

**Market Research Report for
Massachusetts Consumers' Fish Buying
Attitude, Knowledge, Intention, and Behavior**

**ATTITUDES OF MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS TO
PURCHASING AND CONSUMPTION OF FISH**

Raymond R. Liu, Ph.D.

Mary Lou Roberts, Ph.D.

**With the Assistance of Marketing Research Students at UMass Boston
February 2005**



Table of Contents

Executive Summary -----	2
Introduction -----	4
Research Methods -----	5
Survey Results and Data Analysis -----	6
Basic Statistics Findings -----	6
Relational Statistics Findings -----	9
Conclusions -----	12
Recommendations -----	14
Appendix A. Focus Group Interview Guide -----	16
Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire -----	18
Appendix C. Frequencies and Descriptive Analysis -----	20
Appendix D. Cross-Tabulations Analysis -----	38
Appendix E. Regression Analysis -----	177

ATTITUDES OF MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS TO PURCHASING AND CONSUMPTION OF FISH

Executive Summary

The purpose of this research was to study the attitudes of Massachusetts consumers to the purchase and consumption of fresh fish, with the goal of introducing the brand name under Massachusetts fishermen. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used in this research. The qualitative research methods include secondary data research, depth interviews, and focus group interviews. The quantitative research method was a structured survey. The survey questionnaire was constructed with the inputs of all the qualitative research results. The surveys were then randomly distributed to the respondents in 59 cities or towns in East Massachusetts area, mainly in the greater Boston area. Trained interviewers who were senior college students with marketing concentration collected the data under the guidance of Professor Raymond Liu.

The results of this research suggest that there is an opportunity for Massachusetts' fishermen to introduce a brand strategy for their catch. By using branding, certification, and promotions, they could inform the fish-consuming public about the benefits of purchasing and consuming locally caught fish. More specifically, we have the following recommendations:

1. All the analysis suggests that New England fishermen should introduce a brand name.
2. To become a trusted brand name, New England fishermen need to educate fish buyers about its brand and product. More specifically, it should emphasize the brand's competitive advantages in freshness, taste, safety, fish handling process, and its reputation (such as one of the most regulated area in the world). In addition, it needs to educate the fish buyers on where the fish was caught, the fish handling process, and fishing regulations.

3. A market test for price change is needed. The test price should be around \$1:00 more per pound.
4. To promote the brand, the best channel is through supermarket/restaurant where the fish is sold, followed by Internet, TV, and Newspaper.
5. To gain consumers' trust, a government certification of the brand is helpful.
6. Although people with different demographic background could be the potential buyers for the brand, the initial and primary target market might be the fish buyers who are married, older (45 and above), higher household income, and with higher educational background.
7. In terms of psychographics, the target markets should be those who agree with that "I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat", "Safety is determined by the fishing regulations", "Safety is determined by the fish handling process", and "I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name".

Introduction

The Massachusetts Fishing industry has suffered reduced revenues and a drop in employment, due to the depletion of the fish population along the New England Coast line. Over fishing has led to government regulation, which limits the amount of fish that Massachusetts fishermen can catch. They are also faced with foreign competition, unpredictable prices, and low awareness of the value of their products. The goal of the Massachusetts Fishermen's Partnership (MFP) is to help sustain the industry by helping both fishermen and their families and to preserve the industry for future growth and employment. Our goal for this marketing research project is to uncover consumer fish-buying behavior and intentions in terms of who buys, where, how, and why they buy, and the attitude of consumers toward a trusted brand name.

Objectives

The specific objectives of this research project were to:

- Profile the purchasers of fresh fish in terms of demographics, attitudes, and purchase-related behaviors.
- Identify important factors that affect fresh fish buying behavior.
- Level of knowledge about where the fish was caught, the fish handling process and fishing regulations.
- How attitudes and knowledge affect consumers' perception of the importance of a trusted brand and/or government certification.
- The impact a trusted brand would have on attitudes, purchase frequency, and the price consumers would be willing to pay.
- Who are the target buyers in terms demographics and psychographics.
- How frequent they buy fish.

