Detailed Tables

Chapter 12

Detailed Table 12.1
Interest in S&T and other knowledge areas – São Paulo State, 2007

Areas	Interest (%)		
	Total	Highly interested	Interested
Food & consuming	83.3	37.5	45.8
Medicine & health	80.4	34.9	45.5
Environment & ecology	76.0	31.6	44.4
Sport	65.4	30.5	34.9
Science & technology	63.4	16.3	47.1
Cinema, art & culture	58.7	20.3	38.4
Economy & business	43.2	12.7	30.6
Curiosities about the lives of famous people	32.2	9.3	22.8
Astrology & occultism	26.0	7.5	18.5
Politics	21.2	5.0	16.1

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Single-frequency table. A complete breakdown of the responses (adding up to 100%) is presented in Detailed Table 12.13.

Detailed Table 12.2
Interest in S&T by city surveyed – São Paulo & other cities covered by Ibero-American Project, 2007

Cities covered by survey	Breakdown of respondents by interest in S&T (%)				
	Total	Very interested	Interested	Fairly interested	Not interested
Bogota	100.0	47.5	33.2	15.3	4.0
Buenos Aires	100.0	20.3	54.6	19.6	5.5
Caracas	100.0	28.4	52.5	16.8	2.3
Madrid	100.0	16.7	52.7	24.8	5.9
Panama	100.0	26.6	52.7	14.9	5.8
Santiago	100.0	16.5	45.0	26.1	12.4
São Paulo	100.0	15.4	49.6	25.5	9.4

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).

Detailed Table 12.3
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in S&T and socioeconomic class – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by socioeconomic class (%)				
	Total	A	B	C	D/E
Very interested	100.0	10.8	36.0	36.7	16.5
Interested	100.0	8.7	26.0	37.9	27.3
Fairly interested	100.0	4.1	27.8	41.1	27.0
Not interested	100.0	2.3	9.9	36.0	51.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.4a
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in S&T and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Very interested	100.0	56.6	43.4
Interested	100.0	51.6	48.4
Fairly interested	100.0	43.4	56.6
Not interested	100.0	47.1	52.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.4b
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in medicine & health and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in medicine & health	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Very interested	100.0	41.0	59.0
Interested	100.0	52.0	48.0
Fairly interested	100.0	58.0	42.0
Not interested	100.0	69.0	31.0

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.4c
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in food & consuming and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in food & consuming	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Very interested	100.0	41.6	58.4
Interested	100.0	52.5	47.5
Fairly interested	100.0	59.5	40.5
Not interested	100.0	65.9	34.1

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.4d
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in environment & ecology and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in environment & ecology	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Very interested	100.0	47.8	52.2
Interested	100.0	50.4	49.6
Fairly interested	100.0	50.0	50.0
Not interested	100.0	54.1	45.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.5
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in S&T and educational attainment – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by educational attainment (%)					
	Total	Tertiary education/ specialization/MBA/ master's/PhD	Secondary education	Primary education	Pre-primary education	No formal schooling
Very interested	100.0	21.9	53.9	21.5	1.7	1.0
Interested	100.0	11.5	45.8	37.0	3.0	2.7
Fairly interested	100.0	5.2	43.6	42.7	3.9	4.6
Not interested	100.0	1.2	26.3	47.4	8.8	16.4

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.6
Binary logistic regression for data modeling

Model information

Response variable	Level
Number of response levels	2
Model	Binary logit
Optimization technique	Fisher's scoring
Number of observations read	1,825
Number of observations used	1,809

Response profile

Ordered values	1	2
Levels	1	2
Total frequency	1,156	653

Probability modeled level = 1

Note: 16 observations were excluded owing to missing values for responses or explanatory variables.

Class level information

Class	Value	Design variables			
Gender	1	1			
	2	-1			
Education	1	1	0	0	0
	2	0	1	0	0
	3	0	0	1	0
	4	0	0	0	1
	5	-1	-1	-1	-1
Age group	1	1	0		
	2	0	1		
	3	-1	-1		

Model convergence status

Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) is satisfied.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.6 (continued)
Binary logistic regression for data modeling

Model fit statistics

Criterion	Intercept only	Intercept & covariates
AIC	2368.085	2217.992
SC	2373.585	2261.997
-2 Log L	2366.085	2201.992

Testing global null hypothesis: BETA = 0

Test	Chi-square	GL	Pr > QuiQr
Likelihood ratio	164.0924	7	<.0001
Score	154.5549	7	<.0001
Wald	138.7206	7	<.0001

Type III analysis of effects

Effect	GL	Chi-square Wald	Pr > ChiSq
Gender	1	10.3911	0.0013
Education	4	119.6006	<.0001
Age group	2	48.1932	<.0001

Analysis of maximum likelihood estimates

Parameter		GL	Estimate	Error Standard	Chi-square Wald	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept		1	0.1967	0.0900	4.7768	0.0288
Gender	1	1	0.1666	0.0517	10.3911	0.0013
Education	1	1	-1.3539	0.2107	41.2844	<.0001
Education	2	1	-0.6557	0.2143	9.3650	0.0022
Education	3	1	-0.1460	0.1050	1.9317	0.1646
Education	4	1	0.6123	0.1109	30.4809	<.0001
Age group	1	1	-0.1820	0.0806	5.0986	0.0239
Age group	2	1	-0.3370	0.0810	17.3060	<.0001

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.6 (continued)
Binary logistic regression for data modeling

Odds ratio estimates

Effect		Point estimate	95% Wald confidence limits	
Gender	1 vs 2	1.396	1.140	1.709
Education	1 vs 5	0.055	0.029	0.105
Education	2 vs 5	0.111	0.058	0.213
Education	3 vs 5	0.185	0.118	0.289
Education	4 vs 5	0.394	0.253	0.613
Age group	1 vs 3	0.496	0.382	0.645
Age group	2 vs 3	0.425	0.326	0.553

Association of predicted probabilities and observed responses

Percent Agreent	63.5	Somers' D	0.337
Percent Disagreent	29.8	Gamma	0.362
Percent tied	6.7	Tau-a	0.156
Pairs	754868	c	0.669

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Level: 1. Very interested and Interested in S&T; 2. Fairly interested and Not interested in S&T.

Gender: 1. Male; 2. Female.
Education: 1. No formal schooling; 2. Pre-primary education; 3. Primary education; 4. Secondary education; 5. Tertiary education/specialization/MBA/master's/PhD.
Age group: 1. 16-24; 2. 25-34; 3. 35-44; 4. 45-54; 5. 55 and over.

