CONSUMER'S PREFERENCES ON PURCHASING SEAFOOD FROM THE GULF COAST REGION FOLLOWING THE DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL SPILL

Presented to the Agribusiness Department

California Polytechnic State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Science

By

Jared Wheatley

March 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page**

I. INTRODUCTION…….3

Statement of the Problem……4

Hypothesis……..4

Objectives of Study……4

Justification of the Study……4

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE……6

III. METHODOLOGY……11

Procedure for Data Collection……11

Procedure for Data Analysis……..12

Assumptions and Limitations…….13

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY…….14

Data Collection Problems……...14

Statistical Analysis and Results of Data……14

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS……23

Summary……23

Conclusions……25

Recommendations……..27

References Cited……28

APPENDIX……...29

"HAVE CONSUMER'S PREFERENCES CHANGED ON PURCHASING SEAFOOD FROM THE GULF COAST REGION FOLLOWING THE DEEPWATER HORIZION OIL SPILL"

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Environmental disasters are something that cannot be prepared for unless that exact event has happened before. As of March 10, 2009, British Petroleum's Initial Exploration Plan said that "it is unlikely that an accidental spill would occur" and "no adverse activities are anticipated" to fisheries or fish habitat (Griffitt 2009). Roughly a little more than a year later, on April 20th, 2010, the Deepwater Horizon Drilling Rig exploded in the Gulf of Mexico, causing an oil leak that lasted for about 3 months and dispersed over 190 million gallons of oil into the ecosystem.

The spill has caused a rippling effect to the Gulf Coast Region and brought back memories of Hurricane Katrina with people very quickly becoming unemployed and being taking a hit financially. Roughly a month after the spill approximately one-third of the Gulf of Mexico's surface was covered by oil. On May 24th, the Federal Government declared fisheries disaster, meaning that fish farms were in great danger and at very low supply for the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana; the initial cost estimates to the industry were $2.5 billion. One month later the ban was lifted on an 8,000 square mile area, still leaving roughly 78,000 square miles of the Gulf, with no fishing.

With such as massive oil spill as Deepwater Horizon was, there are going to be questions about water safety. This will also bring about questions as to what's coming out of the water.

Many people rely on the Gulf Coast Region to provide their seafood, but there is the potential that more people will not want to get seafood from that region until there is a certainty that there is no more oil contaminating anything in the water. Figuring out what exactly concerns people when purchasing seafood and where it has come from is will play a vital role in this study.

Problem Statement

How much have consumers' preferences changed on purchasing seafood from the Gulf Coast Region after the recent Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill?

Hypothesis

Consumer's preferences have changed following the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. Although Government agencies are committing to buying seafood from the region, overall interest in seafood have gone down.

Objectives

1. To observe if people have been following the news coverage of the initial blow-out and clean up of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.

2. To determine if people who did follow it, will their purchasing habits of seafood coming from the Gulf Coast Region change after the oil spill.

Justification

The findings from this research will benefit and inform many people of certain job areas such as the fisherman and the processors who ship and sell seafood. The extent of the Deepwater

Horizon Oil Spill is not completely known and the after effects of the spill may still linger around for many years to come. According to FIS financial, to start the first shrimp season after the spill in August, Louisiana only had about 50 boats of the fleet of 5,000 boats take to sea, or roughly 1%. Since the Gulf Coast Region will not be contributing nearly as much of a product, it is very important to find out who still does want to buy seafood from the region. Also, given that the study is looking at if consumer preferences of seafood coming from the Gulf Coast Region, fisherman and producers of seafood from the region will be able to find out if they should take extra measures to ensure people will still purchase their products on a consistent basis. The possibility of losing or gaining billions of dollars could be determined by these findings.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Natural disaster such as hurricanes, oil spills, and disease outbreak can cause massive mortality and dramatic habitat effects on local and even regional scales. Even though most designers of marine reserves assume a low risk over a short period of time for catastrophes, over the long term, it is actually quite probable that such an event will happen. A way to make this reserve network better is to provide a buffer for the additional area that would be required to counter the effects of a catastrophe. The paper titled "Ensuring Persistence of Marine Reserves: Catastrophes Require Adopting an Insurance Factor" does exactly that, determining a "insurance factor", which is the multiplier to calculate the additional reserve area necessary to ensure that functional goals of reserves will be met within a given "catastrophe regime"(Allison et.al 2003). It is found that inclusion of realities such as catastrophes into the design of reserve networks will substantially improve the probability that reserves will accomplish their goals. This is useful in things such as seafood supply and other potential variables that can be affected by catastrophes.

Rettger and Boisvert (1979), looked at alternative federal flood relief assistance programs looked at on an economic comparison of flood insurance and disaster loan programs. They look at how the distribution of costs, benefits, and program transfers, both public and private, are simulated over time to determine sensitivity of the programs and how they perform with different parameters involved. The empirical results of the case show that both programs provide efficient protection at approximately equivalent costs. It can also be noted that variations in premiums and interest rate subsidies can have massive effects on the distribution of total costs between

public and private sector such as businesses and the Federal Government. This study helps potentially for study due to the fact that there can probably be a use for people who live in areas of oil rigs to possibly create oil spill insurance or help the government to create federal relief programs that provide help in the event of an oil spill.