- What are the important factors affecting their fish-buying behavior.
- How much they know about fishing place, fish handling process, and fishing regulations.
- What are their attitudes towards the relationships between the freshness, safety, and taste of fish and the fishing place, fish handling process, fishing regulations, price, and a trusted brand.
- If such a trusted brand exists, what are their intentions in terms how much they would trust it, how confident they would be if it has a government certification on the brand, how much more they are willing to pay for it, and how likely they would purchase it.

Research Methods

Both qualitative and quantitative research methods are used in this research. The qualitative research methods include secondary data research, depth interviews, and focus group interviews.

Secondary data research was conducted mainly through literature search in the library and from the Internet. We found no previous studies on the same topic with the same group of target respondents.

Depth interviews were conducted in two phases. The first step was to conduct informal interviews with potential respondents (selected and conducted by a group of trained senior marketing students) regarding the important factors when buying fish and how and why people would buy fish. Through this step, we developed initial ideas regarding fish-buying behavior. The second step was conducted while the senior marketing students were conducting the survey. Because the survey was conducted face-to-face, the senior marketing students had the opportunity to ask some further questions based on the respondents' reactions to the survey questionnaire.

Professor Raymond Liu conducted a focus group interview with the help of MFP. Please see the Focus Group Interview guide in Appendix A.

The quantitative research method was a structured survey. The survey questionnaire was constructed with the inputs of all the qualitative research results. Professor Liu designed the questionnaire draft. After receiving feedback from MFP, the students, and a small-scale pilot study, he finalized the survey questionnaire (Please see the Survey Questionnaire in Appendix B). The surveys were then distributed to the respondents in 59 cities or towns in East Massachusetts area, mainly in the greater Boston area.

All the interviewers were trained senior marketing students. They conducted the face-to-face survey primarily in two places - supermarkets and restaurants. The major advantage of a face-to-face survey is that it provides assistance when needed to the respondents. For instance, when some respondents had questions on the survey, the interviewers could explain them to the respondents.

300 survey questionnaires were sent out and 280 usable questionnaires were returned (higher than 90%). The response rate is extremely high because of the face-to-face method.

Survey Results and Data Analysis

After coding and data entry, we did both basic data analysis (i.e., Frequencies, Mean, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation analysis) and relational data analysis (Cross-tabulation, Analysis of Variance, Stepwise Regression, other multivariate statistical analysis.

Here are the main results:

Basic Statistics Findings

(Please refer to Frequencies and Descriptive Analysis in Appendix C):

1. How many times do you buy fish per week?

- One fourth of the respondents buy fish less than once a week
 - 40.6% of them buy fish once a week
 - 20.5% of them buy fish twice a week
 - 10.4% of them buy fish three times a week
 - 2.9% of them buy more than three times
2. How important are the following factors to you when you buy fish (The factors are: Freshness, Taste, Safety, Price, Convenient Location, Seller's Reputation, Fish Handling Process, and Locally caught (by New England fishermen))?
- The top three factors are Freshness, Taste, and Safety.
 - The top five factors are Freshness, Taste, Safety, Fish Handling Process, and Seller's Reputation.
 - It is interesting to notice that Price is not among the top five factors.
3. How much do you know about the fish that you buy (such as: "Where the fish was caught", and "What is the fish handling process from the Ocean to your table", and "What are the fishing regulations (environmental concerns, safety, etc.)")?
- The average rating is from 2.67 to 2.89 (based on a 1 to 7 scale. Please see the questionnaire in Appendix B), which means people lack of the knowledge regarding fishing process and regulations. Especially, very few people know the fish handling process.
4. Please indicate your opinion on the following statements:
- "Freshness depends on where the fish was caught", "Taste depends on where the fish was caught", "Safety is determined by the fish handling process", "Safety is determined by the fishing regulations", "I am willing to pay more for fish that is fresher", "I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat", and "I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name".
- People agree with the above statements in general with the average rating from 4.55 to 5.86 (based on a 1 to 7 scale. Please see the questionnaire in Appendix B). Especially, they are willing to pay more for safer (5.86) and fresher fish (5.63).
5. If you were looking for a trusted brand name, where would be the places you would go to find the information?
- The best way to market the brand name is through "Supermarkets/restaurants" (64.3%). The next one is through Internet (38.6%), then TV (32.9%), and Newspaper the last (28.2%).
6. If there is a trusted brand name for fresher and safer fish, how much more per pound you are willing to pay for it?