Detailed Table 12.7a
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in S&T and age – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by age group (%)					
	Total	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55 and over
Very interested	100.0	27.6	25.9	19.2	14.8	12.5
Interested	100.0	23.5	19.4	23.3	15.8	17.9
Fairly interested	100.0	27.0	30.7	17.0	10.8	14.5
Not interested	100.0	27.9	20.3	14.0	14.0	23.8

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.7b
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in environment & ecology and age – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in environment & ecology	Breakdown of respondents by age group (%)					
	Total	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55 and over
Very interested	100.0	25.0	25.7	20.5	15.6	13.2
Interested	100.0	23.5	22.3	21.6	14.6	18.0
Fairly interested	100.0	29.8	23.5	17.3	10.4	19.0
Not interested	100.0	29.6	21.4	13.3	15.3	20.4

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.7c
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in medicine & health and age – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in medicine & health	Breakdown of respondents by age group (%)					
	Total	16 -24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55 and over
Very interested	100.0	21.9	26.3	20.8	14.9	16.2
Interested	100.0	23.1	21.7	22.0	14.7	18.5
Fairly interested	100.0	37.6	24.1	14.9	10.2	13.2
Not interested	100.0	32.8	19.0	10.3	17.2	20.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.7d
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in food & consuming and age – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in food & consuming	Breakdown of respondents by age group (%)					
	Total	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55 and over
Very interested	100.0	24.0	27.0	21.3	13.6	14.0
Interested	100.0	22.8	21.2	21.2	14.7	20.1
Fairly interested	100.0	37.1	21.6	14.7	12.7	13.9
Not interested	100.0	29.5	22.7	9.1	20.5	18.2

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.8
Interest in S&T by administrative region – Administrative regions of São Paulo State & São Paulo City, 2007

São Paulo Ciy & administrative regions (AR)	Breakdown of respondents by interest in S&T (%)				
	Total	Very interested	Interested	Fairly interested	Not interested
São Paulo City	100.0	15.4	49.6	25.5	9.4
São José do Rio Preto AR	100.0	11.5	50.0	28.8	9.6
São José dos Campos AR	100.0	27.8	51.9	16.5	3.8
Araçatuba AR	100.0	20.8	45.8	33.3	0.0
Barretos AR	100.0	16.7	11.1	38.9	33.3
Bauru AR	100.0	8.3	44.4	33.3	13.9
Campinas AR	100.0	18.7	39.4	35.2	6.7
Central AR	100.0	14.7	41.2	32.4	11.8
Franca AR	100.0	16.7	29.2	20.8	33.3
Marília AR	100.0	15.8	84.2	0.0	0.0
Pres. Prudente AR	100.0	20.0	43.3	23.3	13.3
Ribeirão Preto AR	100.0	29.5	43.2	18.2	9.1
Santos AR	100.0	11.5	49.2	37.7	1.6
Registro AR	100.0	27.3	27.3	36.4	9.1
Sorocaba AR	100.0	13.4	40.2	28.9	17.5

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.9
Level of information about S&T and other subjects – São Paulo State, 2007

Areas	Respondents' level of information (%)		
	Total	Highly informed	Informed
Food & consuming	72.1	18.8	53.3
Sport	64.1	25.2	38.8
Medicine & health	63.6	14.4	49.2
Environment & ecology	61.4	13.9	47.5
Cinema, art & culture	47.1	10.1	36.9
Science & technology	45.3	5.8	39.6
Economy & business	31.8	5.9	25.9
Curiosities about the lives of famous people	31.6	6.8	24.7
Politics	23.8	4.5	19.3
Astrology & occultism	23.3	4.4	18.8

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Single-frequency chart. A complete breakdown of the responses (adding up to 100%) is presented in Detailed Table 12.13.

Detailed Table 12.10
Breakdown of survey respondents by Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC) and declared knowledge of any Brazilian science institution – São Paulo State, 2007

Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC)	Breakdown of respondents by declared knowledge of any Brazilian science institution (%)		
	Total	Knowledge	No knowledge
High	100.0	58.0	42.0
Medium-high	100.0	31.7	68.3
Medium-low	100.0	25.6	74.4
Low	100.0	9.8	90.2
None	100.0	4.3	95.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.11
Breakdown of survey respondents by Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC) and declared reading of food labels – São Paulo State, 2007

Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC)	Breakdown of respondents by declared reading of food labels (%)			
	Total	Read frequently	Read occasionally	Read very rarely
High	100.0	74.4	17.1	8.5
Medium-high	100.0	70.8	25.0	4.2
Medium-low	100.0	60.3	29.6	10.1
Low	100.0	43.3	36.9	19.8
None	100.0	35.3	29.8	34.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.12

Breakdown of survey respondents who declared consumption of information about S&T by Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC) and attitude to risks and benefits – São Paulo State, 2007

Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC)	Breakdown of respondents by declared consumption of information about S&T and attitude to risks and benefits				
	Total	Many risks & many benefits	Many risks & few benefits	Few risks & many benefits	No risks & no benefits
High	100.0	57.0	6.3	36.7	0.0
Medium-high	100.0	56.7	12.1	30.5	0.7
Medium-low	100.0	53.2	15.0	29.5	2.3
Low	100.0	45.1	21.7	27.4	5.8
None	100.0	42.9	25.5	23.5	8.1

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q14: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many risks, Some risks, Few risks or No risks for the world?"

Q15: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many benefits, Some benefits, Few benefits or No benefits for the world?"

Detailed Table 12.13
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

1. Question: "Do you regularly watch TV?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Yes	1,753	96.1
No	72	3.9

2. Question: "What kind of programs do you mostly watch?"

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,753**	**100.0**
1. News	885	50.5
2. Films, series	210	12.0
3. Cultural programs	27	1.5
4. Medicine, health	6	0.3
5. Sport	133	7.6
6. Environment, wildlife	9	0.5
7. Current affairs, politics, debates	9	0.5
8. Science documentaries	13	0.7
9. Concerts, shows, entertainment	44	2.5
10. Weather	3	0.2
11. Soap operas	370	21.1
12. Other	44	2.5

2nd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,693**	**100.0**
1. News	393	23.2
2. Films, series	419	24.7
3. Cultural programs	79	4.7
4. Medicine, health	26	1.5
5. Sport	218	12.9
6. Environment, wildlife	60	3.5
7. Current affairs, politics, debates	25	1.5
8. Science documentaries	32	1.9
9. Concerts, shows, entertainment	73	4.3
10. Weather	18	1.1
11. Soap operas	308	18.2
12. Other	42	2.5

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

3rd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1.589**	**100.0**
1. News	192	12.1
2. Films, series	375	23.6
3. Cultural programs	92	5.8
4. Medicine, health	47	3.0
5. Sport	210	13.2
6. Environment, wildlife	109	6.9
7. Current affairs, politics, debates	43	2.7
8. Science documentaries	51	3.2
9. Concerts, shows, entertainment	152	9.6
10. Weather	38	2.4
11. Soap operas	231	14.5
12. Other	49	3.1

3. Question: "Do you read newspapers or magazines?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1.825**	**100.0**
Yes, frequently	388	21.3
Yes, occasionally	471	25.8
No, never	966	52.9
DK/NA	0	0.0

4. Question: "Which sections or kind of news do you mainly read?"

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	**863**	**100.0**
1. Domestic politics	142	16.5
2. Economy	64	7.4
3. Agriculture/rural	9	1.0
4. Sport	161	18.7
5. Science	31	3.6
6. Horoscope	75	8.7
7. Health	66	7.6
8. TV programming	38	4.4
9. Environment	26	3.0
10. International	7	0.8
11. Events, entertainment	7	0.8
12. Information (about the weather)	4	0.5
13. Crime	93	10.8

