Ratio	3.486	3	.323
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.281	1	.070
N of Valid Cases	736		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.47.



**Q11d Some say the remedy for congestion is to better manage the operations side of the transportation system with technology \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	25.0%	
Agree	62.4%	62.1%	62.2%
Disagree	11.5%	18.0%	14.9%
Disagree strongly	1.1%	2.1%	1.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.847 <sup>a</sup>	3	.013
Likelihood Ratio	10.944	3	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.640	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	733		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.83.

**Q11d Some say the remedy for congestion is to better manage the operations side of the transportation system with technology \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	17.3%	23.4%	20.6%	21.4%
Agree	64.4%	60.8%	65.7%	62.4%
Disagree	15.8%	14.7%	12.7%	14.7%
Disagree strongly	2.5%	1.1%	1.0%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.182 <sup>a</sup>	6	.521
Likelihood Ratio	5.099	6	.531
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.275	1	.132
N of Valid Cases	740		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.52.

**Q11d Some say the remedy for congestion is to better manage the operations side of the transportation system with technology \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	22.4%	20.2%	21.3%
	Agree	59.3%	65.4%	62.3%
	Disagree	16.2%	13.4%	14.8%
	Disagree strongly	2.2%	1.1%	1.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.807 <sup>a</sup>	3	.283
Likelihood Ratio	3.836	3	.280
Linear-by-Linear Association	.327	1	.567
N of Valid Cases	738		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.97.

**Q11d Some say the remedy for congestion is to better manage the operations side of the transportation system with technology \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	20.9%	21.4%	21.0%	21.2%
	Agree	58.2%	65.0%	58.8%	62.4%
	Disagree	29.4%	12.4%	17.6%	14.7%
	Disagree strongly	1.5%	1.2%	2.5%	1.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.842 <sup>a</sup>	6	.336
Likelihood Ratio	6.664	6	.353
Linear-by-Linear Association	.649	1	.420
N of Valid Cases	739		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.09.

**Q13 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if the service went more places. \***  
**employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	20.7%	17.3%	19.6%
Agree	44.2%	48.1%	45.4%
Disagree	30.7%	31.2%	30.8%
Disagree strongly	4.4%	3.5%	4.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.781 <sup>a</sup>	3	.619
Likelihood Ratio	1.808	3	.613
Linear-by-Linear Association	.106	1	.745
N of Valid Cases	733		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.45.

**Q13 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if the service went more places. \***  
**education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	25.1%	
Agree	46.6%	44.7%	45.6%
Disagree	24.0%	37.2%	30.8%
Disagree strongly	4.2%	3.7%	4.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.429 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.634	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.347	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	730		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.06.

**Q13 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if the service went more places. \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

		age recoded into three groups			Total
		18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
	Agree strongly	25.5%	19.3%	9.1%	19.6%
	Agree	48.5%	43.5%	48.5%	45.6%
	Disagree	24.0%	32.6%	36.4%	30.7%
	Disagree strongly	2.0%	4.7%	6.1%	4.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.186 <sup>a</sup>	6	.006
Likelihood Ratio	19.871	6	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.167	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	733		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.05.

**Q13 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if the service went more places. \***  
**rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	20.9%	18.4%	19.6%
	Agree	43.6%	47.3%	45.5%
	Disagree	31.0%	30.6%	30.8%
	Disagree strongly	4.5%	3.7%	4.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.463 <sup>a</sup>	3	.691
Likelihood Ratio	1.463	3	.691
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.907
N of Valid Cases	734		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.63.



**Q13 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if the service went more places. \***  
**trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	26.9%	16.5%	23.5%	19.8%
	Agree	49.3%	47.6%	40.7%	45.5%
	Disagree	22.4%	32.8%	29.2%	30.7%
	Disagree strongly	1.5%	3.1%	6.6%	4.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.682 <sup>a</sup>	6	.016
Likelihood Ratio	15.600	6	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.066	1	.302
N of Valid Cases	734		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.74.

**Q14 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if wait times were decreased. \*  
employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	in labor force	not in labor force	
	Agree strongly	22.8%	
Agree	45.5%	49.3%	46.7%
Disagree	27.4%	30.3%	28.3%
Disagree strongly	4.3%	3.2%	3.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.635 <sup>a</sup>	3	.304
Likelihood Ratio	3.730	3	.292
Linear-by-Linear Association	.946	1	.331
N of Valid Cases	713		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.68.