- 4% said no increase
- 16.6% said \$0.01 to \$0.50
- 43.0% said \$0.51 to \$1.00
- 36.5% said over \$1.00

It seems \$1.00 or slightly more is the best choice.

7. Would government certification of the brand increase your confidence in the brand?
 - 67.1% showed favorable opinion, 18.9% showed unfavorable opinion, and 14% showed neutral attitude. The average rating is 5.0.
8. If New England fishermen were to introduce a brand name for fresher and safer fish, what would be your **attitude** toward the brand?
 - 72.1% showed favorable opinion, 7.9% showed unfavorable opinion, and 20% showed neutral attitude. The average rating is 5.2.
9. If New England fishermen were to introduce a brand name for fresher and safer fish, how likely would you be to **buy** fish under their brand?
 - 76% showed favorable opinion, 9% showed unfavorable opinion, and 15.1% showed neutral attitude. The average rating is 5.3.
10. Gender:
 - 41.6% are male and 58.4% are female
11. Age:
 - 30.4% are under 25
 - 32.9% are between 25 and 44
 - 32.5% are between 45 and 64
 - 4.3% are over 64.
 - Which indicates the sample is quite evenly distributed with less people older than 64.
12. Marital status:
 - 44.4% are married and 55.5 % are not.
13. Educational background:
 - 14.3% with high school or less, 28.9% with 1-3 years college, 41.4% with 4 years college, and 15.4% with graduate school education.
14. Household income:

- 34.7% with less than \$40K, 25.5% with \$40-59K, 20.3% with \$60-80K, and 19.6% with over \$80K.

15. Ethnic background: __Asian __Black __Hispanic __Native __White __Other.

- 15% are Asians, 9.3% are Blacks, 10.4% are Hispanics, 0.4% are Natives, 58.4% are Whites, and 6.5% are Others. The sample is pretty much spread over with diverse ethnic background except a relative higher Asian percentage.

16. City or town where you live (Median household income data of each town are based on the "Neighborhood Profiles" from www.bestplaces.net):

- 17.8% from Low Income towns
- 44.1% from Middle Income towns
- 38.1% from High Income towns

17. The survey was conducted in either a restaurant or a supermarket:

- 64.4% from Supermarkets
- 35.6% from Restaurants

Relational Statistics Findings

1. **Cross-Tabulations** (To use Cross-Tabulations Analysis, we recode the 1-to-7 scales into three categories: favorable, neutral, and unfavorable, please see Appendix D) - Here we analyze who said what and what are the differences:

In general, all the respondents follow the same patterns in the Basic Statistical Findings.

(1) Gender

There are no significant differences between male and female respondents regarding their fish consumption attitude, and intention, and behavior questions, only a few exceptions:

- 59.3% of the female and 43.1% of the male respondents consider that "Locally Caught is an important factor when they buy fish".
- 82.8.3% of the female and 72.4% of the male respondents agree "Safety is determined by the fish handling process".

(2) Age

There are no significant differences among respondents from different age groups for most of their fish consumption attitude, and intention, and behavior questions. The following are some interesting findings:

- Older people have higher fish buying frequencies (from zero up to twice a week.
- Higher percentage of older people think seller's reputation important

- People who are older than 44 have higher percentage to think “Locally caught” important.
- Younger people are less likely to look for the brand name information from newspaper but more from Internet than older people
- Older people are more like to buy brand name fish than younger people.

(3) Marital Status

There are no significant differences between married and unmarried respondents regarding their fish consumption attitude, and intention, and behavior questions, only a few interesting exceptions:

- 59.0% of married and 46.8% of unmarried respondents consider that “Locally Caught is an important factor when they buy fish”.
- Although both groups are not knowledgeable regarding the fish handling process, 24.4% of married and 9.9% of the unmarried respondents say they know it
- 83.7% of married and 74.0% of unmarried respondents consider “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”.
- 33.3% of married and 23.4% of unmarried respondents would read newspaper to look for trusted brand name information.
- 82.9% of married and 70.6% of unmarried respondents are likely to buy brand name fish.