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

14. Gossip column, curiosities about the lives of famous people	51	5.9
15. Arts, culture	45	5.2
16. Other	44	5.1
2nd choice	**Frequency**	**%**
Total	**829**	**100.0**
1. Domestic politics	76	9.2
2. Economy	79	9.5
3. Agriculture/rural	21	2.5
4. Sport	94	11.3
5. Science	28	3.4
6. Horoscope	62	7.5
7. Health	83	10.0
8. TV programming	53	6.4
9. Environment	56	6.8
10. International	40	4.8
11. Events, entertainment	12	1.4
12. Information (about the weather)	19	2.3
13. Crime	73	8.8
14. Gossip column, curiosities about the lives of famous people	56	6.8
15. Arts, culture	53	6.4
16. Other	24	2.9
3rd choice	**Frequency**	**%**
Total	787	100.0
1. Domestic politics	58	7.4
2. Economy	38	4.8
3. Agriculture/rural	28	3.6
4. Sport	75	9.5
5. Science	23	2.9
6. Horoscope	41	5.2
7. Health	72	9.1
8. TV programming	54	6.9
9. Environment	67	8.5
10. International	32	4.1
11. Events, entertainment	23	2.9
12. Information (about the weather)	28	3.6
13. Crime	105	13.3
14. Gossip column, curiosities about the lives of famous people	53	6.7
15. Arts, culture	75	9.5
16. Other	15	1.9

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

5. Question: "We would like to know how much you admire certain professions. I'm going to read out a list and for each of the professions listed, please choose A great deal of admiration, Some admiration, Very little admiration or No admiration."

%

Profession	A great deal of admiration	Some admiration	Very little admiration	No admiration	DK/NA
Doctors	74.4	15.8	6.6	3. 2	0.1
Scientists	49.2	27.5	14.9	7. 3	1.1
Engineers	42.9	34.6	15.7	6. 2	0.5
Judges	31.0	28.8	25.2	14. 6	0.5
Lawyers	31.4	30.6	24.6	13. 2	0.2
Athletes	50.1	27.7	15.3	6. 7	0.1
Journalists	52.5	32.3	10.5	4. 5	0.2
Business executives	28.2	34.7	25.9	10. 8	0.3
Teachers	75.1	16.7	5.6	2. 5	0.2
Clergy	36.0	27.6	21.4	14. 6	0.4
Politicians	3.9	8.3	26.4	61.0	0.4
Military	20.5	25.3	25.4	28. 5	0.3
Folk healers	7.0	11.5	19.1	61. 6	0.8
Artists	25.2	35.8	26.7	12. 1	0.2

6. Question: "I'm going to read out a list of areas and I'd like you to say how well you think Brazil performs in each one, choosing Outstanding performance, Above-standard performance, Standard performance or Insignificant."

%

Area	Outstanding	Above average	Standard	Insignificant	DK/NA
Sport	67.7	20.7	10.1	1.0	0.5
Industry	28.3	35.4	30.9	3.6	1.9
Agriculture	35.6	31.9	26.1	4.0	2.4
Health	12.5	22.0	40.8	24.2	0.4
Development of technologies	18.3	39.2	33.0	6.0	3.4
Arts, culture	19.3	40.0	34.0	4.5	2.1
Scientific research	13.2	35.9	38.0	8.4	4.5
Tourism	36.3	35.8	22.7	3.3	1.9
Education	11.2	20.4	39.7	28.3	0.5

7. Question: "Imagine you can decide how the government spends the taxpayer's money. I'm going to show you a card with a list of sectors. I'd like you to tell me in which sectors you would increase investment, by order of importance."

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	1,825	100.0
1. Public works	575	31.5
2. Transport	337	18.5
3. Science & technology	105	5.8

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

4. Environment	300	16.4
5. Defense	56	3.1
6. Justice	161	8.8
7. Culture	213	11.7
8. Sport	77	4.2
DK/NA	1	0.1

2nd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,822**	**100.0**
1. Public works	261	14.3
2. Transport	380	20.9
3. Science & technology	147	8.1
4. Environment	358	19.6
5. Defense	94	5.2
6. Justice	241	13.2
7. Culture	227	12.5
8. Sport	111	6.1
DK/NA	3	0.2

3rd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,814**	**100.0**
1. Public works	236	13.0
2. Transport	246	13.6
3. Science & technology	157	8.7
4. Environment	305	16.8
5. Defense	130	7.2
6. Justice	289	15.9
7. Culture	265	14.6
8. Sport	181	10.0
DK/NA	5	0.3

8. Question: "I'm going to read out a list of topics or areas. Please say whether you are Very interested, Interested, Fairly interested or Not interested in each one."

%

Areas	Very interested	Interested	Fairly interested	Not interested	DK/NA
Food & consuming	37.5	45.8	14.2	2.4	0.1
Science & technology	16.3	47.1	26.4	9.4	0.8
Cinema, art & culture	20.3	38.4	32.5	8.3	0.5
Sport	30.5	34.9	24.9	9.3	0.3
Economy & business	12.7	30.6	40.5	15.8	0.4
Medicine & health	34.9	45.5	16.2	3.2	0.2

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

Environment & ecology	31.6	44.4	18.4	5.4	0.2
Astrology & occultism	7.5	18.5	29.4	43.6	1.0
Politics	5.0	16.1	32.2	46.0	0.6
Curiosities about the lives of famous people	9.3	22.8	29.0	38.4	0.5

9. Question: "You say you are not particularly interested in science and technology. Why not?"

10. Question: "How well-informed do you consider yourself on each of these same subjects? Would you say you are Highly informed, Informed, Moderately informed or Not informed?"

%

Answer	Highly informed	Informed	Moderately informed	Not informed	DK/NR
Food & consuming	18.8	53.3	23.0	4.8	0.1
Science & technology	5.8	39.6	36.5	17.6	0.5
Cinema, art & culture	10.1	36.9	39.3	13.3	0.3
Sport	25.2	38.8	25.5	10.2	0.2
Economy & business	5.9	25.9	46.5	21.6	0.1
Medicine & health	14.4	49.2	30.5	5.8	0.2
Environment & ecology	13.9	47.5	29.7	8.6	0.3
Astrology & occultism	4.4	18.8	28.9	46.8	1.0
Politics	4.5	19.3	36.9	38.6	0.6
Curiosities about the lives of famous people	6.8	24.7	31.7	36.3	0.4

11. Question: : "You say you are not particularly interested in science and technology. Why not?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**989**	**100.0**
Don't understand	362	36.6
No time	116	11.7
Never thought about it	51	5.2
Dislike it	44	4.4
Interest not aroused	176	17.8
Don't know how to get information on the subject	143	14.5
Don't need to know about it	29	2.9
No particular reason	47	4.8
Other	21	2.1

12. Question: "I'm going to read ask some questions about habits relating to information. Please tell me in each case if this is something you do Often, Occasionally or Never."