**Q14 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if wait times were decreased. \***  
**education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	26.3%	
Agree	48.0%	45.5%	46.7%
Disagree	22.0%	34.5%	28.4%
Disagree strongly	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.746 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	18.914	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.821	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	711		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.14.

**Q14 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if wait times were decreased. \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	26.1%	21.5%	8.2%	21.0%
Agree	53.7%	43.7%	46.4%	46.9%
Disagree	18.2%	30.4%	40.2%	28.3%
Disagree strongly	2.0%	4.3%	5.2%	3.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.378 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.190	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.661	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	714		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.67.

**Q14 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if wait times were decreased. \***  
**rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	21.2%	20.8%	21.0%
	Agree	46.4%	47.3%	46.8%
	Disagree	28.2%	28.5%	28.3%
	Disagree strongly	4.2%	3.4%	3.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.359 <sup>a</sup>	3	.949
Likelihood Ratio	.360	3	.948
Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.866
N of Valid Cases	713		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.44.

**Q14 – I would be more likely to use the bus system if wait times were decreased. \*  
trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	17.9%	19.4%	24.3%	20.9%
	Agree	56.7%	48.0%	42.3%	46.9%
	Disagree	23.9%	29.4%	27.6%	28.3%
	Disagree strongly	1.5%	3.2%	5.9%	3.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.169 <sup>a</sup>	6	.164
Likelihood Ratio	9.153	6	.165
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.771
N of Valid Cases	714		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.63.

**Q19a - What is now being done to improve our transportation system is adequate to address our problems. \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

		employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
		labor force		
		in labor force	not in labor force	
	Agree strongly	2.5%	1.8%	2.3%
	Agree	25.9%	27.4%	26.4%
	Disagree	59.7%	57.1%	58.8%
	Disagree strongly	11.9%	13.7%	12.5%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.024 <sup>a</sup>	3	.795
Likelihood Ratio	1.032	3	.793
Linear-by-Linear Association	.103	1	.748
N of Valid Cases	690		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.08.

**Q19a- What is now being done to improve our transportation system is adequate to address our problems. \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	3.7%	
Agree	34.9%	19.1%	26.6%
Disagree	53.5%	63.4%	58.7%
Disagree strongly	8.0%	16.3%	12.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.497 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	34.079	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.836	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	688		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.60.



**Q19a - What is now being done to improve our transportation system is adequate to address our problems. \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	6.3%	0.5%	2.0%	2.3%
Agree	36.6%	22.3%	23.5%	26.4%
Disagree	49.2%	62.3%	63.3%	58.8%
Disagree strongly	7.9%	14.9%	11.2%	12.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.668 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.074	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.866	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	692		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.27.

**Q19a - What is now being done to improve our transportation system is adequate to address our problems. \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	3.4%	1.5%	2.5%
	Agree	25.8%	27.1%	26.4%
	Disagree	57.1%	60.4%	58.7%
	Disagree strongly	13.7%	11.0%	12.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.932 <sup>a</sup>	3	.269
Likelihood Ratio	4.021	3	.259
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.956
N of Valid Cases	693		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.24.

**Q19a - What is now being done to improve our transportation system is adequate to address our problems. \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	8.3%	1.7%	1.7%	2.3%
	Agree	41.7%	26.6%	22.6%	26.6%
	Disagree	46.7%	63.2%	53.9%	58.7%
	Disagree strongly	3.3%	8.5%	21.7%	12.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.696 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	40.728	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.137	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	692		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.39.

**Q19b - Toll road revenues should be used to help pay for public transportation like bus and rail? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	15.3%	11.8%	14.2%
Agree	54.9%	54.6%	54.8%
Disagree	24.7%	27.9%	25.8%
Disagree strongly	5.0%	5.7%	5.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.106 <sup>a</sup>	3	.551
Likelihood Ratio	2.142	3	.543
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.786	1	.181
N of Valid Cases	726		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.99.

**Q19b - Toll road revenues should be used to help pay for public transportation like bus and rail? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	14.3%	
Agree	61.3%	48.5%	54.7%
Disagree	20.1%	31.2%	25.8%
Disagree strongly	4.3%	6.1%	5.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.256 <sup>a</sup>	3	.002
Likelihood Ratio	15.380	3	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.238	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	724		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.32.