The problem that was looked at in Hanson et. al (1995) is the reason why all of a sudden that after years of increased consumption in seafood with a peak in it in 1987, although it has now been slowly going down the past years. The contributors found that in recent years the wild-catch supply of fish has decreased in the last years which have been helped by some new technology to the industry. Another factor that has changed consumption is one that is heavily based on the supply of the good, since there have been less fish to go around and demand has been very high, which in turn means higher prices for goods. For the time period looked at for this study, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) went up roughly forty-six percent, whereas other industries of similar goods only went up twenty or thirty percent in the time span. As it turns out, they found that that price perception is a key factor in differentiating consumers who hold favorable attitudes toward fish. This can be a key to finding out how the fish market is doing today after such hard times that the Gulf region has gone through, do the consumers really still believe that a more expensive product is a better one to purchase? Or do they look at the product they are receiving.

The issue at hand for Kitchell (2000) was looking at the restoration and rehabilitation of the native fish communities of the Great Lakes. The main goal was looking at the potential to get the lake trout populations back up in Lake Superior. Kitchell (2000) mentions also that there now are a vast range of different types of salmon, smelt, and lamprey that now are also growing in population in the regions as well. Their analyses are based on the Ecosim model, which

includes the variables production, predatory losses, non-predatory losses, and harvest. After their analyses they came to the conclusion that Lake Superior does not offer as much opportunity for the enhancement of native fish stocks as previously thought. This article is helpful in research because it gives a model to check production and fish levels of an area, which will be vital to deciding on how the world is going to get their seafood in the aftermath of the Deepwater Horizon Spill.

The problem being looked at by Churchill and Moschis (1979) is the effect of television and other sources of consumer information on the development of young consumers' purchasing behaviors. Some people believe that these points of contact into the mind are very important, but on the other hand many believe that parents modify these behaviors. In this study a model of consumer socialization is formed and tested; the model is made based on theoretical notions and empirical findings. The model is tested using two-stage least squares. Empirical results that were formed contribute to the understanding of the influence of television, peers, and family on adolescent consumer learning. This can be vital to trying to figure out what are the exact characteristics people are looking for when purchasing seafood. Also this will hopefully help the producers or sellers decide on how they want to market seafood to the consumer now.

Walsh (1995) looks at buyer behavior, in particular whether a consumer is best off purchasing an assortment of alternatives or an equal number of one alternative. Models of an expected-utility-maximizing consumer are formed, and it is shown that an assortment of an alternative may have greater expected utility than an equal number of one alternatives. The rationale behind this is that the assortment allows the consumer to choose the most appropriate for the occasion using preference information. They also show that when the consumer is

consuming alternatives from inventory, the consumer may forego the alternative offering the most utility in the expectation that it will yield even more utility in the future. Once again, these findings will help with deciding on important preferences that people use when choosing certain commodities such as seafood, for example someone deciding when to buy maybe a specialty type of seafood for one occasion or to wait and buy it another time.

Sometimes consumers act against their better judgment, engaging in behavior that is often regrettable afterwards and would have been avoided with adequate foresight. Hoch and Loewenstein (1991), address consumer impatience by developing a decision-theoretic model based on reference points. The model explains why and how consumers seem to experience sudden increases in desire for a product, increases that can overthrow long-known preferences. The use of tactics by consumers to control their behaviors is also discussed. Consumer self-control is a power struggle between two psychological forces, desire and willpower. Finally two different strategies to self-control are described, ones that directly reduce desire and those that overcome desire through willpower. The use of these self-control strategies could be a tool useful to give to respondents of the survey given. Maybe that would allow some people who may still be holding on purchasing Gulf Coast seafood to allow them to see that it is ok to buy from the region again

The idea that mood states can play a role in consumer behavior is presented by Gardner (1985); he also reviews findings from psychological literature that indicates that mood states have a direct and indirect effect on behavior, evaluation, and recall. The scope and limitations of these effects are discussed. The implications for consumer behavior revolve around three areas—service encounters, point-of-purchase stimuli, and communications are looked at. She finally discusses the potential feasibility and viability of mood-related approaches to marketing

research. These ideas can be key to helping link what consumers preferences are and if they can change in the heat of the moment or after experiencing a tragedy or disaster of some sort. This also will call into account the question about where seafood is purchased, hopefully narrowing down moods people feel and places they like to shop to purchase seafood.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Procedures for Data Collection

The procedure used to collect the data for the study is through survey research, to obtain primary data. Over a screening and collecting period of two to three weeks, approximately 100 surveys will be handed out to respondents. Respondents of the survey will be members of the San Luis Obispo community, with trying to focus on not surveying students because most students seem to not be the typical seafood consumer. The survey will be administered at Albertson's and Von's grocery stores located in San Luis Obispo as well as a few stores in the surrounding area as to try and go along with trying to get non-student individual. The respondents of the survey will be filling it out on their own, not having the questions read aloud to them to keep the attention span of the person and cut down on actual time spend filling out the survey. The survey is approximately 12 questions, that cover both the demographics of the individual as well as whether they have followed the events of the oil spill in the news or not.

Procedures for Data Analysis

To evaluate the data from the survey the data must be manipulated to some degree. Being that this is a consumer preferences research project; the data will be analyzed through the use of cross-tabulation of question 5 part B and D, which look first at if the respondent has eaten seafood from the region since the spill and if the spill has changed the person's purchasing habits. Looking at the frequency of the answers to these questions will also come into play so we may see how many people have actually eaten seafood as of late. The questions on the survey are numbered and will be coded so that the results of each survey will be able to be inputted into a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) spreadsheet for analysis.