%

Question	Often	Occasionally	Never	DK/NA
Do you watch TV programs or documentaries about science and technology or nature?	16.1	55.9	27.7	0.3

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

Do you read science news in the newspapers?	7.0	26.3	66.5	0.2
Do you listen to radio programs about science and technology?	2.4	14.2	83.1	0.3
Do you read science magazines?	3.6	16.4	79.8	0.2
Do you read science books?	2.7	9.3	87.6	0.4
Do you use the internet to look for information about science?	4.8	14.2	80.8	0.2
Do you visit science and technology museums, centers or exhibitions?	1.4	11.5	86.8	0.3
Do you talk to friends about science, technology or the environment?	7.0	40.0	52.7	0.3
Do you participate or have you ever participated in activities relating to science, technology or the environment, such as demonstrations or protests, writing letters to the newspapers, attending debates, signing petitions, voting in referendums etc?	1.2	4.4	93.6	0.7

13. Question: "In your answers to the previous question you said you had participated or are participating in activities relating to science, technology or the environment. Please specify."

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**103**	**100.0**
Yes	79	76.7
No	17	16.5
DK/NA	7	6.8

14. Question: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many risks, Some risks, Few risks or No risks for the world?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Many risks	509	27.9
Some risks	652	35.7
Few risks	382	20.9
No risks	180	9.9
DK/NA	102	5.6

15. Question: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many benefits, Some benefits, Few benefits or No benefits for the world?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Many benefits	600	32.9
Some benefits	721	39.5
Few benefits	321	17.6
No benefits	113	6.2
DK/NA	70	3.8

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

16. Question: "I'm going to read out some statements and I'd like you to say how much you agree or disagree with each one."

%

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NA
There is a possibility that the people who pay for research may influence scientists to come up with results that are favorable to them	12.3	40.3	18.2	14.1	3.1	11.9
Researchers and experts don't allow the people who fund their work to influence the results of their research	7.2	32.7	28.7	18.9	2.6	9.9
It's wrong to impose restrictions on new technology until there is scientific proof that it may cause serious harm to human beings and the environment	18.1	44.1	14.1	16.4	3.2	4.1
Until the consequences of new technology are known, it is necessary to act with caution to protect health and the environment	32.4	55.9	7.8	1.6	0.2	2.1
Scientific knowledge is the best foundation for the writing of laws and regulations	11.5	34.4	29.2	14.7	1.5	8.7
Cultural values matter as much as scientific knowledge when laws and regulations are being written	12.2	45.4	26.6	7.3	0.8	7.7
Decisions about social problems relating to science and technology should left to the experts	15.4	44.4	20.3	14.6	2.5	2.7
Citizens should play a more important role in decisions about social problems relating to science and technology	18.1	49.9	18.6	8.4	1.5	3.6

17. Question: "Sometimes the results of science and technology are controversial for society. In these cases whom do you trust most when forming your opinion?"

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
1. Government	249	13.6
2. Universities, public research centers	749	41.0
3. Political parties	11	0.6
4. Trade unions	34	1.9
5. Media	328	18.0
6. Church	104	5.7
7. Friends, family	148	8.1
8. Consumer associations	14	0.8
9. Environmentalist associations	79	4.3
10. Business organizations	38	2.1
11. Social movements	51	2.8
12. Other	20	1.1

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

2nd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,790**	**100.0**
1. Government	259	14.5
2. Universities, public research centers	269	15.0
3. Political parties	35	2.0
4. Trade unions	49	2.7
5. Media	447	25.0
6. Church	100	5.6
7. Friends, family	231	12.9
8. Consumer associations	75	4.2
9. Environmentalist associations	163	9.1
10. Business organizations	64	3.6
11. Social movements	96	5.4
12. Other	2	0.1

3rd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,703**	**100.0**
1. Government	150	8.8
2. Universities, public research centers	173	10.2
3. Political parties	38	2.2
4. Trade unions	42	2.5
5. Media	260	15.3
6. Church	62	3.6
7. Friends, family	243	14.3
8. Consumer associations	101	5.9
9. Environmentalist associations	260	15.3
10. Business organizations	147	8.6
11. Social movements	223	13.1
12. Other	4	0.2

18. Question: "How would you rate the education you received at school in the field of science and technology? Was it..."

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Very good	82	4.5
Good	479	26.2
Average	618	33.9
Poor	316	17.3
Very poor	254	13.9
DK/NA	76	4.2

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

19. Question: "To what extent do you agree with this statement: Scientific and technological knowledge improves people's ability to decide about important things in their lives?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Strongly agree	224	12.3
Agree	1073	58.8
Neither agree nor disagree	370	20.3
Disagree	113	6.2
Strongly disagree	15	0.8
DK/NA	30	1.6

20. Question: "How useful would you say scientific and technological knowledge can be in the following walks of life? Would you say it is Very useful, Fairly useful, Not very useful or Useless?"

					%
Answer	Very useful	Fairly useful	Not very useful	Useless	DK/NA
Helping me understand the world	34.8	43.7	15.9	4.3	1.3
Helping me take care of my health and prevent illness	56.8	33.7	7.2	1.3	1.0
Helping protect the surroundings of my home and the environment	42.0	37.4	15.8	3.1	1.7
Helping me take decisions as a consumer	30.0	39.3	22.5	6.0	2.1
Helping me form my political and social opinions	19.6	33.5	32.2	11.6	3.2
Helping me in my career or work	24.1	30.6	23.7	19.5	2.1

21. Question: "I'm going to read out descriptions of things that some people do on a routine basis. Please tell me in each case if this is something you do Often, Occasionally or Very rarely".

				%
Statements	Yes, often	Yes, occasionally	No, very rarely	DK/NA
Read the patient information leaflet before taking medicine	53.9	26.1	18.7	1.3
Read food labels or take an interest in the nutritional value of food	48.6	31.1	19.2	1.1
Check the technical specifications or manuals of home appliances	44.2	30.0	24.9	0.9
Take medical advice before following a diet	45.4	33.4	20.2	1.1
Attend to public health campaigns	50.8	34.5	14.4	0.3
Consult a dictionary to find out more about unfamiliar words or terms	30.5	26.8	39.9	2.7

22. Question: "New applications of science and new technological developments frequently arouse controversy because they involve both risks as well as benefits. Tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements as they apply to such cases".

						%
Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NA
The citizens should be heard and their opinions taken into consideration	34.4	55.1	7.1	2.7	0.3	0.5

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

Only the views of experts should be heard	3.6	15.7	23.5	46.9	9.5	0.8
A new application of science or technology should be banned if there is the least possibility of a grave risk	26.9	49.3	14.7	7.1	0.9	1.2
I would look at the information on each case before taking decision	29.0	57.6	10.3	1.8	0.2	1.0
I would not be concerned as long as I was not directly affected	2.2	14.2	18.9	49.0	14.6	0.9
I would accept as long as there was a benefit for the community	18.0	57.6	12.2	9.5	2.2	0.5

23. Question: "Suppose you or a relative of yours had a life-threatening illness. You have to take a decision in this context. What types of information would you take most into consideration? Would you also be influenced by any other opinions or information?

