

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
MODEL OF PERCEPTION IN RELATION TO WETLAND VALUES, SCIENCE,AND MANAGEMENT	6
Introduction.....	6
Perception	6
Classification	7
Summary.....	9
PERCEPTION OF WETLAND VALUES IN THE WRITTEN MEDIA (You are what you read and read what you are)	10
Introduction.....	10
Literature Review	10
Methods.....	13
Results	13
Comparison of Descriptive Parameter Sets to Media Categories ..	13
Academic Category	15
News Category.....	17
Agency Category	20
Trade Category	22
Environmental Category	25
Comparison of Values: Numbers and Co-Occurrence.....	27
Summary.....	27
Academic Paradigm.....	32
News Paradigm.....	32

Agency Paradigm.....	32
Trade Paradigm	32
Environmental Paradigm.....	32
SURVEY OF PERCEPTION OF WETLAND VALUES IN SOUTH CENTRAL MINNESOTA.....	34
Introduction.....	34
Methods.....	34
Results	41
Public Perception of Wetland Values.....	41
Age Categories: Students versus Parents	45
Residence Categories: Rural Farm versus Rural Non-Farm versus Urban Less Than 5000 versus Urban Greater Than 5000.....	45
Broad Categories.....	45
Further Analysis of Rural Farm: Rural Farm Student Versus Rural Farm Parent.....	46
Public Perception of Wetland Values Compared to Select Groups.....	46
Discussion/Summary.....	52
Public Perception of Wetland Values.....	52
Public Perception of Wetland Values Compared to Select Groups.....	54
CONCLUSIONS	57
Comparison of Evaluation Methodologies.....	57
Model of Perception.....	57
Perception of Wetland Values in the Written Media	57
Survey of Perceptions of Wetland Values in South Central Minnesota .	59
Comparison of Public Perception of Wetland Values	59
Comparison of Public Perception of Wetland Values To Professional, Technical Select Groups	59
Overall Conclusions.....	60
LITERATURE CITED	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	<u>Page</u>
I.	Breakdown of descriptive parameter sets related to wetland values by written media 14
II.	Academic media breakdown of value citations by descriptive parameter sets 19
III.	News media breakdown of value citations by descriptive parameter sets 21
IV.	Agency media breakdown of value citations by descriptive parameter sets 23
V.	Trade media breakdown of value citations by descriptive parameter sets 24
VI.	Environmental media breakdown of value citations by descriptive parameter sets 26
VII.	South Central Minnesota participating high schools and number of respondents 42
VIII.	Results of the specific questions by student versus parent and by location 43
IX.	Results of the broad category questions by student versus parent and by location 44
X.	Number of responses and means by respondent groups and value categories 49
XI.	Significant mean difference at the .05 level for comparisons of all participant groups 50
XII.	Significant mean difference at the .05 level for comparisons of the four lumped participant groups to value categories 51
XIII.	Significant mean difference at the .05 level for comparisons of the grouped technical water professionals to value categories 53
XIV.	Summary respondent versus. value categories by percent possible .. 55

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		<u>Page</u>
1.	Composite matrix of selected wetland evaluation methodologies.....	3
2.	Context of wetland policy.....	8
3.	Percent of articles citing specific values by media category	16
4.	Percent of values cited by media category.....	18
5.	Number of values cited by article	28
6.	Percent of values cited by article	29
7.	Percent value to value comparison by total and media category	30
8.	Survey of perception of wetland values in South Central Minnesota by site selection.....	35
9.	Rural farm student (S) versus rural farm parent (P) specific questions	47
10.	Rural farm student (S) versus rural farm parent (P) broad category questions	48

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank the following for their contributions to this paper.

The Comparison of The Minnesota Wetland Evaluation Methodology to Selected Recent North American Methodologies was the work of the wetlands class of 1990. Mr. John Wells, Chairperson of the Minnesota WEM Task Force (Water Planning Board) assisted with ideas and obtaining methodologies and Ms. Jean Spellacy of the MSU Water Resources Center prepared the numerous drafts and final document.

The model of the Context of Values in Wetland Policy and position statement was developed by six students from the 1998 wetlands class in a follow up project (Tory Christensen, Melanie Coners, Brett Ellanson, Jennifer Heymann, Rhonda Payonk, and Carrie Trytten).

The data for the chapter on media paradigms was collected by the wetlands class of 1992. Three of the students (Ben Green, Kathy Kleen, and Shari Pernu) followed up with the data analysis and draft report. Robin McCartney, a student in mass communications, did the literature review. David Bye, Joanna Skluzacek, and Jean Spellacy worked on revisions of drafts and data presentation.

The Perception of Wetland Values chapter involved the wetland classes of 1995 and 1996. The development of the survey was the direct result of the initiative of Rick Hanna and Julie Conrad, Blue Earth County Water Planners. Jane Starz, Brown County Water Planner, provided the survey distribution plan. Carrie Trytten, a biology graduate student, expanded the survey distribution to include state and county personnel as well as wetland class students. Gregg Asher, professor in the MSUM Department of Computer and Information Sciences provided the statistical analysis. Joanna Skuzacek and Jean Spellacy, Water Resources Center, provided the data formatting and draft reports. A special thank you to the 11 area high school biology teachers, students and parents as well as the regional state agency and county personnel who took their time to fill out the lengthy questionnaire.

All of the above provided the data and input which has made this paper possible. Throughout this extended project the county water planners of the South Central Minnesota Comprehensive Water Planning Project (SCMCCWPP) were partners providing input in the form of direction, requests, and ideas which gave this project its reason for being.

The Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources provided a 205j3 grant in 1992 to the 13 County Water Planning Joint Powers for a workshop on wetland values which I presented and which helped start this whole endeavor. Mankato State University, Department of Biological Sciences provided the resources for my Wetlands classes that were essential to this extended project.

Finally I wish to thank Cis Berg, acting director of the MSUM Water Resources Center, for her support of the project; Dr. Brad Cook, Professor of Biological Sciences, MSUM, and Chris Hughes, Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources for their review and editing of the draft document; Dr. Ann Quade, Professor of Computer and Information Science, for her retrieving of data from old files and editing; and Sunnie McCalla, an undergraduate Biological Sciences major, for her persistence and professionalism in putting this document into final form. The ten year pursuit of developing an understanding of the context and perception of wetland values has hopefully been a worthwhile endeavor and learning experience for all involved.

This research project report is available on the Minnesota River Basin Data Center: Water Resources Center, Minnesota State University Mankato.
<http://mrbdc.mnsu.edu>