(4) Education Background

Similar to the above results, there are a few interesting findings:

- The higher education they completed, the higher percentage that they are more willing to pay more for fresher fish.
- The similar pattern found for willingness to pay how much more per pound.
- The similar pattern found for their confidence with a government certification on a brand name.
- The similar pattern found for their trust to the New England fishermen brand name.
- And the similar pattern found for their willingness to buy the New England fishermen brand name.

(5) Income

Very much like education background, Income shows the following differences:

- The higher income group people have higher percentage to pay more for per pound
- The similar pattern found for their trust to the New England fishermen brand name.
- And the similar pattern found for their willingness to buy the New England fishermen brand name.

(6) Town

Like other variables, there is no much difference for most of their fish consumption attitude, and intention, and behavior questions. The following are some interesting findings and some of them are even surprising:

- Towns with lower median income consider “convenient location” more important.
- Towns with lower median income consider “seller’s reputation” more important.
- Towns with higher median income have even lesser knowledge on where the fish was caught.
- Towns with higher median income have even lesser knowledge on the fish handling process.
- Towns with higher median income have even lesser knowledge on fishing regulations.
- Towns with higher median income even lesser likely to read newspaper for brand name information.

(7) Supermarket vs. Restaurant

Again, there is no much difference for most of their fish consumption attitude, and intention, and behavior questions. The following are some exceptions:

- People buy fish more frequent in supermarket than in restaurant.
- More people in restaurant than in supermarket consider Seller’s reputation as an important factor to buy fish.
- More people in restaurant (29.2%) than in supermarket (10.5%) know the fish handling process.
- More people in restaurant (25.0%) than in supermarket (18.4%) know the fishing regulations.
- More people in restaurant (61.5%) than in supermarket (43.7%) agree “Taste depends on where the fish was caught”.
- More people in supermarket (72.8%) than in restaurant (63.5%) agree “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”.
- More people in restaurant (45.8%) than in supermarket (32.8%) find brand name information from Internet.
- While more people in restaurant (53.7%) are willing to pay \$.50-1.00 than in supermarket (35.5%), more people in supermarket (43.0%) are willing to pay more than \$1:00 than in restaurant (27.4%).

2. Regression – Relationships between Intentions on buying fish under a trusted brand name and other attitude variables

(1) Dependent variable is “How much more to spend on trusted band”. The following independent variables are significant:

- “I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat”
- “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”
- “Price is an important factor when buying fish”
- “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”

(2) Dependent variable is “Government certification of the brand would increase your confidence in the brand”. The following independent variables are significant:

- “I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name”

- “How many times do you buy fish per week”
- “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”.

(3) Dependent variable is “I would trust it if New England fishermen were to introduce a brand name for fresher and safer fish”. The following independent variables are significant:

- “I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat”
- “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”

(4) Dependent variable is “I would like buy fish under the brand name by New England fishermen”. The following independent variables are significant:

- “I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat”
- “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”
- “I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name”

Conclusions

1. Most people (75%) surveyed buy fish at least once a week.
2. When people buy fish, the top three factors affecting their buying decision are Freshness, Taste, and Safety, followed by Fish Handling Process and Seller’s Reputation.
3. Although they consider Fish Handling Process important, their knowledge regarding fish handling process and fishing regulation is very limited. The direct implication is that it is important to educate people regarding the fish handling process.
4. People do agree that “Freshness depends on where the fish was caught”, “Taste depends on where the fish was caught”, “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”, “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”, and “I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name”,

And especially, they agree that “I am willing to pay more for fish that is fresher” and “I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat”. It implies that people like the idea of introducing a brand name for fresher and safer fish.