**Q19b - Toll road revenues should be used to help pay for public transportation like bus and rail? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	18.4%	13.2%	9.3%	14.2%
Agree	62.6%	51.9%	52.6%	55.0%
Disagree	17.0%	28.8%	30.9%	25.7%
Disagree strongly	1.9%	6.1%	7.2%	5.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.041 <sup>a</sup>	6	.001
Likelihood Ratio	23.779	6	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.085	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	727		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.94.

**Q19b - Toll road revenues should be used to help pay for public transportation like bus and rail? \* rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	11.9%	16.6%	14.2%
	Agree	56.1%	53.9%	55.0%
	Disagree	25.3%	25.8%	25.6%
	Disagree strongly	6.7%	3.7%	5.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.329 <sup>a</sup>	3	.097
Likelihood Ratio	6.400	3	.094
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.499	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	727		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.61.

**Q19b - Toll road revenues should be used to help pay for public transportation like bus and rail? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	12.3%	14.0%	14.9%	14.2%
	Agree	72.3%	56.8%	48.0%	55.2%
	Disagree	12.3%	25.4%	29.4%	25.6%
	Disagree strongly	3.1%	3.9%	7.7%	5.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.123 <sup>a</sup>	6	.009
Likelihood Ratio	17.689	6	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.268	1	.012
N of Valid Cases	727		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.31.



**Q19c - And do you agree or disagree with this statement: Improving Central Florida's transportation system means we will have to increase funding, through taxes and/or fees**  
 . \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Agree strongly	3.5%	3.9%	3.6%
Agree	53.8%	47.8%	51.9%
Disagree	35.6%	39.7%	36.9%
Disagree strongly	7.2%	8.6%	7.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.289 <sup>a</sup>	3	.515
Likelihood Ratio	2.286	3	.515
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.441	1	.230
N of Valid Cases	721		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.37.

**Q19c - And do you agree or disagree with this statement: Improving Central Florida's transportation system means we will have to increase funding, through taxes and/or fees**  
 . \* education level recoded into 2 categories

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Agree strongly	4.1%	
Agree	49.9%	53.7%	51.9%
Disagree	37.9%	35.9%	36.9%
Disagree strongly	8.2%	7.2%	7.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.331 <sup>a</sup>	3	.722
Likelihood Ratio	1.331	3	.722
Linear-by-Linear Association	.356	1	.551
N of Valid Cases	719		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.40.

**Q19c - And do you agree or disagree with this statement: Improving Central Florida's transportation system means we will have to increase funding, through taxes and/or fees**  
 . \* age recoded into three groups

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Agree strongly	4.9%	3.5%	1.9%	3.6%
Agree	56.0%	51.2%	46.7%	51.7%
Disagree	33.2%	37.8%	41.0%	37.1%
Disagree strongly	6.0%	7.6%	10.5%	7.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.935 <sup>a</sup>	6	.431
Likelihood Ratio	5.967	6	.427
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.668	1	.017
N of Valid Cases	723		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.78.

**Q19c - And do you agree or disagree with this statement: Improving Central Florida's transportation system means we will have to increase funding, through taxes and/or fees**  
 . \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Agree strongly	4.6%	2.5%	3.6%
	Agree	51.1%	52.4%	51.7%
	Disagree	36.1%	38.1%	37.1%
	Disagree strongly	8.2%	7.0%	7.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.864 <sup>a</sup>	3	.413
Likelihood Ratio	2.905	3	.407
Linear-by-Linear Association	.119	1	.730
N of Valid Cases	723		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.84.

**Q19c - And do you agree or disagree with this statement: Improving Central Florida's transportation system means we will have to increase funding, through taxes and/or fees**  
 . \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Agree strongly	7.7%	3.6%	2.5%	3.6%
	Agree	63.1%	53.1%	46.3%	51.7%
	Disagree	29.2%	38.3%	37.1%	37.1%
	Disagree strongly		5.0%	14.2%	7.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.428 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.469	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.528	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	723		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.34.

**Q23 – Increase the gasoline tax? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Strongly approve	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%
Approve	25.5%	21.2%	24.1%
Disapprove	54.4%	55.1%	54.6%
Strongly disapprove	19.2%	22.4%	20.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.274 <sup>a</sup>	3	.518
Likelihood Ratio	2.283	3	.516
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.701	1	.192
N of Valid Cases	767		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.56.