There will be a cross-tabulation test run on the respondent's education level versus whether he or she followed the coverage of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. This test will show if there is a difference in education level and whether the respondent followed the news of the Oil Spill.

There will also be frequency tests run on part of question five as well as number six. Part A of question five looks as if respondent has followed coverage of the spill, so by running a frequency test we will be able to differentiate in the results whose preferences have changed due to the spill occurring and if the person knew about it or not. Meanwhile, question six asks the likeliness of someone purchasing seafood from the Gulf Coast Region in the near future. A frequency table of this question will show the amount of people on a small scale that will still continue to purchase seafood from the region following the spill, one of the main focal points of the study.

Once the final cross-tabulations and frequency tests have been run, a set of final conclusions will be formed. A decision shall be made about education level and if it affects whether respondents followed coverage of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. Also from the frequency tables that will be computed from questions five and six, significant numbers will help determine if consumer's preferences have changed for purchasing seafood, following The Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.

Assumptions

This study assumes that not all answers on the survey may be necessarily true, the administrator is solely dependent on the individual filling the survey out and the trust they have with the administer of the survey.

Limitations

There will only be a testable sample in the San Luis Obispo Area, in the perfect world going to the Gulf Coast and obtaining a survey sample there would be most ideal.

Chapter 4

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

Data Collection Problems

There turned out to be several different problems during the survey process. To get the best results for a survey, one-on-one interviews should be conducted, which can take quite a good deal of time. Having the respondent fill out the survey on their own was not turning out to be good data. So after a handful of surveys were filled out, the decision was made to start reading the questions aloud to the respondents. The general response for most of the time was positive and the respondents enjoyed more interaction with me.

With the new way of conducting research being a more time-consuming but happy experience for the respondents, the data collection ended up taking more time. To get one-hundred (100) surveys it took just over three weeks to complete. The overall collection process went quite smoothly though and was a fun and exciting process to be a part of.

Analysis

The hypothesis of this study was that consumer's preferences have changed following the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, even though Federal Government agencies are committing to buying seafood from the region and have continued to do so to date, an overall interest in

seafood has gone down. Meanwhile, the two objectives of the study were to observe if the general population has been following the news coverage of the initial blow-out and then clean up of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. From the people, who did follow the spill; will their purchasing habits of seafood coming from the Gulf Coast Region change because of the spill.

The first point of analysis from the data was to conduct a cross-tabulation and frequency test of question 5, part B and D, to examine if the respondent of the survey has eaten seafood coming from the Gulf Coast Region since the oil spill and if the spill has changed the person's purchasing habits of seafood. Analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) spreadsheet program. Below are the actual input data spreadsheets for question 5 part B and D for reference:

Part B:

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q5gulfb * q5deepa	87	87.0%	13	13.0%	100	100.0%

q5gulfb * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa	Total
			1.00	
q5gulfb	1.00	Count	78	78

		% within q5deepa	89.7%	89.7%
	2.00	Count	9	9
		% within q5deepa	10.3%	10.3%
Total		Count	87	87
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	87

a. No statistics are computed because q5deepa is a constant.

According to part A of question 5, 87 of 100 of the respondents followed coverage of the Oil Spill. These tables from part B also show that of the 87 respondents to the survey that had been following coverage of the Oil Spill 78 of the respondents have eaten seafood that they know has come from the Gulf Coast region meanwhile 9 have not eaten seafood. This is seen clearly knowing that 1.00 represents a "yes" to the question and 2.00 a "no" answer.

Part D:

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q5habitsd * q5deepa	87	87.0%	13	13.0%	100	100.0%

q5habitsd * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa	Total
			1.00	
q5habitsd	1.00	Count	6	6
		% within q5deepa	6.9%	6.9%
	2.00	Count	12	12
		% within q5deepa	13.8%	13.8%
	3.00	Count	56	56
		% within q5deepa	64.4%	64.4%
	4.00	Count	13	13
		% within q5deepa	14.9%	14.9%
Total		Count	87	87
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	87

a. No statistics are computed because q5deepa is a constant.

The tables once again first show that after the target separating question; part A of question 5, there are 87 respondents to the purchasing behavior question. A 1.00 means

"describes not at all", 2.00 "describes slightly well", 3.00 "describes somewhat well", and 4.00 "describes very well" for reference purposes. The majority of respondents, 56 or 64.4% of the target when asked if their purchasing habits have changed due to the oil spill was "describes somewhat well", which in this case means that their habits have changed to a certain extent but not completely. Meanwhile the next highest drawing answers were almost 15 percent (14.9%) of respondents said it described their habits very well and another almost 14 percent (13.8%) said the spill slightly well changed their purchasing habits.

The next test conducted was to run a cross-tabulation and frequency test of questions 5a and 10, determining if there was a difference in respondent's education level and if they followed the news of the oil spill. Once again for reference from SPSS:

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q10education * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q10education * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q10education	3.00	Count	14	2	16
		% within q5deepa	16.1%	15.4%	16.0%
	4.00	Count	37	9	46

		% within q5deepa	42.5%	69.2%	46.0%
	5.00	Count	27	2	29
		% within q5deepa	31.0%	15.4%	29.0%
	6.00	Count	9	0	9
		% within q5deepa	10.3%	.0%	9.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The first thing taken from these tables is that the most respondents of the survey fall in the range of having at least some college level experience (4.00), at 46% of the sample size (46 people), of these 37 had followed coverage of the spill and 9 had not. This is roughly a 4 to 1 ratio of have to have not followed coverage. The next largest group of interest is college graduates (5.00), 29% of the sample size. Of these 29 respondents, 27 followed coverage of the spill to only 2 respondents not following an almost 14 to 1 ratio. The group representing high school graduates (3.00), are 16 % of the sample size. Of these 16, 14 followed the coverage to only 2 not following, a 7 to 1 ratio. Lastly, there were 9% of the sample size having a Post Graduate degree (6.00), and all 9 of these respondents followed coverage of the spill.