1st choice (mainly)	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
1. Only doctors and specialists	1104	60.5
2. I would take medical opinion into account but it would not be decisive	440	24.1
3. I would consult a faith healer	12	0.7
4. I would seek help from my church	121	6.6
5. I would consider the opinions of family and friends	50	2.7
6. I would seek alternative treatment and medicine	78	4.3
7. I would search for information on my own, in books and magazines, on the web etc.	17	0.9
DK/NA	3	0.2

2nd choice (what else)	Frequency	%
Total	**1,796**	**100.0**
1. Only doctors and specialists	156	8.7
2. I would take medical opinion into account but it would not be decisive	396	22.0
3. I would consult a faith healer	50	2.8
4. I would seek help from my church	271	15.1
5. I would consider the opinions of family and friends	458	25.5
6. I would seek alternative treatment and medicine	340	18.9
7. I would search for information on my own, in books and magazines, on the web etc.	118	6.6
DK/NA	7	0.4

3rd choice (any more)	Frequency	%
Total	**1,592**	**100.0**
1. Only doctors and specialists	54	3.4
2. I would take medical opinion into account but it would not be decisive	157	9.9
3. I would consult a faith healer	48	3.0
4. I would seek help from my church	154	9.7

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

5. I would consider the opinions of family and friends	415	26.1
6. I would seek alternative treatment and medicine	477	30.0
7. I would search for information on my own, in books and magazines, on the web etc.	284	17.8
DK/NA	3	0.2

24. Question: "Imagine that a technological facility is going to be installed near your home and this could be a hazard to your health or the environment. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements."

%

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly agree	DK/NA
My views would have to be considered	44.2	46.6	4.9	3.2	0.5	0.6
I would do whatever it took to move	14.0	21.0	16.2	34.4	13.4	1.1
I'd accept the facility if I were personally compensated	4.1	18.5	21.4	37.3	17.5	1.3
I would organize with my neighbors	23.9	50.1	15.2	8.8	1.3	0.6
I wouldn't take it very seriously, because people always exaggerate in these cases	1.4	11.0	24.5	48.3	13.4	1.3
I would protest through the media or go to court	19.1	35.7	23.6	17.2	2.9	1.5
I wouldn't do anything, because nothing you do in these cases makes a difference	1.5	7.1	15.9	54.1	20.4	1.1

25. Question: "Can you name an institution that does scientific research in this country?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Yes	285	15.6
No	1,481	81.2
DK/NA	59	3.2

26. Question: "In your opinion, is Brazil an advanced, intermediate or backward country in terms of scientific research?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Advanced	156	8.5
Intermediate	1,075	58.9
Backward	451	24.7
DK/NA	143	7.8

27. Question: "Is Brazil an advanced country compared with other countries? (FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED THAT BRAZIL IS AN "ADVANCED" COUNTRY)

28. Question: "Is Brazil a backward country compared with other countries? (FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED THAT BRAZIL IS A "BACKWARD" COUNTRY)

29. Question: "Would you say scientists as a profession are..."

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

29.1 Attractions of a career in science for young people	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Highly attractive for young people	817	44.8
Unattractive for young people	859	47.1
DK/NA	149	8.2

29.2 Rewards of a career in science	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Highly rewarding from the personal standpoint	1,163	63.7
Unrewarding from the personal standpoint	474	26.0
DK/NA	188	10.3

29.3 Earning power of a career in science	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Well-paid	1,157	63.4
Underpaid	302	16.5
DK/NA	366	20.1

29.4 Prestige of a career in science	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Prestigious	1,143	62.6
Unprestigious	494	27.1
DK/NA	188	10.3

30. Question: "Have you heard recently about any controversial issue relating to science, technology or their applications, about which there are concerns and debates in society?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Yes	420	23.0
No	1,328	72.8
DK/NA	77	4.2

31. Question: "How would you rate your level of knowledge about the subject(s) you mentioned?"

32. Question: "How old are you?"

Age group	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
16-24	463	25.4
25-34	429	23.5

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

35-44	365	20.0
45-54	259	14.2
55 or more	308	16.9
DK/NA	1	0.1

33. Question: Gender

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Male	908	49.8
Female	917	50.2

34. Question: Education

34.1 "What was the highest level of formal education you attended?"	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
No formal education	80	4.4
Pre-primary education	67	3.7
Primary education	676	37.0
Secondary education	810	44.4
Tertiary education	185	10.1
Specialization, MBA	3	0.2
Master's	1	0.1
PhD	2	0.1
DK/NA	1	0.1

34.2 "Did you complete this level?"	Frequency	%
Total	**1,745**	**100.0**
Yes	968	55.5
No	774	44.4
DK/NA	3	0.2

35. Question: Do you work?

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Yes	1 144	62.7
No	673	36.9
DK/NA	8	0.4

36. Question: "What is your religion?"

Answer	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Catholic	1,149	63.0

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

Protestant	43	2.4
Pentecostal	349	19.1
Atheist or agnostic	122	6.7
Spiritist	76	4.2
Afro-Brazilian	13	0.7
Jewish	5	0.3
Buddhist	12	0.7
Other	40	2.2
None	16	0.9

37. Question: "Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements."

%

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NA
We value science too highly and religious faith too little	11.6	39.2	15.8	27.0	5.9	0.5
Science and technology can solve any problem	2.0	12.5	18.5	51.9	14.0	1.2

38. Question: "Who typically pays for scientific and technological research in this country?"

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Scientists, with their own money	145	7.9
Companies	305	16.7
Private foundations	233	12.8
The government	574	31.5
Foreign countries	139	7.6
International organizations	135	7.4
DK/NA	294	16.1

2nd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,508**	**100.0**
Scientists, with their own money	110	7.3
Companies	316	21.0
Private foundations	280	18.6
The government	337	22.3
Foreign countries	247	16.4
International organizations	215	14.3
DK/NA	3	0.2

39. Question: "What are the main motivations that lead scientists to do their research?"

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

1. Power and prestige	207	11.3
2. Their own professional interests	196	10.7
3. Winning major prizes	91	5.0
4. Making money	331	18.1
5. Solving people's problems	249	13.6
6. Doing good	89	4.9
7. Pursuing knowledge as a calling	133	7.3
8. Contributing to the nation's scientific and technological development	317	17.4
DK/NA	212	11.6

2nd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,595**	**100.0**
1. Power and prestige	150	9.4
2. Their own professional interests	142	8.9
3. Winning major prizes	120	7.5
4. Making money	244	15.3
5. Solving people's problems	257	16.1
6. Doing good	209	13.1
7. Pursuing knowledge as a calling	190	11.9
8. Contributing to the nation's scientific and technological development	279	17.5
DK/NA	4	0.3

40. Question: "What is the main driver of scientific development in the world?"

1st choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Economic and market demand	386	21.2
Multinational corporations	335	18.4
Governments of rich countries	430	23.6
International organizations	158	8.7
Scientists' choices	165	9.0
DK/NA	351	19.2

2nd choice	Frequency	%
Total	**1,482**	**100.0**
Economic and market demand	169	11.4
Multinational corporations	353	23.8
Governments of rich countries	353	23.8
International organizations	319	21.5
Scientists' choices	258	17.4
DK/NA	30	2.0

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

41. Question: "I'm going to read out a list of public science and technology venues or events. Please tell me whether you have visited any of these places or taken part in any of these events in the last year (last 12 months)."

			%
Statements	**Yes**	**No**	**DK/NA**
Science and technology museum or center	5.2	93.3	1.5
Public library	24.1	74.6	1.3
Art museum	13.3	85.3	1.4
Zoo, botanic garden, ecological park	32.2	66.7	1.1

42. Question: "Is there a reason why you haven't visited a science museum or science and technology center in the last year (last 12 months)?"