5. It shows that the most effective way to introduce a brand name for fish is through supermarket and restaurant, followed by Internet, and then TV and Newspaper.
6. While 43% of them said that they are willing to pay \$0.50 to \$1:00 more per pound for the trusted brand name fish, 37% are willing to pay over \$1:00 more. The best point might be set at \$1:00.
7. Since 67% of them think a government certification would increase their confidence in the brand, it might be a good idea to get a government certification.
8. Majority people would trust the brand (72%) and buy fish under the brand (76%) if New England fishermen were to introduce a brand name for fresher and safer fish. It suggests that New England fishermen should introduce a brand for their fish.
9. While male and female respondents have similar opinions regarding fish-buying attitude and behavior, there are two exceptions: there are more female respondents than male respondents considering that “Locally Caught is an important factor when they buy fish” and agreeing that “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”.
10. The results show that the older, married, higher education background, and higher income people are somewhat different from the younger, lower education background, and lower income ones in terms of their attitude, intention, and buying behavior. It suggests that although people from all groups could be the potential buyers (since their attitude, intention, and buying behavior were all positive), older, married, higher education background, and higher income people are even more likely to be the target group.
11. People from the towns with lower median income consider “convenient location” and “seller’s reputation” more important than ones with higher median income, and people from the towns with higher median income have even lesser knowledge on “where the fish was caught”, “fish handling process”, and “fishing regulations”. However, there is no significance among the towns with different median income in terms of fish-buying attitude, intention, and behavior.

12. It is not surprising to see that people buy fish more frequently in supermarket than in restaurant.

People who buy fish from supermarket have even lesser knowledgeable than those from restaurant. While more people who buy fish from restaurant are willing to pay \$0.50-\$1:00 than those from supermarket, more people who buy fish from supermarket are willing to pay over \$1:00 than those from restaurant.

13. People, who are willing to pay more, agree to have government certification, trust New England fishermen brand name, and buy fish with New England fishermen brand name, are those who buy fish more frequently and agree that:

- “I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat”
- “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”
- “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”
- “I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name”.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis above, we have the following suggestions:

1. All the analyses suggest that New England fishermen should introduce a brand name.
2. To become a trusted brand name, New England fishermen need to educate fish buyers about its brand and product. More specifically, it should emphasize the brand’s competitive advantages in freshness, taste, safety, fish handling process, and its reputation (such as one of the most regulated area in the world). In addition, it needs to educate the fish buyers on where the fish was caught, the fish handling process, and fishing regulations.
3. A market test for price change is needed. The test price should be around \$1:00 more per pound.
4. To promote the brand, the best channel is through supermarket/restaurant where the fish is sold, followed by Internet, TV, and Newspaper.
5. To gain consumers’ trust, a government certification of the brand is helpful.

6. Although people with different demographic background could be the potential buyers for the brand, the initial and primary target market might be the fish buyers who are married, older (45 and above), higher household income, and with higher educational background.
7. In terms of psychographics, the target markets should be those who agree with that “I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat”, “Safety is determined by the fishing regulations”, “Safety is determined by the fish handling process”, and “I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name”.

Appendix A. Focus Group Interview Guide

Good evening. Thank you for coming. I will be the moderator for today's focus group.

Today's discussion topic is related to fish and fish consumption. Please feel free to say whatever is on your mind. It is very critical for this study that what you say is truly from your own mind. We are taping this discussion today so we don't have to take notes. Everything you say is, of course, confidential, and the results of this discussion will be reported anonymously. Because we have a very limited time for the discussion, I'll try to keep things moving.

Before we start, to be relaxed and get acquainted each other, let's go around the table to introduce yourself by two things: your first name and occupation. I will start first: My name is Raymond and "Everybody loves Raymond". I am a marketing professor at UMass Boston. Next:
.....

Some of you here are professional buyers; others are consumers. I'd like to ask that the professional buyers sit back a little during the first part of this session, but as the discussion moves forward your opinions will be equally important.

Now let's begin.

1. You are invited here partly because you said you like to eat fish and seafood. What do you like about it?
2. Where do you usually buy fish, supermarket or special seafood store (please specify the name of the places. For example, Stop & Shop)? Or which restaurants do you usually go to for fish or seafood? And why there?
3. When you buy fish, what are the important factors that influence your purchase decision? And why do you think they are important?
4. Just now some people mentioned freshness is very important. What do you mean by "fresh"? How can you tell whether the fish was previously frozen? **What do you professional buyers have to say about this?**

