Analyzing Environmental Spending Trends: A Comparison Across Political Party Preference and Awareness

Intro to Data Analytics
DATA220L-112
EcoTrackers

Marist College
School of Computer Science and Mathematics
Submitted To:
Dr. Reza Sadeghi

January 29, 2025

# Analyzing Environmental Spending Trends: A Comparison Across Political Party Preference and Awareness

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

PRES20:

Bar Chart:

Mosaic Plot:

Stacked Bar Chart For PRES20 and NEWS:

NEWS:

Pie Chart:

Proportion of News Consumption Frequency

Bar Chart:

Frequency of News Consumption

NATPARK:

Bar Chart:

Distribution of NATPARK Responses

Mosaic Plot:

Stacked Bar Chart For NATPARK and NATENRGY:

NATENRGY:

Box Plot:

Bar Chart:

Grouped Bar Chart of National Energy Policy Support

Project Objective and Research Question

Project Objective

The project objective is to analyze environmental spending data and examine how it correlates with political party affiliation. This includes identifying trends and patterns in data provided by the General Social Survey (GSS) as well as exploring differences in spending across political parties to gain a better understanding of this potential relationship. Specifically, we will incorporate variables such as voting behavior in the 2020 U.S. presidential election (PRES20), frequency of newspaper readings (NEWS), opinions on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK), and views on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY).

Research Question

Does political party affiliation influence environmental spending priorities and preferences and what role do voting behavior, consumption of news, opinions on spending for parks and recreational services, and views on spending for alternative energy sources play in shaping these spending prerogatives?

Details:

1. **Subset of GSS Data:**
   - Political party affiliation
   - Environmental spending

2. **Task to Investigate:**
   - Exploring whether there is a relationship between political party preference/political awareness and environmental spending

3. **Four Related Variables:**
   - PRES20 1.000 Did you vote for Joe Biden or Donald Trump?
   - NEWS 1.000 How often do you read the newspaper--every day, a few times a week, once a week, less than once a week, or never?
   - NATPARK 1.000 (... are we spending too much, too little, or the right amount on …. Parks and recreation
   - NATENRGY 1.000 (... are we spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on) Developing alternative energy sources

All categorical variables - chi-square test

Review the Related Work

Samples

1. Pacca, L., Curzi, D., Rausser, G., & Olper, A. (2021). The Role of Party Affiliation, Lobbying, and Electoral Incentives in Decentralized US State Support of the Environment. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, *8*(3), 617–653. https://doi.org/10.1086/711583

Positives: States with abundant oil or high-polluting sectors tend to contribute more economically. Governors receiving higher contributions are associated with lower expenditures on environmental conservation efforts. Lobbying, specifically polluting lobbies, may affect a governor's decision-making. Environmentalists may become more active by persuading politicians and the voting public when polluting lobbies are stronger. Results suggest that environmental expenditures increase by about 10% under Democratic governors compared to Republican ones (Pacca et al., 2021).

Negatives: This article focuses on governors, which may limit variability due to a lack of data from other political systems and government organizations (Pacca et al., 2021).

2. Cruz, S. M. (2017). The relationships of political ideology and party affiliation with environmental concern: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *53*, 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.06.010
3.

Positives: Political party affiliation is demonstrated to have had a statistically significant positive relationship with environmental concerns. Political ideology has an even stronger relationship (Cruz, 2017).

Negatives: Studies were conducted at different times, so different political movements, shifts, or environmental concerns could have changed, which may have caused differences, a lack of trends/patterns, or unreliability in data (Cruz, 2017).

4. McCright, A. M., Xiao, C., & Dunlap, R. E. (2014). Political polarization on support for government spending on environmental protection in the USA, 1974–2012. *Social Science Research*, *48,* 251–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.06.008

Positives: Provides history into the issue of polarization between the two parties and how they view environmental spending. Laying a strong basis for what each party believes in and what they want to spend money on (McCright et al., 2014).

Negatives: It provides essential background information on the topic and why and how each political party goes through their thought process on economic spending; however, it only references our governmental system from pre-2012, so it would be before the Paris Agreement, which had a massive change on our governmental views with regards to economic spending (McCright et al., 2014).