Answer	**Frequency**	**%**
Total	**2,373**	**100.0**
No time	678	28.6
There aren't any in the vicinity	314	13.2
Too far	285	12.0
Can't afford to go	165	7.0
Don't know where they are	330	13.9
Not interested	547	23.1
Other	35	1.5
DK/NA	19	0.8

43. Question: "How well-informed do you consider yourself on the following areas of health: Highly informed, Informed, Moderately informed or Not informed?"

					%
Answer	**Highly informed**	**Informed**	**Moderately informed**	**Not informed**	**DK/NA**
Obesity	26.2	35.1	30.5	8.1	0.1
Diabetes	28.3	35.9	28.9	6.7	0.1
AIDS	41.8	39.1	14.9	4.0	0.2

44. Socioeconomic Class

Socioeconomic Class	**Frequency**	**%**
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
A1	26	1.4
A2	105	5.8
B1	179	9.8
B2	303	16.6
C	699	38.3
D	485	26.6
E	28	1.5

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Detailed Table 12.13 (continued)
Public perceptions of S&T survey: Breakdown of responses to questionnaire – São Paulo State, 2007

Type of dwelling	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
House	1,632	89.4
Apartment	193	10.6

Marital status	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
Married	900	49.3
Single	718	39.3
Widowed, divorced, separated	207	11.3

City in which this questionnaire was applied	Frequency	%
Total	**1,825**	**100.0**
São Paulo	1,076	59.0
São José do Rio Preto AR	54	3.0
São José dos Campos AR	82	4.5
Araçatuba AR	24	1.3
Barretos AR	18	1.0
Bauru AR	36	2.0
Campinas AR	195	10.7
Central AR	34	1.9
Franca AR	24	1.3
Marília AR	38	2.1
Pres. Prudente AR	30	1.6
Ribeirão Preto AR	44	2.4
Santos AR	61	3.3
Registro AR	12	0.7
Sorocaba AR	97	5.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State. AR = Administrative Region

DK/NA: Don't know/no answer.

Detailed Table 12.14
Level of admiration for scientists and other professions – São Paulo State, 2007

Profession	Level of admiration among survey respondents (%)		
	Total	A great deal of admiration	Very little admiration
Teachers	91.8	75.1	16.7
Doctors	90.2	74.4	15.8
Journalists	84.8	52.5	32.3
Athletes	77.9	50.1	27.7
Engineers	77.5	42.9	34.6
Scientists	76.7	49.2	27.5
Clergy	63.6	36.0	27.6
Business executives	63.0	28.2	34.7
Lawyers	62.0	31.4	30.6
Artists	61.0	25.2	35.8
Judges	59.8	31.0	28.8
Military	45.8	20.5	25.3
Folk healers	18.5	7.0	11.5
Politicians	12.2	3.9	8.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Single-frequency table. A complete breakdown of the responses (adding up to 100%) is presented in Detailed Table 12.13.

Detailed Table 12.15
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in S&T and admiration for scientists – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by level of admiration for scientists (%)				
	Total	A great deal of admiration	Some admiration	Very little admiration	No admiration
Very interested	100.0	73.4	14.5	8.1	4.0
Interested	100.0	53.6	33.0	10.5	2.8
Fairly interested	100.0	35.6	27.2	24.7	12.5
Not interested	100.0	28.4	27.2	22.8	21.6

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.16
Breakdown of survey respondents by socioeconomic class and perception of future benefits of S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Socioeconomic class	Breakdown of respondents by perception of future benefits of S&T (%)				
	Total	Many benefits	Some benefits	Few benefits	No benefits
A	100.0	50.4	35.9	10.7	3.1
B	100.0	44.2	40.2	12.0	3.6
C	100.0	30.7	40.5	21.9	6.9
D/E	100.0	24.7	44.1	21.5	9.6

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q15: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many benefits, Some benefits, Few benefits or No benefits for the world?"

Detailed Table 12.17
Breakdown of survey respondents by perception of future benefits of S&T and socioeconomic class – São Paulo State, 2007

Perception of future benefits	Breakdown of respondents by socioeconomic class (%)				
	Total	A	B	C	D/E
Many benefits	100.0	11.0	35.0	34.3	19.7
Some benefits	100.0	6.5	26.5	37.7	29.3
Few benefits	100.0	4.4	17.8	45.8	32.1
No benefits	100.0	3.5	15.0	40.7	40.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q15: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many benefits, Some benefits, Few benefits or No benefits for the world?"

Detailed Table 12.18
Breakdown of survey respondents by socioeconomic class and perception of future risks of S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Socioeconomic class	Breakdown of respondents by perception of future risks of S&T (%)				
	Total	Many risks	Some risks	Few risks	No risks
A	100.0	18.5	43.8	26.9	10.8
B	100.0	27.6	40.2	22.3	9.9
C	100.0	30.9	37.0	20.2	11.9
D/E	100.0	32.8	34.9	23.4	8.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State

Note: Q14: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many risks, Some risks, Few risks or No risks for the world?"

Detailed Table 12.19
Breakdown of survey respondents by frequency of reading about science in newspapers and perception of future benefits of S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency of reading about science in newspapers	Breakdown of respondents by perception of future benefits of S&T (%)				
	Total	Many benefits	Some benefits	Few benefits	No benefits
Often	100.0	60.3	31.7	6.3	1.6
Sometimes	100.0	42.6	43.8	12.1	1.5
Never	100.0	27.9	41.0	22.1	9.0

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q15: "Generally speaking, do you believe the development of science and technology in the next 20 years will offer Many benefits, Some benefits, Few benefits or No benefits for the world?"

Detailed Table 12.20a
Breakdown of survey respondents by frequency of reading newspapers or magazines and perception of future benefits of S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency of reading newspapers or magazines	Breakdown of respondents by perception of future benefits of S&T (%)				
	Total	Many benefits	Some benefits	Few benefits	No benefits
Often	100.0	46.9	39.1	12.0	2.1
Sometimes	100.0	38.1	45.0	13.1	3.7
Never	100.0	26.8	39.9	23.6	9.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State

Detailed Table 12.20b
Breakdown of survey respondents by frequency of reading newspapers or magazines and perception of future risks of S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency of reading newspapers or magazines	Breakdown of respondents by perception of future risks of S&T (%)				
	Total	Many risks	Some risks	Few risks	No risks
Often	100.0	23.2	41.0	24.0	11.7
Sometimes	100.0	27.1	38.7	23.2	10.9
Never	100.0	33.5	36.0	20.8	9.6

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.21
Breakdown of survey respondents by perception of future risks of S&T and frequency of reading science news – São Paulo State, 2007

Perception of risks of S&T	Breakdown of respondents by frequency of reading science news (%)			
	Total	Often	Sometimes	Never
Many risks	100.0	7.9	22.9	69.2
Some risks	100.0	6.6	30.3	63.1
Few risks	100.0	6.5	29.6	63.9
No risks	100.0	10.0	26.7	63.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.22a
Breakdown of survey respondents by level of interest in S&T and frequency of reading patient information leaflets – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by frequency of reading patient information leaflets (%)			
	Total	Often	Occasionally	Very rarely
Very interested	100.0	63.9	19.9	16.2
Interested	100.0	54.7	29.1	16.2
Fairly interested	100.0	56.1	24.9	19.0
Not interested	100.0	35.3	27.5	37.1