Next in the analysis process was conducting a cross-tabulation and frequency test of question 6, which gave an 11 point rating scale and asked the respondent how likely they would be to purchase seafood from the Gulf Coast Region if it were available for purchase in the next year. The results are as shown in SPSS:

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q6liklihood * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q6liklihood * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q6liklihood	2.00	Count	2	0	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	.0%	2.0%
	3.00	Count	16	3	19
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	23.1%	19.0%
	4.00	Count	41	4	45
		% within q5deepa	47.1%	30.8%	45.0%
	5.00	Count	16	2	18
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	15.4%	18.0%
	6.00	Count	5	0	5
		% within q5deepa	5.7%	.0%	5.0%
	7.00	Count	1	1	2
		% within q5deepa	1.1%	7.7%	2.0%
	8.00	Count	1	2	3
		% within q5deepa	1.1%	15.4%	3.0%

	9.00	Count	2	0	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	.0%	2.0%
	10.00	Count	3	1	4
		% within q5deepa	3.4%	7.7%	4.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Taken from these tables are the different likelihoods of respondents purchasing seafood from the Gulf Coast Region. First, no one stated they would be certain to purchase (1.00), Only 2 respondents stated they were almost sure they would buy (2.00) seafood from the region. Next, 19% of respondents stated they would very probably purchase (3.00) from the region. The largest chunk was next, with 45% of respondents stating they would probably buy (4.00), from the Gulf Coast Region. And as you go down lower, 18% of the sample stated there was a good possibility (5.00) of purchasing and 5% stated a fairly good possibility (6.00) to purchase seafood from the Region. Another 7% of respondents fell between some possibilities to a very slight possibility of purchasing (7.00-9.00). Meanwhile 4% of the sample size stated that there was no chance at all they would purchase (10.00), seafood from the Gulf Coast region if it were available in the next year for purchase.

This question also divided the answers of likeliness between the people who did and did not follow coverage, as represented by the 1.00 for did and 2.00 for did not at the top of the chart. So of the 13 people who did not follow coverage of the spill, over 68% of the respondent's likelihood of purchasing seafood from the region fall in the very probably to good

possibility of purchasing; 3.00-5.00, which is very similar to that of the people who did follow coverage. There were 15% of that group that said there was a slight chance they would purchase seafood but that only represents 2 of the 100 respondents overall.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was survey research to determine if the consumer preferences and purchasing behaviors have changed for seafood coming from the Gulf Coast Region, following the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. It was believed that they would change and were tested in a few different cross-tabulations of questions to determine a few different characteristics of the consumer. First, to observe if respondents had been following the news coverage of the initial blow-out and clean up of the oil spill, and secondly to determine of the people who had been following the spill, will their purchasing habits of seafood coming from the Gulf Coast Region change because of it.

There first was a cross-tabulation to determine if the respondent had eaten seafood from the region since the spill and if the spill has changed the person's purchasing habits. Of the 87 respondents who had been following the spill, almost 90 percent (89.7%) had eaten seafood from the Gulf Coast Region since the spill and only 10.3% had not eaten seafood from the region. When asked if the spill had changed their purchasing habits of seafood, the majority (64.4%) of the respondents stated that that statement described somewhat well how they felt. Meanwhile, almost 15 percent (14.9%) of respondents said the statement described very well their behaviors and another 13.8% of respondents said it slightly well described their habits and behaviors.

The next test run was to look at the respondent's education level and whether or not they followed the news coverage of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. The majority of respondents (46%), had at least some college experience and a ratio of 37 to 9 had followed the coverage of the spill. The next largest group at 29% was college graduates. A ratio of 27 to 2 was accounted for those who had followed coverage of the spill to those who hadn't almost 14 to 1 odds. At 16%, high school graduates were at a 14 to 2 ratio of following the spill to not, and the smallest group, people with a Post Graduate degree composed 9% of the sample, all nine respondents in this category followed the spill.

The last test run was to run a frequency and cross-tabulation test of if the person had followed coverage of the spill and the likelihood that they would purchase seafood in the near future coming from the Gulf Coast Region. A majority (66%) of the sample size fell between almost sure will buy and probably will buy seafood from the region in the next year. Another 23% fell between a good and fairly good possibility of purchasing, and 7% between some possibility and very slight possibility. Only 4% of the sample said that there was no chance at all they will buy seafood from the Gulf Coast Region if it were available for purchase in the next year.

From these tests a set of final conclusions shall now be made about the purchasing habits and behaviors of the consumer sample size and possible recommendations for the general seafood market for the Gulf Coast Region.

Conclusions

The objective of this study was to determine how much consumer's preferences have changed on purchasing seafood from the Gulf Coast Region after the recent Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, with the initial hypothesis being that the consumer's preferences have changed following the oil spill to a certain extent. Through the tests run on several questions of the survey, the hypothesis was backed up.