The Merits of Your Project

Based on the previous step, this project provides different advantages since it builds upon previously existing research. These advantages include:

1. A comprehensive understanding of political party affiliation and political influence on environmental spending
2. Additional factors, such as lobbying, may influence environmental spending
3. Extends beyond a presidential or governor's role, including policymakers, legislators, and additional levels of government
4. Tracking of historical trends and patterns in environmental spending
5. Help to shape public policy and increase advocacy

An end user should report this project because it will provide data-driven results of political party affiliations on environmental spending. This project will address limitations to previous studies, such as the Pacca et al. (2021) study, which focuses solely on a governor's role in environmental spending. Additionally, this project can inform legislators, advocacy groups, etc., on different environmental efforts and initiatives, further help citizens to have a better understanding of environmental spending and concerns on a political scale and increase public awareness and decision-making.

GitHub Repository Address

Github link: Data-220-112-Analyzing-environmental-spending-trends-Ecotrackers

Descriptive Statistics

PRES20:

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	NA's
1.000	1.000	1.000	1.428	2.000	4.000	1352

Interpretation:

These statistical values summarize the distribution variable PRES20. The distribution is skewed right based on the minimum, 1st quartile, median, and 3rd quartile, indicating that most values are concentrated around 1.0 and 2.0. The median (1.000) is slightly lower than the mean (1.428), suggesting a right-skewed tendency. The upper limit of the data is shown by the maximum value of 4.000, while a substantial amount of incomplete data is indicated by the 1,325 missing values (NAs).

NEWS:

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	NA's
1.000	2.000	4.000	3.717	5.000	5.000	1397

Interpretation:

These statistical values summarize the distribution variable of NEWS. The distribution appears slightly left-skewed based on the minimum, first quartile, median, and third quartile, suggesting that most values are concentrated around 2.000 and 4.000. The mean (3.717) is slightly lower than the median (4.000), reinforcing this left-skewed tendency.

NATPARK:

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	NA's
1.000	1.000	2.000	1.667	2.000	3.000	73

Interpretation:

These statistical values summarize the variables of NATPARK. The minimum value is 1.000, and the maximum is 3.000, indicating a relatively small range. The 1st quartile (1.000) and median (2.000) suggest that at least half of the data is concentrated between 1.000 and 2.000. The mean (1.667) is slightly lower than the median, which suggests a slight left skew in the distribution. The 3rd quartile (2.000) indicates that most values do not exceed 2.000, with only a few reaching 3.000. There are 73 missing values (NAs) in the dataset.

NATENRGY:

Min	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max	NA'S
1.000	1.000	1.000	1.561	2.000	3.000	123

Interpretation:

 These statistical values summarize the variables of NATENRGY. The minimum (1.000), 1st quartile (1.000), and median (1.000) indicate that a large portion of the data is concentrated at the lowest value. The mean (1.561) is slightly higher than the median, suggesting a slight right skew in the distribution. The 3rd quartile (2.000) and maximum (3.000) show that while most values are low, a portion extends to higher numbers. Additionally, there are 123 missing values (NAs) in the dataset.

Data Visualization

PRES20: Bar Chart

2020 Presidential Vote Choice

The bar chart for the PRES20 variable shows survey respondents's voting choices in the 2020 U.S. presidential election. Each bar represents the number of survey respondents who voted for each candidate in 2020, with President Joe Biden having the tallest bar. This indicates that most respondents voted for President Joe Biden while the least amount of respondents did not vote.

NEWS: Pie Chart

Proportion of News Consumption Frequency

The pie chart for the NEWS variable represents the frequency of news consumption across survey respondents. The largest response is daily, indicating that almost half of survey

respondents consume the news daily, while the smallest response is weekly, indicating that less than a quarter of respondents consume news weekly. This distribution helps to understand the survey respondent's engagement with current news.

NATPARK: Bar Chart

The histogram for the NATPARK variable represents the distribution of responses related to national park engagement. The largest response category is 2, indicating that the majority of the survey respondents fall into this group, followed by category 1 with a slightly lower count. The smallest response is category 3, showing significantly fewer respondents in this group. This distribution helps to understand the level of engagement or visitation patterns among survey participants.

NATENRGY: Boxplot

The boxplot for NATENRGY variable represents the distribution of responses related to national energy attitudes. The median response is around 2, with most responses falling between 1 and 2, indicating a relatively concentrated distribution. The upper whisker extends to 3, suggesting

some higher values, but no extreme outliers are present. The distribution helps to understand survey respondents' general sentiment or preference regarding national energy topics.

Advanced Descriptive Statistics

Provide a short paragraph about your interpretation of statistical values.