**Q23 – Increase the gasoline tax? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Strongly approve	0.5%	1.8%	1.2%
Approve	16.8%	31.0%	24.2%
Disapprove	60.1%	49.6%	54.6%
Strongly disapprove	22.6%	17.6%	20.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.309 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.822	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.186	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	765		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.33.

**Q23 – Increase the gasoline tax? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Strongly approve	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.2%
Approve	18.0%	25.7%	28.3%	24.0%
Disapprove	60.0%	53.3%	50.9%	54.7%
Strongly disapprove	20.5%	20.0%	19.8%	20.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.113 <sup>a</sup>	6	.411
Likelihood Ratio	6.311	6	.389
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.808	1	.179
N of Valid Cases	771		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.24.



**Q23 – Increase the gasoline tax? \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Strongly approve	1.6%	0.5%	1.0%
	Approve	28.2%	20.1%	24.2%
	Disapprove	50.5%	58.9%	54.7%
	Strongly disapprove	19.7%	20.6%	20.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.841 <sup>a</sup>	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	9.963	3	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.961	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	770		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.99.

**Q23 – Increase the gasoline tax? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Strongly approve	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%	1.0%
	Approve	35.3%	25.2%	19.2%	24.1%
	Disapprove	51.5%	56.7%	52.2%	54.7%
	Strongly disapprove	11.8%	17.2%	27.5%	20.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.400 <sup>a</sup>	6	.005
Likelihood Ratio	17.944	6	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.771	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	771		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .71.

**Q24 – Increase the sales tax? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

		employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
		labor force		
		in labor force	not in labor force	
	Strongly approve	1.8%	1.3%	1.6%
	Approve	34.1%	31.8%	33.4%
	Disapprove	52.6%	52.7%	52.7%
	Strongly disapprove	11.5%	14.2%	12.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.495 <sup>a</sup>	3	.683
Likelihood Ratio	1.485	3	.686
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.283	1	.257
N of Valid Cases	752		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.81.

**Q24 – Increase the sales tax? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

		education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
		lesser educated	more educated	
Q16 -	Strongly approve	1.1%	2.0%	1.6%
	Approve	38.0%	29.4%	33.5%
	Disapprove	48.3%	56.5%	52.6%
	Strongly disapprove	12.6%	12.0%	12.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.542 <sup>a</sup>	3	.056
Likelihood Ratio	7.570	3	.056
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.537	1	.215
N of Valid Cases	749		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.74.

**Q24 – Increase the sales tax? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Strongly approve	0.5%	2.2%		1.5%
Approve	34.5%	33.6%	30.8%	33.5%
Disapprove	54.5%	51.6%	54.8%	52.8%
Strongly disapprove	10.5%	12.6%	14.4%	12.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.172 <sup>a</sup>	6	.404
Likelihood Ratio	7.890	6	.246
Linear-by-Linear Association	.723	1	.395
N of Valid Cases	750		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53.

**Q24 – Increase the sales tax? \* rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Strongly approve	2.4%	0.5%	1.5%
	Approve	32.4%	34.5%	33.4%
	Disapprove	53.3%	52.1%	52.7%
	Strongly disapprove	11.9%	12.8%	12.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.826 <sup>a</sup>	3	.185
Likelihood Ratio	5.189	3	.158
Linear-by-Linear Association	.249	1	.617
N of Valid Cases	751		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.48.

**Q24 – Increase the sales tax? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Strongly approve	4.5%	0.9%	2.0%	1.6%
	Approve	36.4%	36.2%	27.8%	33.4%
	Disapprove	53.0%	53.0%	52.4%	52.8%
	Strongly disapprove	6.1%	9.9%	17.9%	12.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.135 <sup>a</sup>	6	.004
Likelihood Ratio	18.034	6	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.480	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	752		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.05.

**Q25 – Increase property taxes? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

	employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
	labor force		
	in labor force	not in labor force	
Strongly approve	1.0%	0.4%	0.8%
Approve	20.2%	15.1%	18.6%
Disapprove	61.4%	63.6%	62.1%
Strongly disapprove	17.5%	20.9%	18.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.138 <sup>a</sup>	3	.247
Likelihood Ratio	4.283	3	.232
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.816	1	.051
N of Valid Cases	749		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.91.