The first cross-tabulation of questions asked about following the news coverage of the spill and if they had eaten seafood from the Gulf Coast Region. Of the 100 respondents to the survey, 87 had followed news coverage of the spill. Of these 87, 78 people had eaten seafood from the Gulf Coast Region that they know of since the spill. Both of these numbers represent roughly 90% of their respective sample sizes, which is good indicators for the hypothesis initially, that the sample size understands the topic pretty clearly.

Next, was a cross-tabulation of the 87 people who had followed coverage of the Oil Spill and if their purchasing habits of seafood have changed because of it. The majority of the sample (64.4%) said that their behaviors had changed "somewhat". Meanwhile 14.9% of the sample said their behaviors changed described "very well" and 13.8% of the sample stated that it describes their behaviors "slightly well". So to look at and take from this is that most people feel that their purchasing behaviors have changed somewhat but not to an extreme value yet, but potentially.

Significant to us as well was if there was a difference in viewing purposes of the coverage of the Oil Spill between different people of education statuses. Respondents with a high school diploma made up 16% of the sample size and had a 7 to 1 ratio of coverage viewers to non-viewers. People with some college made up the majority of the sample at 46% and had an almost 4 to 1 ratio of 37 to 9 viewers to non-viewers. College graduates made up 29% of the sample and had an almost 14 to 1 ratio of viewers to non-viewers. Meanwhile, people with Post graduate work comprised only 9% of the sample but all of the individuals followed the coverage. So, minus the people with some college, which is composed of mostly current college students, the generalization could be made that as education level went up in the respondent, the more likely they were to have followed coverage of the Oil Spill.

The last and most important test run was a cross-tabulation of people who had or hadn't watched coverage of the spill. Roughly 66% of the sample size stated their likelihood to purchase seafood from the Gulf Coast Region in the next year in the range of Almost sure to probably will buy, a 70-90 chances out of 100 possibilities. Meanwhile, only 9% of the sample size stated their likelihood between very slight to some possibility, 10-30 chances in 100, and no one stated that they would flat out not at all purchase seafood from the region. This is comforting information for people from the Gulf Coast region, due to the fact that people's purchasing behaviors have changed somewhat but, consumers are still willing to at least try seafood that comes from the Gulf Coast Region.

Recommendations

There are a few recommendations that should be drawn from this study. First, an individual who decides to do survey research needs to know the great time commitment that is involved to complete a good study. As mentioned earlier in data collection problems, you need to conduct respondent interviews with the person to get good interaction and receive the best data possible.

Secondly, there is the potent for further work on this research topic. The entirety of the oil spill cleanup has still not finished completely. There is the possibility to conduct this survey once again in a few months to see if there are still lingering effects or the possibility to try and conduct a promotion campaign of some sorts for the Seafood industry and in particular from the Gulf Coast Region.

References Cited.

Allison, Gary, Steven D. Gaines, Jane Lubchenco, and Hugh P. Possingham. 2003."Ensuring Persistence of Marine Reserves: Catastrophes Require Adopting an Insurance Factor." *Ecological Application*: (13:1) 8-24.

Churchill, Gilbert A., and George P. Moschis 1979. "Television and Interpersonal Influences on Adolescent Consumer Learning." *The Journal of Consumer Research*: 6:1(June) 23-35.

Gardner, Meryl. 1985."Mood States and Consumer Behavior: A Critical Review." *The Journal of Consumer Research* 12:3 (Dec.): 281-300.

Hanson, Gregory D., Robert O. Herrmann, and James W. Dunn. (77:5) (1995)"Determinants of Seafood Purchase Behavior: Consumers, Restaurants, and Grocery Stores." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics"* :(77:5) 1301-305.

Hoch, Stephen J., and George F. Loewenstein.1991. "Time-Inconsistent Preferences and Consumer Self-Control." *The Journal of Consumer Research* 17:4 (March): 492-507.

Kitchell, James F. (3:6) (2000)"Sustainability of the Lake Superior Fish Community: Interactions in a Food Web Context." *Ecosystems* 3:6 (Nov.-Dec.): 545-60.

Rettger, Michael J., and Richard N. Boisvert. (1979). "Flood Insurance or Disaster Loans: An Economic Evaluation." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*: (61:3) 496-505.

Walsh, John W. 1995."Flexibility in Consumer Purchasing for Uncertain Future Tastes." *Marketing Science* 14.2: 148-65.

Appendices

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:44:18
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q1Age BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.

Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.069
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q1Age * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q1Age * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q1Age	2.00	Count	12	8	20
		% within q5deepa	13.8%	61.5%	20.0%
	3.00	Count	5	2	7
		% within q5deepa	5.7%	15.4%	7.0%
	4.00	Count	7	3	10
		% within q5deepa	8.0%	23.1%	10.0%
	5.00	Count	8	0	8
		% within q5deepa	9.2%	.0%	8.0%

	6.00	Count	10	0	10
		% within q5deepa	11.5%	.0%	10.0%
	7.00	Count	12	0	12
		% within q5deepa	13.8%	.0%	12.0%
	8.00	Count	7	0	7
		% within q5deepa	8.0%	.0%	7.0%
	9.00	Count	6	0	6
		% within q5deepa	6.9%	.0%	6.0%
	10.00	Count	4	0	4
		% within q5deepa	4.6%	.0%	4.0%
	11.00	Count	16	0	16
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	.0%	16.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.361[a]	9	.002
Likelihood Ratio	29.764	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.289	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	100		