5. Other factors I heard were safety, freshness, types, price, can you rank the order of the importance and write them down on the paper? **You professional buyers, would you please also rank these according to what your needs are?**
6. What is your way of determining the quality (fresh, safe, good taste etc.) of the fish you purchase? **Consumers first, please..... and now, how about the professionals?**
7. **Consumers:** How much do you know about the handling process of the fish from the ocean to your table? How important is the process to you since it is behind the scenes?
8. **Consumers:** What would be best way to guaranty the quality (such as fresh and safe) of the handling process you trust?
9. **This is addressed to both consumers and professionals:** Is buying locally caught fish important to you? Why or why not?
10. (Based on the answer of Q8, I may modify this question) When you hear **about the** “Die Hard” battery, you have the trust on the brand. What do you think of having a trusted brand idea for fish? If so, what would be a good name for the brand?
11. (Again, based on the answer of Q9, I may modify this question) What do you think of the name of “Fisherman’s Best”?
12. If there is a brand that does have the quality (such as fresh and safe) of the handling process, what is the best or easiest way for you to get the information about the brand?
13. Just like people pay more for Lexus than for Corolla of Toyota, are you willing to pay more for a trusted premium brand? If so, how much more (cents or dollars per pound, and % per pound)?
14. Did you know that New England fishermen are the most regulated in the world in terms of mesh size, closures, days they are allowed to fish, etc? Do you think it matters to consumers when they buy fish?

In summing up: we agree

Thank you very much for helping us out today.

Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire



Dear Massachusetts Resident:

Hello! We are senior marketing students at University of Massachusetts Boston. To meet our course requirement, we are currently conducting a survey regarding consumer behavior regarding fish purchasing and consumption. This study will help the local fishing industry to understand their customers (i.e., people like you) better and therefore provide better services for you.

The questions below are simple and designed to be completed in a few minutes. We appreciate your participation. Your answers will be pooled with others and will be completely confidential. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to call our professor, Dr. Raymond R. Liu, at (617) 287-7739.

Thank you for taking the time to help us with our class project.

Sincerely,

Students in Marketing Research class

Survey Questionnaire

1. How many times do you buy fish per week? <1 1 2 3 4 5 >5

2. How important are the following factors to you when you buy fish

		<u>Very unimportant</u>					<u>Very important</u>
Freshness -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Taste -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Safety -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Price -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Convenient Location -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seller's Reputation -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fish Handling Process -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Locally caught (by New England fishermen) ----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. How much do you know about the fish that you buy?

	<u>Know Nothing</u>				<u>Know Everything</u>		
Where the fish was caught -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The fish handling process from the Ocean to your table ---	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fishing regulations (environmental concerns, safety, etc.) -	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. Please indicate your opinion on the following statements: (1= Strongly disagree, 4 = Neutral, and 7= Strongly agree).

	<u>Strongly disagree</u>				<u>Strongly agree</u>		
Freshness depends on where the fish was caught --	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Taste depends on where the fish was caught -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Safety is determined by the fish handling process --	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Safety is determined by the fishing regulations ----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am willing to pay more for fish that is fresher ----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I would pay more for fish I know is safe to eat ----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I prefer the fish sold under a trusted brand name ---	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. If you were looking for a trusted brand name, where would be the places you would go to find the information (check all that apply)?

Newspaper, Internet, TV, Supermarkets/restaurants, Other

6. If there is a trusted brand name for fresher and safer fish, how much more per pound you are willing to pay for it?

\$0.01 - \$0.50, \$0.50 - \$1.00, More than \$1.00, \$0.00.

7. Would government certification of the brand increase your confidence in the brand?

Definitely no 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Definitely yes

8. If New England fishermen were to introduce a brand name for fresher and safer fish, what would be your **attitude** toward the brand?

Would not trust it at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Would totally trust it

9. If New England fishermen were to introduce a brand name for fresher and safer fish, how likely would you be to **buy** fish under their brand?

Very Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Likely

10. Your gender: male female.

11. Your age: under 25 25-44 45-64 over 64.

12. You are: Married Not Married.

13. Your education: high school or less 1-3 yrs college 4 yrs college graduate school.

14. Your household income: < \$40K \$40K-59K \$60K-80K >\$80K.

15. Your ethnic background: Asian Black Hispanic Native White Other.

16. City or town where you live: _____

Thank you for your participation in our research project!