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.22b
Breakdown of survey respondents by frequency of reading food labels and level of interest in S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Level of interest in S&T	Breakdown of respondents by frequency of reading food labels (%)			
	Total	Often	Occasionally	Very rarely
Very interested	100.0	64.6	25.3	10.1
Interested	100.0	49.1	34.1	16.8
Fairly interested	100.0	47.0	32.3	20.8
Not interested	100.0	28.7	26.9	44.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.23a
Breakdown of survey respondents by educational attainment and frequency of reading patient information leaflets – São Paulo State, 2007

Educational attainment	Breakdown of respondents by frequency of reading patient information leaflets (%)			
	Total	Often	Sometimes	Very rarely
No formal schooling	100.0	19.7	23.0	57.4
Pre-primary education	100.0	46.2	26.2	27.7
Primary education	100.0	50.4	28.6	20.9
Secondary education	100.0	57.5	26.5	16.1
Tertiary education, specialization, MBA Master's, PhD	100.0	71.7	19.4	8.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.23b
Breakdown of survey respondents by educational attainment and frequency of reading food labels – São Paulo State, 2007

Educational attainment	Breakdown of respondents by frequency of reading food labels or taking an interest in the nutritional value of food (%)			
	Total	Often	Occasionally	Very rarely
No formal schooling	100.0	11.3	22.6	66.1
Pre-primary education	100.0	35.4	32.3	32.3
Primary education	100.0	45.4	31.5	23.1
Secondary education	100.0	51.6	34.2	14.2
Tertiary education, specialization, MBA Master's, PhD	100.0	69.1	22.0	8.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.24
Breakdown of survey respondents by frequency of reading patient information leaflets and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency of reading patient information leaflets	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Often	100.0	39.7	60.3
Occasionally	100.0	58.8	41.2
Very rarely	100.0	65.4	34.6

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.25
Breakdown of survey respondents by frequency of reading food labels and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency of reading food labels	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Often	100.0	39.9	60.1
Occasionally	100.0	56.7	43.3
Very rarely	100.0	63.1	36.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.26
Breakdown of survey respondents who consider themselves well-informed about S&T by routine behavior – São Paulo State, 2007

Routine behavior	Well-informed about S&T (%)
Reading patient information leaflets before taking medicine	72.1
Reading food labels or taking an interest in the nutritional value of food	73.3
Reading technical specifications and appliance manuals	70.5
Attending to public health campaigns	65.7
Taking medical advice before following a diet	60.6
Looking up unfamiliar words in a dictionary	60.0

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.27
Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem and Scientific Consumption Information Indicator (ICIC) score – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that S&T can solve any problem	Breakdown of respondents by ICIC score (%)					
	Total	High	Medium-high	Medium-low	Low	None
Strongly agree	100.0	18.9	10.8	32.4	16.2	21.6
Agree	100.0	7.0	7.5	26.3	43.0	16.2
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	4.2	8.6	28.2	34.1	24.9
Disagree	100.0	3.8	8.0	24.0	39.0	25.2
Strongly disagree	100.0	3.5	6.7	18.4	38.8	32.5

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q37.2: "Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statement: Science and technology can solve any problem."

Detailed Table 12.28
Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem and level of interest in S&T – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that S&T can solve any problem	Breakdown of respondents by level of interest in S&T (%)				
	Total	Very interested	Interested	Fairly interested	Not interested
Strongly agree	100.0	37.8	29.7	29.7	2.7
Agree	100.0	19.9	56.6	18.6	4.9
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	11.7	55.1	23.4	9.9
Disagree	100.0	16.6	43.6	31.0	8.8
Strongly disagree	100.0	17.0	47.4	19.4	16.2

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q37.2: "Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statement: Science and technology can solve any problem."

Detailed Table 12.29
Breakdown of respondents by Scientific Consumption Information Indicator (ICIC) score and response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem – São Paulo State, 2007

ICIC score	Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem (%)					
	Total	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High	100.0	8.5	19.5	17.1	43.9	11.0
Medium-high	100.0	2.8	11.9	20.3	53.1	11.9
Medium-low	100.0	2.7	13.6	21.5	51.5	10.7
Low	100.0	0.9	14.3	16.7	53.7	14.4
None	100.0	1.8	8.2	18.6	53.0	18.4

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Note: Q37.2: "Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statement: Science and technology can solve any problem."

Detailed Table 12.30
Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem and age group – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that S&T can solve any problem	Breakdown of respondents by age group (%)					
	Total	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55 and over
Strongly agree	100.0	29.7	13.5	16.2	24.3	16.2
Agree	100.0	25.4	24.1	18.9	12.3	19.3
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	25.8	20.5	16.6	16.9	20.2
Disagree	100.0	25.6	25.6	21.1	12.9	14.8
Strongly disagree	100.0	23.9	22.4	22.4	14.1	17.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.31
Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem and socioeconomic class – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that S&T can solve any problem	Breakdown of respondents by socioeconomic class (%)				
	Total	A	B	C	D/E
Strongly agree	100.0	10.8	29.7	29.7	29.7
Agree	100.0	8.8	30.3	35.5	25.4
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	8.6	24.6	38.6	28.2
Disagree	100.0	7.0	27.3	39.6	26.1
Strongly disagree	100.0	4.7	23.5	36.1	35.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.32
Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem and educational attainment – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that S&T can solve any problem	Breakdown of respondents by educational attainment (%)					
	Total	Tertiary/specialization/ MBA/master's/PhD	Secondary	Primary	Pre-primary	No formal schooling
Strongly agree	100.0	13.5	45.9	29.7	8.1	2.7
Agree	100.0	11.4	46.5	34.6	3.5	3.9
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	11.0	43.9	36.8	3.9	4.5
Disagree	100.0	10.8	46.6	35.7	3.2	3.7
Strongly disagree	100.0	8.2	36.5	44.7	4.3	6.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.33
Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that S&T can solve any problem and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that S&T can solve any problem	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Strongly agree	100.0	59.5	40.5
Agree	100.0	56.1	43.9
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	53.4	46.6
Disagree	100.0	48.2	51.8
Strongly disagree	100.0	44.7	55.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.34
Breakdown of survey respondents by response to the statement that science is overvalued and religious faith undervalued and gender – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that science is overvalued and religion undervalued	Breakdown of respondents by gender (%)		
	Total	Men	Women
Strongly agree	100.0	40.8	59.2
Agree	100.0	49.3	50.7
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	54.5	45.5
Disagree	100.0	52.7	47.3
Strongly disagree	100.0	43.9	56.1

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.35
Breakdown of survey respondents by response to the statement that science is overvalued and religious faith undervalued and socioeconomic class – São Paulo State, 2007

Response to statement that science is overvalued and religion undervalued	Breakdown of respondents by socioeconomic class (%)				
	Total	A	B	C	D/E
Strongly agree	100.0	6.6	26.5	35.1	31.8
Agree	100.0	7.8	23.7	41.1	27.4
Neither agree nor disagree	100.0	8.0	32.6	36.1	23.3
Disagree	100.0	7.1	27.2	36.7	29.0
Strongly disagree	100.0	2.8	26.2	37.4	33.6