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.361[a]	9	.002
Likelihood Ratio	29.764	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.289	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 11 cells (55.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .52.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:44:56
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q2Placea BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.016
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.013
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q2Placea * q5deepa	86	86.0%	14	14.0%	100	100.0%

q2Placea * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q2Placea	1.00	Count	77	9	86
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	77	9	86
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	86

a. No statistics are computed because q2Placea is a constant.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:45:21
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>

	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q2Placeb BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.000
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.008
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q2Placeb * q5deepa	94	94.0%	6	6.0%	100	100.0%

q2Placeb * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q2Placeb	2.00	Count	83	11	94
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	83	11	94
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	94

a. No statistics are computed because q2Placeb is a constant.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:45:49
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q2Placec BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.016

Elapsed Time	00:00:00.007
Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q2Placec * q5deepa	44	44.0%	56	56.0%	100	100.0%

q2Placec * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q2Placec	3.00	Count	42	2	44
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	42	2	44
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	44

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	44

a. No statistics are computed because q2Placec is a constant.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:46:10
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.

Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q2Placed BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.016
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.012
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q2Placed * q5deepa	36	36.0%	64	64.0%	100	100.0%

q2Placed * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa	Total
			1.00	
q2Placed	4.00	Count	36	36

	% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	36	36
	% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	36

a. No statistics are computed because q2Placed and q5deepa are constants.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:46:35
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100

Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q2Placee BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.007
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q2Placee * q5deepa	11	11.0%	89	89.0%	100	100.0%

\

q2Placee * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa	Total
			1.00	
q2Placee	5.00	Count	11	11
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	11	11
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	11

a. No statistics are computed because q2Placee and q5deepa are constants.

T-Test

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:47:17
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>

	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		T-TEST GROUPS=q5deepa(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=q3apermonth /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.000
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.016

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Group Statistics

	q5deepa	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q3apermonth	1.00	87	4.8391	2.27664	.24408
	2.00	13	3.2308	2.35067	.65196

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
q3apermonth	Equal variances assumed	.824	.366	2.366	98
	Equal variances not assumed			2.310	15.557

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
q3apermonth	Equal variances assumed	.020	1.60831	.67969
	Equal variances not assumed	.035	1.60831	.69615

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
q3apermonth	Equal variances assumed	.25948	2.95714
	Equal variances not assumed	.12912	3.08751

T-Test

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:47:47
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		T-TEST GROUPS=q5deepa(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=q3bspendsea /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.008

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.saV

Group Statistics

	q5deepa	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q3bspendsea	1.00	87	50.0805	25.46051	2.72965
	2.00	13	22.3077	10.53079	2.92071

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
q3bspendsea	Equal variances assumed	7.873	.006	3.870	98
	Equal variances not assumed			6.947	38.065

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
q3bspendsea	Equal variances assumed	.000	27.77277	7.17620

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
	Equal variances assumed	.000	27.77277	7.17620
	Equal variances not assumed	.000	27.77277	3.99770

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
q3bspendsea	Equal variances assumed	13.53183	42.01371
	Equal variances not assumed	19.68031	35.86522

Descriptives

Notes

Output Created	03-Mar-2011 11:50:05

Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.
Syntax		DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=q4seaa q4seab q4seac q4sead q4seae q4seaf q4seag q4seah q4seai q4seaj q4seak /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX /SORT=MEAN (D).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.000
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.007

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
q4seag	100	60.00	100.00	93.0000	10.39619
q4seaj	100	60.00	100.00	90.6000	10.42724
q4seae	100	60.00	100.00	85.0000	9.15633
q4sead	100	40.00	100.00	79.4000	8.74094
q4seab	100	20.00	100.00	78.8000	10.56772
q4seaf	100	20.00	100.00	74.0000	14.90712
q4seai	100	20.00	100.00	66.8000	11.79625
q4seah	100	20.00	100.00	64.2000	12.15888
q4seak	100	20.00	100.00	61.2000	11.65844
q4seac	100	20.00	100.00	61.0000	16.17455
q4seaa	100	20.00	100.00	57.6000	15.11705
Valid N (listwise)	100				

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	03-Mar-2011 11:51:45

Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		T-TEST GROUPS=q5deepa(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=q4seag q4seaj q4seae q4sead q4seab q4seaf q4seai q4seah q4seak q4seac q4seaa /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.018

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Group Statistics

	q5deepa	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q4seag	1.00	87	94.2529	9.10305	.97595
	2.00	13	84.6154	14.50022	4.02164
q4seaj	1.00	87	90.5747	10.49433	1.12511
	2.00	13	90.7692	10.37749	2.87820
q4seae	1.00	87	85.5172	8.99077	.96391
	2.00	13	81.5385	9.87096	2.73771
q4sead	1.00	87	79.7701	7.14908	.76646
	2.00	13	76.9231	16.01282	4.44116
q4seab	1.00	87	77.9310	10.13145	1.08621
	2.00	13	84.6154	11.98289	3.32346
q4seaf	1.00	87	73.5632	14.78348	1.58496
	2.00	13	76.9231	16.01282	4.44116
q4seai	1.00	87	67.8161	11.95197	1.28139
	2.00	13	60.0000	8.16497	2.26455
q4seah	1.00	87	65.0575	11.50061	1.23300
	2.00	13	58.4615	15.19109	4.21325
q4seak	1.00	87	61.6092	10.21553	1.09522
	2.00	13	58.4615	19.08147	5.29225

q4seac	1.00	87	61.8391	14.18554	1.52085
	2.00	13	55.3846	26.01775	7.21602
q4seaa	1.00	87	59.0805	14.59788	1.56506
	2.00	13	47.6923	15.35895	4.25981