Appendix C. Frequencies and Descriptive Analysis

Fish Purchase Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less Than 1	71	25.4	25.5	25.5
	1.00	113	40.4	40.6	66.2
	2.00	57	20.4	20.5	86.7
	3.00	29	10.4	10.4	97.1
	4.00	5	1.8	1.8	98.9
	5.00	3	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Freshness Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	9	3.2	3.2	3.2
	2.00	2	.7	.7	3.9
	3.00	2	.7	.7	4.6
	Neutral	7	2.5	2.5	7.1
	5.00	16	5.7	5.7	12.9
	6.00	41	14.6	14.6	27.5
	Very Important	203	72.5	72.5	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Taste Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	8	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2.00	3	1.1	1.1	3.9
	3.00	4	1.4	1.4	5.4
	Neutral	4	1.4	1.4	6.8
	5.00	17	6.1	6.1	12.9
	6.00	56	20.0	20.0	32.9
	Very Important	188	67.1	67.1	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Safety Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	6	2.1	2.2	2.2
	2.00	6	2.1	2.2	4.3
	3.00	8	2.9	2.9	7.2
	Neutral	23	8.2	8.3	15.5
	5.00	24	8.6	8.6	24.1
	6.00	43	15.4	15.5	39.6
	Very Important	168	60.0	60.4	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Price Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	5	1.8	1.8	1.8
	2.00	5	1.8	1.8	3.6
	3.00	19	6.8	6.8	10.4
	Neutral	54	19.3	19.3	29.6
	5.00	58	20.7	20.7	50.4
	6.00	67	23.9	23.9	74.3
	Very Important	72	25.7	25.7	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Convenient Location Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	8	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2.00	16	5.7	5.7	8.6
	3.00	26	9.3	9.3	17.9
	Neutral	68	24.3	24.3	42.1
	5.00	56	20.0	20.0	62.1
	6.00	53	18.9	18.9	81.1
	Very Important	53	18.9	18.9	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Seller's Reputation Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	10	3.6	3.6	3.6
	2.00	9	3.2	3.2	6.8
	3.00	18	6.4	6.5	13.3
	Neutral	35	12.5	12.6	25.9
	5.00	56	20.0	20.1	46.0
	6.00	62	22.1	22.3	68.3
	Very Important	88	31.4	31.7	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Fish Handling Process Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	15	5.4	5.4	5.4
	2.00	16	5.7	5.7	11.1
	3.00	14	5.0	5.0	16.1
	Neutral	23	8.2	8.2	24.4
	5.00	38	13.6	13.6	38.0
	6.00	49	17.5	17.6	55.6
	Very Important	124	44.3	44.4	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Locally Caught Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	33	11.8	11.8	11.8
	2.00	21	7.5	7.5	19.4
	3.00	29	10.4	10.4	29.7
	Neutral	49	17.5	17.6	47.3
	5.00	42	15.0	15.1	62.4
	6.00	54	19.3	19.4	81.7
	Very Important	51	18.2	18.3	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Know Where Fish Was Caught

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Know Nothing	80	28.6	28.6	28.6
	2.00	60	21.4	21.4	50.0
	3.00	56	20.0	20.0	70.0
	Neutral	32	11.4	11.4	81.4
	5.00	25	8.9	8.9	90.4
	6.00	18	6.4	6.4	96.8
	Know Everything	9	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Know The Fish Handling Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Know Nothing	103	36.8	37.1	37.1
	2.00	55	19.6	19.8	56.8
	3.00	39	13.9	14.0	70.9
	Neutral	35	12.5	12.6	83.5
	5.00	17	6.1	6.1	89.6
	6.00	15	5.4	5.4	95.0
	Know Everything	14	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
	Total	280	100.0		