**Q25 – Increase property taxes? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Strongly approve	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%
Approve	17.5%	19.6%	18.6%
Disapprove	61.7%	62.6%	62.2%
Strongly disapprove	19.7%	17.0%	18.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.443 <sup>a</sup>	3	.695
Likelihood Ratio	1.444	3	.695
Linear-by-Linear Association	.781	1	.377
N of Valid Cases	748		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.37.

**Q25 – Increase property taxes? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Strongly approve	2.5%	0.2%		0.8%
Approve	23.7%	17.4%	12.5%	18.4%
Disapprove	64.1%	61.5%	62.5%	62.3%
Strongly disapprove	9.6%	20.9%	25.0%	18.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.833 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	28.232	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.152	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	751		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .83.

**Q25 – Increase property taxes? \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Strongly approve	1.3%	0.3%	0.8%
	Approve	18.4%	18.5%	18.5%
	Disapprove	60.8%	63.7%	62.2%
	Strongly disapprove	19.5%	17.5%	18.5%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.249 <sup>a</sup>	3	.355
Likelihood Ratio	3.493	3	.322
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.994
N of Valid Cases	752		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.97.

**Q25 – Increase property taxes? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

	trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Strongly approve		0.9%	1.2%	0.9%
Approve	26.5%	18.5%	15.5%	18.4%
Disapprove	67.6%	65.7%	55.0%	62.3%
Strongly disapprove	5.9%	14.6%	28.3%	18.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.111 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.036	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.943	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	750		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .63.

**Q26 – Increase the number of toll roads? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

		employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
		labor force		
		in labor force	not in labor force	
	Strongly approve	2.3%	0.8%	1.9%
	Approve	43.8%	42.7%	43.4%
	Disapprove	43.0%	43.5%	43.2%
	Strongly disapprove	10.9%	13.0%	11.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.632 <sup>a</sup>	3	.452
Likelihood Ratio	2.923	3	.404
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.246	1	.264
N of Valid Cases	753		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.44.

**Q26 – Increase the number of toll roads? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Strongly approve	2.2%	1.3%	1.7%
Approve	41.8%	45.4%	43.7%
Disapprove	45.1%	41.0%	43.0%
Strongly disapprove	10.9%	12.3%	11.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.587 <sup>a</sup>	3	.460
Likelihood Ratio	2.592	3	.459
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.959
N of Valid Cases	749		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.23.

**Q26 – Increase the number of toll roads? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Strongly approve	3.0%	1.1%	2.0%	1.7%
Approve	39.6%	46.3%	40.0%	43.7%
Disapprove	48.5%	40.1%	46.0%	43.1%
Strongly disapprove	8.9%	12.5%	12.0%	11.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.705 <sup>a</sup>	6	.191
Likelihood Ratio	8.598	6	.198
Linear-by-Linear Association	.220	1	.639
N of Valid Cases	751		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.73.

**Q26 – Increase the number of toll roads? \* rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Strongly approve	2.6%	1.1%	1.9%
	Approve	43.8%	43.4%	43.6%
	Disapprove	43.8%	42.3%	43.0%
	Strongly disapprove	9.9%	13.3%	11.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.305 <sup>a</sup>	3	.230
Likelihood Ratio	4.392	3	.222
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.752	1	.186
N of Valid Cases	753		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.86.



**Q26 – Increase the number of toll roads? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

	trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Strongly approve		1.8%	2.4%	1.9%
Approve	67.6%	44.6%	35.4%	43.6%
Disapprove	30.9%	42.7%	46.9%	43.0%
Strongly disapprove	1.5%	10.9%	15.4%	11.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.188 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.888	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.117	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	755		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.26.

**Q27 – Raise tolls on existing toll roads to pay for other types of transportation such as bus or rail projects? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

		employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
		labor force		
		in labor force	not in labor force	
	Strongly approve	1.5%	1.7%	1.6%
	Approve	32.5%	32.8%	32.6%
	Disapprove	48.7%	49.8%	49.1%
	Strongly disapprove	17.2%	15.8%	16.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.260 <sup>a</sup>	3	.967
Likelihood Ratio	.262	3	.967
Linear-by-Linear Association	.121	1	.728
N of Valid Cases	758		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.82.

**Q27 – Raise tolls on existing toll roads to pay for other types of transportation such as bus or rail projects? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
	Strongly approve	1.6%	
Approve	36.0%	29.4%	32.6%
Disapprove	48.1%	50.1%	49.1%
Strongly disapprove	14.3%	18.9%	16.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.112 <sup>a</sup>	3	.164
Likelihood Ratio	5.126	3	.163
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.743	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	755		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.79.