PRES20:

B index: 0.05405649

Interpretation:

A B index of 0.05405649 for the PRES20 variable indicates a weak relationship since the value is close to zero. This suggests that changes in the PRES20 variable have little effect on its overall impact. This weak relationship and the B index's proximity to zero may also indicate that the data is not well spread out along the five categories of PRES20, as the Biden, NA, and Trump categories contain a larger number of observations in comparison to the other two categories

NEWS:

B index: 0.4122566

Interpretation:

This suggests a moderate concentration of news consumption where there are still news sources that dominate the industry however there is enough lew way and individuality to allow these news sources to spread diversity. A B index of 0.4122566 could indicate that the more diverse news outlets are gaining traction. This moderate relationship also suggests that changes in the NEWS variable have a more significant effect on its overall impact.

NATPARK:
B index: 0.2719003

Interpretation:

This b index of 0.271 indicates that there are interactions between multiple national parks around the country rather than just a select few. This could indicate an inclination to see more than one or a couple national parks increasing the interest of the participants. This also reflects effective management and outreach from the national parks.

NATENRGY:

B index: 0.4672798

Interpretation:

This indicates a slight domination of viewpoints with a B index of 0.467 however it still allows for a little diversity between these said viewpoints allowing for a gray area. This indicates that national debates regarding energy consumption lead to mass agreement in some discussions and divisions in others. This indicates ideological influences on energy attitudes with some groups sharing opinions and others diverging significantly throughout the topic.

Bivariate analysis

PRES20: Mosaic Plot

Interpretation: This visual interpretation for the PRES20 variable suggests that the Biden category takes up the most space, indicating a greater number of voters for President Biden, while the did not vote category takes up the least amount of space, indicating that a small fraction of people did not vote in this specific survey. Overall, the PRES20 variable is largely dominated by votes for Biden and Trump, indicating favoritism for the two-party system, making politics largely dominated by the Democratic or Republican party.

NEWS: Bar Chart

Interpretation: This bar chart displays the distribution of responses to news consumption as collected by the NEWS variable. The majority of respondents viewed/read the news daily, with the next most frequent response being never. We plan to run bivariate analyses to help draw conclusions between current event awareness and presidential candidate preference.

Comparing Two Categorical Variables: PRES20 and NEWS - Stacked Bar Chart

Interpretation: This bar chart comparing the PRES20 and NEWS variables shows the relationship between news consumption and voting choice in the 2020 presidential election. The majority of respondents who consumed news more frequently voted for President Biden, followed by President Trump. A very small number of voters chose to vote for a third party or chose not to vote at all. Overall, survey respondents who consumed the most news likely voted for the major candidates, with more votes for President Biden.

NATPARK: Mosaic Plot

Interpretation: This mosaic plot illustrates the distribution of support levels for national parks. Most respondents fall into the "Strongly Support" and "Support" categories, as indicated by the two largest sections of the plot. The "Neutral," "Oppose," and "Strongly Oppose" categories take up much smaller portions, suggesting that opposition to national parks is relatively rare. Overall, the data indicates that most survey respondents express some level of support for national parks, with strong opposition being minimal.

NATENRGY: Bar Chart

Interpretation: This grouped bar chart displays the distribution of respondent opinions on national energy policy and spending in the US. The majority of respondents said they strongly supported developing alternative energy sources. The least amount stated that they were neutral on the subject, with zero respondents stating that they were against energy spending.

Comparing Two Categorical Variables: NATPARK and NATENRGY - Grouped Bar Chart

Interpretation: This grouped bar chart displays the distribution of respondent opinions on level of support for national park spending versus national energy policy. The majority of respondents stated that they "strongly support" or "support" national parks and national energy policy, while minimal respondents remain neutral pertaining to these issues.

Null Hypothesis Significance Testing (NHST)

Null Hypothesis: Political party affiliation has no significant influence on environmental spending initiatives and preferences, with regard to opinions on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK) and views on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY), regardless of voting behavior (PRES20) and frequency of news consumption (NEWS).

Alternative Hypothesis: Political party affiliation has a significant influence on environmental spending initiatives and preferences, including opinions on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK) and views on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY), which is influenced by voting behavior (PRES20) and frequency of news consumption (NEWS).