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
q4seag	Equal variances assumed	7.387	.008	3.266	98
	Equal variances not assumed			2.329	13.448
q4seaj	Equal variances assumed	.143	.706	-.062	98
	Equal variances not assumed			-.063	15.896
q4seae	Equal variances assumed	2.755	.100	1.470	98
	Equal variances not assumed			1.371	15.127
q4sead	Equal variances assumed	13.968	.000	1.097	98
	Equal variances not assumed			.632	12.724
q4seab	Equal variances assumed	2.979	.088	-2.167	98
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.912	14.677

q4seaf	Equal variances assumed	.117	.733	-.756	98
	Equal variances not assumed			-.713	15.217
q4seai	Equal variances assumed	18.771	.000	2.275	98
	Equal variances not assumed			3.004	20.620
q4seah	Equal variances assumed	.081	.776	1.846	98
	Equal variances not assumed			1.503	14.129
q4seak	Equal variances assumed	3.782	.055	.907	98
	Equal variances not assumed			.582	13.047
q4seac	Equal variances assumed	10.791	.001	1.348	98
	Equal variances not assumed			.875	13.086
q4seaa	Equal variances assumed	.476	.492	2.607	98
	Equal variances not assumed			2.509	15.419

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
q4seag	Equal variances assumed	.002	9.63749	2.95059
	Equal variances not assumed	.036	9.63749	4.13836

q4seaj	Equal variances assumed	.950	-.19452	3.11626
	Equal variances not assumed	.951	-.19452	3.09029
q4seae	Equal variances assumed	.145	3.97878	2.70682
	Equal variances not assumed	.190	3.97878	2.90245
q4sead	Equal variances assumed	.276	2.84704	2.59647
	Equal variances not assumed	.539	2.84704	4.50681
q4seab	Equal variances assumed	.033	-6.68435	3.08529
	Equal variances not assumed	.076	-6.68435	3.49646
q4seaf	Equal variances assumed	.451	-3.35986	4.44225
	Equal variances not assumed	.487	-3.35986	4.71550
q4seai	Equal variances assumed	.025	7.81609	3.43592
	Equal variances not assumed	.007	7.81609	2.60195
q4seah	Equal variances assumed	.068	6.59593	3.57224
	Equal variances not assumed	.155	6.59593	4.38996
q4seak	Equal variances assumed	.367	3.14766	3.46975
	Equal variances not assumed	.570	3.14766	5.40439
q4seac	Equal variances assumed	.181	6.45447	4.78982
	Equal variances not assumed	.397	6.45447	7.37455

q4seaa	Equal variances assumed	.011	11.38815	4.36903
	Equal variances not assumed	.024	11.38815	4.53821

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
q4seag	Equal variances assumed	3.78215	15.49283
	Equal variances not assumed	.72731	18.54766
q4seaj	Equal variances assumed	-6.37864	5.98960
	Equal variances not assumed	-6.74913	6.36010
q4seae	Equal variances assumed	-1.39281	9.35037
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.20311	10.16067
q4sead	Equal variances assumed	-2.30558	7.99965
	Equal variances not assumed	-6.91085	12.60493
q4seab	Equal variances assumed	-12.80700	-.56170
	Equal variances not assumed	-14.15117	.78247
q4seaf	Equal variances assumed	-12.17536	5.45564

	Equal variances not assumed	-13.39825	6.67853
q4seai	Equal variances assumed	.99761	14.63457
	Equal variances not assumed	2.39895	13.23323
q4seah	Equal variances assumed	-.49307	13.68493
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.81154	16.00341
q4seak	Equal variances assumed	-3.73794	10.03326
	Equal variances not assumed	-8.52358	14.81889
q4seac	Equal variances assumed	-3.05077	15.95970
	Equal variances not assumed	-9.46663	22.37556
q4seaa	Equal variances assumed	2.71796	20.05835
	Equal variances not assumed	1.73803	21.03827

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created	03-Mar-2011 11:52:33

Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q5gulfb BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.000
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.010
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q5gulfb * q5deepa	87	87.0%	13	13.0%	100	100.0%

q5gulfb * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa	Total
			1.00	
q5gulfb	1.00	Count	78	78
		% within q5deepa	89.7%	89.7%
	2.00	Count	9	9
		% within q5deepa	10.3%	10.3%
Total		Count	87	87
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value

Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	87

a. No statistics are computed because q5deepa is a constant.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:55:43
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q5packc BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.010
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q5packc * q5deepa	87	87.0%	13	13.0%	100	100.0%

q5packc * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa	Total
			1.00	
q5packc	2.00	Count	2	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	2.3%
	3.00	Count	51	51
		% within q5deepa	58.6%	58.6%
	4.00	Count	32	32
		% within q5deepa	36.8%	36.8%
	5.00	Count	2	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	2.3%
Total		Count	87	87
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	87

a. No statistics are computed because q5deepa is a constant.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:59:35
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.

Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q5habitsd BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.010
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q5habitsd * q5deepa	87	87.0%	13	13.0%	100	100.0%

q5habitsd * q5deepa Crosstabulation

	q5deepa	Total

			1.00	
q5habitsd	1.00	Count	6	6
		% within q5deepa	6.9%	6.9%
	2.00	Count	12	12
		% within q5deepa	13.8%	13.8%
	3.00	Count	56	56
		% within q5deepa	64.4%	64.4%
	4.00	Count	13	13
		% within q5deepa	14.9%	14.9%
Total		Count	87	87
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
N of Valid Cases	87

a. No statistics are computed because q5deepa is a constant.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 11:59:58
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q6liklihood BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.

Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.016
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.011
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q6liklihood * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q6liklihood * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q6liklihood	2.00	Count	2	0	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	.0%	2.0%
	3.00	Count	16	3	19
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	23.1%	19.0%
	4.00	Count	41	4	45
		% within q5deepa	47.1%	30.8%	45.0%

	5.00	Count	16	2	18
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	15.4%	18.0%
	6.00	Count	5	0	5
		% within q5deepa	5.7%	.0%	5.0%
	7.00	Count	1	1	2
		% within q5deepa	1.1%	7.7%	2.0%
	8.00	Count	1	2	3
		% within q5deepa	1.1%	15.4%	3.0%
	9.00	Count	2	0	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	.0%	2.0%
	10.00	Count	3	1	4
		% within q5deepa	3.4%	7.7%	4.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.774[a]	8	.120
Likelihood Ratio	10.059	8	.261
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.208	1	.137
N of Valid Cases	100		

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.774[a]	8	.120
Likelihood Ratio	10.059	8	.261
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.208	1	.137
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 12:00:17
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>

	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q7gender BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.033
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q7gender * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q7gender * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q7gender	1.00	Count	55	7	62
		% within q5deepa	63.2%	53.8%	62.0%
	2.00	Count	32	6	38
		% within q5deepa	36.8%	46.2%	38.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.422[a]	1	.516		

Continuity Correction[b]	.118	1	.732		
Likelihood Ratio	.414	1	.520		
Fisher's Exact Test				.551	.360
Linear-by-Linear Association	.417	1	.518		
N of Valid Cases	100				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 12:02:08
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100

Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q8marital BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.009
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases

	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q8marital * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q8marital * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q8marital	1.00	Count	56	0	56
		% within q5deepa	64.4%	.0%	56.0%
	2.00	Count	31	13	44
		% within q5deepa	35.6%	100.0%	44.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.018[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	16.495	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	23.865	1	.000		

Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.828	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	100				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.72.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 12:02:25
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q9children BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.011
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases		
	Valid	Missing	Total

	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q9children * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q9children * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q9children	1.00	Count	36	0	36
		% within q5deepa	41.4%	.0%	36.0%
	2.00	Count	51	13	64
		% within q5deepa	58.6%	100.0%	64.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.405[a]	1	.004		
Continuity Correction[b]	6.705	1	.010		
Likelihood Ratio	12.675	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.004	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.321	1	.004		

N of Valid Cases	100				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 12:02:38
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q10education BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.012
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q10education * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q10education * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q10education	3.00	Count	14	2	16
		% within q5deepa	16.1%	15.4%	16.0%
	4.00	Count	37	9	46
		% within q5deepa	42.5%	69.2%	46.0%
	5.00	Count	27	2	29
		% within q5deepa	31.0%	15.4%	29.0%
	6.00	Count	9	0	9
		% within q5deepa	10.3%	.0%	9.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.057[a]	3	.255
Likelihood Ratio	5.188	3	.159
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.991	1	.158
N of Valid Cases	100		

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.057[a]	3	.255
Likelihood Ratio	5.188	3	.159
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.991	1	.158
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.17.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 12:02:57
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>

	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q11employed BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.000
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.009
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

(DataSet1) C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q11employed * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q11employed * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q11employed	1.00	Count	45	5	50
		% within q5deepa	51.7%	38.5%	50.0%
	2.00	Count	26	8	34
		% within q5deepa	29.9%	61.5%	34.0%
	3.00	Count	16	0	16
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	.0%	16.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.122[a]	2	.047
Likelihood Ratio	7.669	2	.022
Linear-by-Linear Association	.054	1	.816
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.08.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		03-Mar-2011 12:03:10
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\Cameron\Desktop\Jareddata.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>

	N of Rows in Working Data File	100
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=q12income BY q5deepa /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.012
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174762

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
q12income * q5deepa	100	100.0%	0	.0%	100	100.0%

q12income * q5deepa Crosstabulation

			q5deepa		Total
			1.00	2.00	
q12income	1.00	Count	27	7	34
		% within q5deepa	31.0%	53.8%	34.0%
	2.00	Count	6	1	7
		% within q5deepa	6.9%	7.7%	7.0%
	3.00	Count	12	1	13
		% within q5deepa	13.8%	7.7%	13.0%
	4.00	Count	4	2	6
		% within q5deepa	4.6%	15.4%	6.0%
	5.00	Count	4	1	5
		% within q5deepa	4.6%	7.7%	5.0%
	6.00	Count	8	1	9
		% within q5deepa	9.2%	7.7%	9.0%

	7.00	Count	2	0	2
		% within q5deepa	2.3%	.0%	2.0%
	8.00	Count	5	0	5
		% within q5deepa	5.7%	.0%	5.0%
	9.00	Count	3	0	3
		% within q5deepa	3.4%	.0%	3.0%
	10.00	Count	16	0	16
		% within q5deepa	18.4%	.0%	16.0%
Total		Count	87	13	100
		% within q5deepa	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.388[a]	9	.496
Likelihood Ratio	10.989	9	.276
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.864	1	.027
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 14 cells (70.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.