**Q27 – Raise tolls on existing toll roads to pay for other types of transportation such as bus or rail projects? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Strongly approve	2.9%	0.9%	1.0%	1.4%
Approve	43.1%	30.1%	23.3%	32.7%
Disapprove	39.2%	51.0%	60.2%	49.0%
Strongly disapprove	14.8%	18.0%	15.5%	16.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.701 <sup>a</sup>	6	.001
Likelihood Ratio	22.063	6	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.949	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	761		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.49.

**Q27 – Raise tolls on existing toll roads to pay for other types of transportation such as bus or rail projects? \* rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Strongly approve	2.1%	1.1%	1.6%
	Approve	35.5%	29.9%	32.7%
	Disapprove	45.4%	52.4%	48.9%
	Strongly disapprove	17.0%	16.7%	16.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.005 <sup>a</sup>	3	.171
Likelihood Ratio	5.035	3	.169
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.977	1	.160
N of Valid Cases	761		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.96.

**Q27 – Raise tolls on existing toll roads to pay for other types of transportation such as bus or rail projects? trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

		trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
	Strongly approve	1.5%	1.6%	1.2%	1.4%
	Approve	57.6%	35.8%	20.9%	32.7%
	Disapprove	36.4%	48.3%	53.5%	49.0%
	Strongly disapprove	4.6%	14.4%	24.4%	16.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.261 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	45.173	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	39.817	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	759		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .96.

**Q28 – Increase tag, title and registration fees? \* employment recoded into in or out of labor force**

**Crosstab**

% within employment recoded into in or out of labor force

		employment recoded into in or out of labor force		Total
		labor force		
		in labor force	not in labor force	
	Strongly approve	1.7%	0.8%	1.4%
	Approve	38.2%	28.3%	35.0%
	Disapprove	45.8%	53.4%	48.2%
	Strongly disapprove	14.3%	17.4%	15.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.682 <sup>a</sup>	3	.034
Likelihood Ratio	8.906	3	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.150	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	771		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.52.

**Q28 – Increase tag, title and registration fees? \* education level recoded into 2 categories**

**Crosstab**

% within education level recoded into 2 categories

	education level recoded into 2 categories		Total
	lesser educated	more educated	
Strongly approve	1.6%	1.3%	1.4%
Approve	27.5%	42.2%	35.1%
Disapprove	53.4%	43.9%	48.5%
Strongly disapprove	17.5%	12.6%	15.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.507 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	18.650	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.469	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	767		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.32.



**Q28 – Increase tag, title and registration fees? \* age recoded into three groups**

**Crosstab**

% within age recoded into three groups

	age recoded into three groups			Total
	18-35 yrs	36-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	
Strongly approve	1.0%	1.5%	0.9%	1.3%
Approve	35.7%	36.0%	29.2%	35.0%
Disapprove	50.7%	45.9%	54.7%	48.4%
Strongly disapprove	12.6%	16.6%	15.1%	15.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.878 <sup>a</sup>	6	.559
Likelihood Ratio	4.980	6	.546
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.025	1	.311
N of Valid Cases	771		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.37.

**Q28 – Increase tag, title and registration fees? \* rgender - Record respondent's gender.**

**Crosstab**

% within rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.

		rgender - INTERVIEWER: Record respondent's gender.		Total
		Male	Female	
	Strongly approve	1.0%	1.8%	1.4%
	Approve	38.0%	32.0%	35.1%
	Disapprove	44.7%	51.8%	48.3%
	Strongly disapprove	16.2%	14.3%	15.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.310 <sup>a</sup>	3	.150
Likelihood Ratio	5.326	3	.149
Linear-by-Linear Association	.247	1	.619
N of Valid Cases	773		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.46.

**Q28 – Increase tag, title and registration fees? \* trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt**

**Crosstab**

% within trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt

	trustscore categorized into high, med, and low trust of govt			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Strongly approve		0.9%	2.7%	1.4%
Approve	41.8%	38.0%	27.9%	35.0%
Disapprove	53.7%	48.5%	46.9%	48.4%
Strongly disapprove	4.5%	12.5%	22.5%	15.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.336 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	28.856	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.519	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	772		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .92.