Compute Statistics for Each Categorical Variable:

Voting behavior (PRES20) and news consumption (NEWS):

Chi-squared: 50.12

Tabular Format:

	Daily	Several times a week	Weekly	Less than weekly
Joe Biden	262	150	98	182
Donald Trump	82	58	55	91
Other	5	5	5	10
Did not vote	4	1	0	2

	Never
Joe Biden	480
Donald Trump	352
Other	31
Did not vote	7

	Daily	Several times a week	Weekly	Less than weekly
Joe Biden	220.06	133.41	98.50	177.67
Donald Trump	119.79	72.62	53.62	96.72
Other	10.51	6.37	4.71	8.49
Did not vote	2.63	1.59	1.18	2.12

	Never
Joe Biden	542.36
Donald Trump	295.24
Other	25.91
Did not vote	6.48

P-value: 0 → Null hypothesis is rejected

Interpretation:

The observed and expected values are different, indicating a relationship between voting behavior and news consumption. Although different, the observed and expected values are not significantly far apart from each other as indicated by the chi-squared value 50.12. A p-value of 0 suggests that differences between observed and expected values are statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis can be rejected. The probability of seeing a chi-squared of 50.12 in our sample if there were no relationship between voting behavior and news consumption would be $p < .05$.

Voting behavior (PRES20) and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY):

Chi-squared: 568.14

Tabular Format:

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Joe Biden	1229	408	62
Donald Trump	293	328	306
Other	58	21	14
Did not vote	9	5	3

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Joe Biden	986.74	473.19	239.08
Donald Trump	538.38	258.18	130.44
Other	54.01	25.90	13.09
Did not vote	9.87	4.73	2.39

P-value: 0 → Null hypothesis is rejected

Interpretation:

The observed and expected values are different, indicating a relationship between voting behavior and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources. Some of the observed values, especially Joe Biden voter's having neutral opinions on spending for alternative energy sources, are very different and far from the expected, with the expected value being much larger than the observed value, which is indicated by the large and positive chi-squared value of 568.14. A p-value of 0 suggests that differences between observed and expected values are statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis can be rejected. The probability of seeing a chi-squared as big as 568.14 in our sample if there were no relationship between voting behavior and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources would be $p < .05$.

Voting behavior (PRES20) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK):

Chi-Squared: 53.99

Tabular Format:

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Joe Biden	708	944	48
Donald Trump	297	575	72
Other	31	57	5
Did not vote	8	7	2

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Joe Biden	644.44	977.16	78.40
Donald Trump	357.86	542.61	43.53
Other	35.25	53.46	4.29
Did not vote	6.44	9.77	0.78

P-value: 0 → Null hypothesis is rejected

Interpretation:

The observed and expected values are different, indicating a relationship between voting behavior and views on government spending for parks and recreation. Although different, the observed and expected values are not significantly far apart from each other as indicated by the chi-squared value of 53.99. A p-value of 0 suggests that differences between observed and expected values are statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis can be rejected. The probability of seeing a chi-squared of 53.99 in our sample if there were no relationship between voting behavior and views on government spending for parks and recreation would be $p < .05$.

News consumption (NEWS) and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY):

Chi-Squared: 14.70

Tabular Format:

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Daily	269	113	42
Several times a week	176	97	34
Weekly	133	63	33
Less than weekly	216	125	58
Never	711	414	183

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Daily	239.27	129.09	55.64
Several times a week	173.24	93.47	40.29
Weekly	129.23	69.72	30.05
Less than weekly	225.16	121.48	52.36
Never	738.11	398.24	171.65

P-value: 0.0652 → Null hypothesis is retained

Interpretation:

The observed and expected values are different, indicating a relationship between news consumption and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources. The observed and expected values are not far apart from each other as indicated by the chi-squared value of 14.70. A p-value of 0.0652 suggests that differences between observed and expected value are not statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The probability of seeing a chi-squared of 14.70 in our sample if there were no relationship between news consumption and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources would be 6.52%.

News consumption (NEWS) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK):

Chi-Squared: 12.53

Tabular Format:

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Daily	165	246	13
Several times a week	130	162	15
Weekly	96	115	19
Less than weekly	157	224	23
Never	504	751	79

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Daily	165.26	235.33	23.41
Several times a week	119.66	170.39	16.95
Weekly	89.65	127.65	12.70
Less than weekly	157.47	224.23	22.30
Never	519.96	740.40	73.64

P-value: 0.1291 → Null hypothesis is retained

Interpretation:

The observed and expected values are different, indicating a relationship between news consumption and views on government spending for parks and recreation. The observed and expected values are not far apart from each other as indicated by the chi-squared value of 12.53. A p-value of 0.1291 suggest that differences between observed and expected valure are not statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The probability of seeing a chi-squared of 12.53 in our sample if there were no relationship between news consumption and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources would be 12.91%.

Opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK):

Chi-Squared: 209.11
Tabular Format:

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Strong support	1027	1157	85
Support	345	784	52
Neutral	168	274	83

	Strong support	Support	Neutral
Strong support	879.06	1264.36	125.58
Support	457.54	658.09	65.36
Neutral	203.40	292.55	29.06

P-value: 0 → Null hypothesis is rejected

Interpretation:

The observed and expected values are different, indicating a relationship between opinions on spending for alternative energy sources and views on government spending for parks and recreation. Some of the observed values, such as having strong support for spending on alternative energy sources and strong support on government spending for parks and recreation

are different from the expected, with the expected value being larger than the observed value, which is indicated by the large and positive chi-squared value of 209.11. A p-value of 0 suggests that differences between observed and expected values are statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis can be rejected. The probability of seeing a chi-squared as big as 209.11 in our sample if there were no relationship between opinions on spending for alternative energy sources and views on government spending for parks and recreation would be $p < .05$.

Standardized Residual

Voting behavior (PRES20) and news consumption (NEWS):

```
             gss2022$NEWS
gss2022$PRES20     1       2       3       4       5   Total
---------------------------------------------------------------
1                262     150      98     182     480    1172
               220.1   133.4    98.5   177.7   542.4
               0.224   0.128   0.084   0.155   0.410   0.623
               2.827   1.436  -0.050   0.325  -2.678
---------------------------------------------------------------
2                 82      58      55      91     352     638
               119.8    72.6    53.6    96.7   295.2
               0.129   0.091   0.086   0.143   0.552   0.339
              -3.453  -1.716   0.189  -0.581   3.303
---------------------------------------------------------------
3                  5       5       5      10      31      56
                10.5     6.4     4.7     8.5    25.9
               0.089   0.089   0.089   0.179   0.554   0.030
              -1.701  -0.544   0.135   0.518   0.999
---------------------------------------------------------------
4                  4       1       0       2       7      14
                 2.6     1.6     1.2     2.1     6.5
               0.286   0.071   0.000   0.143   0.500   0.007
               0.846  -0.470  -1.085  -0.084   0.205
---------------------------------------------------------------
Total            353     214     158     285     870    1880
```

Interpretation:

Columns 1-4 are Joe Biden, Donald Trump, Other, and Did not vote for the PRES20 variable and Rows 1-5 are daily, several times a week, weekly, less than weekly, and never. A standardized residual of 2.827 suggests that Biden voters are more likely to consume news daily than the other survey respondents who voted for a different candidate, suggesting that Biden voters consume news most frequently. A standardized residual of -2.678 suggests that less Biden voters do not consume news. A standardized residual of -3.435 suggests that less Trump voters are likely to consume the news daily while a standardized residual of 3.303 suggests that more Trump voters are likely to never consume the news. Overall, Biden voters consume news more than expected while Trump voters consume news less than expected.

Voting behavior (PRES20) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK):

```
             gss2022$NATPARK
gss2022$PRES20     1       2       3   Total
-----------------------------------------------
1                708     944      48    1700
               644.4   977.2    78.4
               0.416   0.555   0.028   0.617
               2.504  -1.061  -3.433
-----------------------------------------------
2                297     575      72     944
               357.9   542.6    43.5
               0.315   0.609   0.076   0.343
              -3.217   1.390   4.315
-----------------------------------------------
3                 31      57       5      93
                35.3    53.5     4.3
               0.333   0.613   0.054   0.034
              -0.717   0.485   0.343
-----------------------------------------------
4                  8       7       2      17
                 6.4     9.8     0.8
               0.471   0.412   0.118   0.006
               0.613  -0.887   1.373
-----------------------------------------------
Total           1044    1583     127    2754
```

Interpretation:

Columns 1-4 are Joe Biden, Donald Trump, Other, and Did not vote for the PRES20 variable and rows 1-3 are strong support, support, and neutral for the NATPARK variable. A standardized residual of 2.504 suggests that Biden voters are more likely to strongly support government spending for parks and recreation while a standardized residual of -3.433 suggests that Biden voters are less likely to have neutral views on government spending for parks and recreation. A standardized residual of -3.217 suggests that Trump voters are less likely to strongly support government spending for parks and recreation while a standardized residual 4.315 suggests that Trump voters are more likely to have neutral views on government spending for parks and recreation. Overall, Biden voters are more likely to strongly support government spending for parks and recreation.