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.36
Breakdown of respondents by Scientific Consumption Information Indicator (ICIC) score and response to the statement that that science is overvalued and religious faith undervalued – São Paulo State, 2007

ICIC score	Breakdown of respondents by response to the statement that science is overvalued and religion undervalued (%)					
	Total	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High	100.0	11.0	25.6	13.4	30.5	19.5
Medium-high	100.0	6.3	25.0	15.3	41.7	11.8
Medium-low	100.0	5.2	27.6	19.5	37.4	10.3
Low	100.0	5.4	26.1	16.1	42.2	10.2
None	100.0	6.4	29.3	12.6	38.1	13.7

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.37
Breakdown of survey respondents by response to the statement that science is overvalued and religious faith undervalued and admiration for scientists – São Paulo State, 2007

Admiration for scientists	Breakdown of survey respondents by response to the statement that science is overvalued and religious faith undervalued (%)					
	Total	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
A great deal of admiration	100.0	12.8	39.1	14.4	26.4	7.3
Some admiration	100.0	9.4	40.7	18.4	27.5	4.0
Very little admiration	100.0	10.0	39.1	16.2	30.6	4.1
No admiration	100.0	15.0	38.3	13.5	24.8	8.3

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State.

Detailed Table 12.38
Comparison of frequency of information consumption in the media: "Do you read science news in newspapers and magazines or on the web?" – Europe, Brazil & São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency	Read news in newspapers and magazines or on the web (%)		
	Europe	Brazil	São Paulo State
Often	19.0	11.0	5.0
Sometimes	60.0	25.0	19.0
Never	20.0	64.0	76.0

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; MCT (2007); Eurobarometer (European Commission, 2005).

Detailed Table 12.39
Comparison of frequency of respondents who visit public S&T venues – Europe, Brazil & São Paulo State, 2007

Public S&T venues	Respondents who say they visited these venues in past year		
	Europe	Brazil	São Paulo State
S&T museum/center	16.0	4.0	5.2
Public library	34.0	25.0	24.1
Art museum	23.0	12.0	13.3
Zoo, botanic garden, ecological park	27.0	28.0	32.2

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; MCT (2007); Eurobarometer (European Commission, 2005).

Note: Q41: "I'm going to read out a list of public science and technology venues or events. Please tell me whether you have visited any of these places or taken part in any of these events in the last year (last 12 months)."

Detailed Table 12.40
Frequency of participation in activities relating to S&T and environment (demonstrations, forums etc.) – Europe, Brazil & São Paulo State, 2007

Frequency	Participation in activities relating to S&T and environment (%)		
	Europe	Brazil	São Paulo State
Often	2.0	2.0	1.2
Sometimes	26.0	7.0	4.4
Never	72.0	91.0	93.6

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; MCT (2007); Eurobarometer (European Commission, 2005).

Detailed Table 12.41
Breakdown of Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC) scores in cities surveyed – São Paulo & other cities surveyed by Ibero-American Project, 2007

Cities in which this questionnaire was applied	ICIC score (%)					
	Total	High	Medium-high	Medium-low	Low	None
Bogota	100.0	12.5	11.9	29.4	29.0	17.2
Buenos Aires	100.0	9.6	10.1	42.4	22.5	15.4
Caracas	100.0	8.9	8.4	34.5	20.0	28.2
Madrid	100.0	9.3	17.6	35.2	22.9	14.9
Panama	100.0	12.9	14.7	32.3	23.5	16.6
Santiago	100.0	12.2	12.0	29.7	29.7	16.5
São Paulo	100.0	4.2	6.5	25.3	38.1	25.9

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).

Detailed Table 12.42
Average Scientific Information Consumption Indicator (ICIC) scores in cities surveyed – São Paulo & other cities surveyed by Ibero-American Project, 2007

ICIC	Cities in which this questionnaire was applied						
	Bogota	Buenos Aires	Caracas	Madrid	Panama	Santiago	São Paulo
Average ICIC	0.87	0.88	0.75	0.92	0.92	0.87	0.63

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).

Detailed Table 12.43
Breakdown of survey respondents by city surveyed and knowledge of scientific institutions – São Paulo & other cities surveyed by Ibero-American Project, 2007

Cities in which this questionnaire was applied	Breakdown of respondents by knowledge of scientific institutions (%)		
	Total	Yes	No
Bogota	100.0	37.1	62.9
Buenos Aires	100.0	59.6	40.4
Caracas	100.0	100.0	0.0
Madrid	100.0	29.9	70.1
Panama	100.0	29.0	71.0
Santiago	100.0	18.2	81.8
São Paulo	100.0	14.1	85.9

Sources: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).

Detailed Table 12.44a
Breakdown of survey respondents by city surveyed and admiration for journalists – São Paulo & other cities surveyed by Ibero-American Project, 2007

Cities in which this questionnaire was applied	Breakdown of respondents by admiration for journalists (%)				
	Total	Great admiration	Some admiration	Little admiration	No admiration
Bogota	100.0	57.7	27.9	10.3	4.1
Buenos Aires	100.0	13.0	56.8	27.0	3.2
Caracas	100.0	41.6	40.3	14.8	3.3
Madrid	100.0	12.8	48.5	34.6	4.2
Panama	100.0	20.9	43.9	29.0	6.2
Santiago	100.0	13.6	40.6	33.8	11.9
São Paulo	100.0	54.7	31.3	9.3	4.7

Sources: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).

Detailed Table 12.44b
Breakdown of survey respondents by city surveyed and admiration for teachers – São Paulo & other cities surveyed by Ibero-American Project, 2007

Cities in which this questionnaire was applied	Breakdown of respondents by admiration for teachers (%)				
	Total	Great admiration	Some admiration	Little admiration	No admiration
Bogota	100.0	30.1	30.2	24.1	15.6
Buenos Aires	100.0	42.9	47.3	7.7	2.1
Caracas	100.0	54.6	37.4	7.1	0.9
Madrid	100.0	37.5	49.0	12.1	1.4
Panama	100.0	42.9	38.8	14.3	4.0
Santiago	100.0	42.1	41.8	12.1	4.0
São Paulo	100.0	75.4	16.7	5.5	2.4

Sources: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).

Detailed Table 12.44c
Breakdown of survey respondents by city surveyed and admiration for politicians – São Paulo & other cities surveyed by Ibero-American Project, 2007

Cities in which this questionnaire was applied	Breakdown of respondents by admiration for politicians (%)				
	Total	Great admiration	Some admiration	Little admiration	No admiration
Bogota	100.0	35.6	30.0	18.0	16.4
Buenos Aires	100.0	1.5	18.0	40.2	40.3
Caracas	100.0	19.5	25.5	33.3	21.7
Madrid	100.0	7.0	25.3	42.9	24.8
Panama	100.0	6.2	7.2	37.7	48.9
Santiago	100.0	3.8	10.5	32.0	53.7
São Paulo	100.0	4.0	7.5	24.4	64.1

Source: Labjor/Unicamp, survey on public perceptions of S&T conducted in São Paulo State; López Cerezo & Polino (2008).