Voting behavior (PRES20) and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY):

```
                  gss2022$NATENRGY
gss2022$PRES20        1         2         3    Total
-----------------------------------------------------
1                  1229       408        62     1699
                  986.7     473.2     239.1
                  0.723     0.240     0.036    0.621
                  7.712    -2.997   -11.452
-----------------------------------------------------
2                   293       328       306      927
                  538.4     258.2     130.4
                  0.316     0.354     0.330    0.339
                -10.575     4.345    15.371
-----------------------------------------------------
3                    58        21        14       93
                   54.0      25.9      13.1
                  0.624     0.226     0.151    0.034
                  0.543    -0.963     0.252
-----------------------------------------------------
4                     9         5         3       17
                    9.9       4.7       2.4
                  0.529     0.294     0.176    0.006
                 -0.278     0.122     0.393
-----------------------------------------------------
Total              1589       762       385     2736
```

Interpretation:

Columns 1-4 are Joe Biden, Donald Trump, Other, and Did not vote for the PRES20 variable and rows 1-3 are strong support, support, and neutral for the NATENRGY variable. A standardized residual of 7.712 suggests that Biden voters are more likely to have strong support for spending for alternative energy sources while a standardized residual of -11.452 suggests that Biden voters are very not likely to have neutral support for spending for alternative energy sources. A standardized residual of -10.575 suggests that Trump voters are very not likely to have strong support for spending for alternative energy sources while a standardized residual of 15.371 suggests that Trump voters are very likely to have neutral support for spending for alternative energy sources. Overall, Biden voters are more likely to strongly support spending for alternative energy sources.

Opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK):

```
                    gss2022$NATPARK
gss2022$NATENRGY       1       2       3    Total
-----------------------------------------------
1                   1027    1157      85     2269
                   879.1  1264.4   125.6
                   0.453   0.510   0.037    0.571
                   4.990  -3.019  -3.621
-----------------------------------------------
2                    345     784      52     1181
                   457.5   658.1    65.4
                   0.292   0.664   0.044    0.297
                  -5.261   4.908  -1.653
-----------------------------------------------
3                    168     274      83      525
                   203.4   292.5    29.1
                   0.320   0.522   0.158    0.132
                  -2.482  -1.084  10.007
-----------------------------------------------
Total               1540    2215     220     3975
```

Interpretation:

Columns 1-3 are strong support, support, and neutral for the NATENRGY variable and rows 1-3 are strong support, support, and neutral for the NATPARK variable. A standardized residual of 4.990 suggests that people who strongly support spending for alternative energy sources are also likely to strongly support government spending for parks and recreation. A standardized residual of -3.621 suggests that people who have neutral support for spending for alternative energy sources also have neutral support for government spending for parks and recreation. Overall, there tends to be a consistent relationship for alternative energy sources and views on government spending for parks and recreation. If someone strong supports spending for alternative energy sources, they will most likely strongly support government spending for parks and recreation.

The Effect Size Using Cramer's V

Voting behavior (PRES20) and news consumption (NEWS):
V = 0.09427073

Interpretation: The relationship between voting behavior and news consumption is very weak despite being statistically significant.

Voting behavior (PRES20) and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY): V = 0.3222208

Interpretation: The relationship between voting behavior and opinions on alternative energy sources is moderate.

Voting behavior (PRES20) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK): V = 0.09900633

Interpretation: The relationship between voting behavior and views on government spending for parks and recreation is weak despite being statistically significant. This is due to the minimal practicality of this information. Meaning, even though there is statistical significance, the information may not be very useful

News consumption (NEWS) and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY): V = 0.05250348

Interpretation: The relationship between news consumption and opinions on spending for alternative energy sources is very weak. This indicates that people's news consumption does not indicate spending on environmental resources.

News consumption (NEWS) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK): V = 0.04817859

Interpretation: The relationship between news consumption and spending for parks and recreation is weak, which means that news consumption has little to no effect on views of governmental spending on parks and recreation.

Opinions on spending for alternative energy sources (NATENRGY) and views on government spending for parks and recreation (NATPARK): V = 0.1621835

Interpretation: Despite being statistically significant, the relationship between opinions on spending on alternative energy sources and views on government spending on parks and recreation is weak. This means that people's views on one aspect of conservation do not extend to all aspects of conservation related to alternative energy and parks and recreation.