Know the Fishing Regulations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Know Nothing	90	32.1	32.1	32.1
	2.00	49	17.5	17.5	49.6
	3.00	43	15.4	15.4	65.0
	Neutral	40	14.3	14.3	79.3
	5.00	29	10.4	10.4	89.6
	6.00	15	5.4	5.4	95.0
	Know Everything	14	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	3.9	3.9	3.9
	2.00	17	6.1	6.1	10.0
	3.00	24	8.6	8.6	18.6
	Neutral	66	23.6	23.7	42.3
	5.00	51	18.2	18.3	60.6
	6.00	49	17.5	17.6	78.1
	Strongly Agree	61	21.8	21.9	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	5.4	5.4	5.4
	2.00	14	5.0	5.0	10.4
	3.00	31	11.1	11.1	21.4
	Neutral	79	28.2	28.2	49.6
	5.00	61	21.8	21.8	71.4
	6.00	44	15.7	15.7	87.1
	Strongly Agree	36	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2.00	6	2.1	2.1	3.6
	3.00	14	5.0	5.0	8.6
	Neutral	36	12.9	12.9	21.4
	5.00	54	19.3	19.3	40.7
	6.00	80	28.6	28.6	69.3
	Strongly Agree	86	30.7	30.7	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	1.1	1.1	1.1
	2.00	9	3.2	3.2	4.3
	3.00	22	7.9	7.9	12.2
	Neutral	49	17.5	17.6	29.7
	5.00	73	26.1	26.2	55.9
	6.00	65	23.2	23.3	79.2
	Strongly Agree	58	20.7	20.8	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Pay More For Fresher Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	2.1	2.2	2.2
	2.00	3	1.1	1.1	3.2
	3.00	17	6.1	6.1	9.4
	Neutral	31	11.1	11.2	20.5
	5.00	48	17.1	17.3	37.8
	6.00	72	25.7	25.9	63.7
	Strongly Agree	101	36.1	36.3	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Pay More For Safer Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	2.5	2.5	2.5
	2.00	2	.7	.7	3.2
	3.00	10	3.6	3.6	6.8
	Neutral	17	6.1	6.1	12.9
	5.00	54	19.3	19.3	32.1
	6.00	67	23.9	23.9	56.1
	Strongly Agree	123	43.9	43.9	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	4.3	4.3	4.3
	2.00	14	5.0	5.0	9.3
	3.00	24	8.6	8.6	17.9
	Neutral	63	22.5	22.5	40.4
	5.00	50	17.9	17.9	58.2
	6.00	62	22.1	22.1	80.4
	Strongly Agree	55	19.6	19.6	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Find Brand Name In Newspaper

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Checked	79	28.2	28.2	28.2
	Not Checked	201	71.8	71.8	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Find Brand Name On Internet

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Checked	108	38.6	38.6	38.6
	Not Checked	172	61.4	61.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Find Brand Name On TV

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Checked	92	32.9	32.9	32.9
	Not Checked	188	67.1	67.1	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Checked	180	64.3	64.3	64.3
	Not Checked	100	35.7	35.7	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Find Brand Name Elsewhere

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Checked	62	22.1	22.1	22.1
	Not Checked	218	77.9	77.9	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$0.00	11	3.9	4.0	4.0
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	46	16.4	16.6	20.6
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	119	42.5	43.0	63.5
	More Than \$1.00	101	36.1	36.5	100.0
	Total	277	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.1		
Total		280	100.0		

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Definitely No	20	7.1	7.4	7.4
	2.00	8	2.9	3.0	10.3
	3.00	23	8.2	8.5	18.8
	Neutral	38	13.6	14.0	32.8
	5.00	57	20.4	21.0	53.9
	6.00	54	19.3	19.9	73.8
	Definitely Yes	71	25.4	26.2	100.0
	Total	271	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.2		
Total		280	100.0		

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Would Not Trust It At All	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2.00	3	1.1	1.1	2.5
	3.00	15	5.4	5.4	7.9
	Neutral	56	20.0	20.0	27.9
	5.00	77	27.5	27.5	55.4
	6.00	79	28.2	28.2	83.6
	Would Totally Trust It	46	16.4	16.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unlikely	3	1.1	1.1	1.1
	2.00	4	1.4	1.4	2.5
	3.00	18	6.4	6.5	9.0
	Neutral	42	15.0	15.1	24.0
	5.00	81	28.9	29.0	53.0
	6.00	67	23.9	24.0	77.1
	Very Likely	64	22.9	22.9	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	116	41.4	41.6	41.6
	Female	163	58.2	58.4	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under 25	85	30.4	30.4	30.4
	25-44	92	32.9	32.9	63.2
	45-64	91	32.5	32.5	95.7
	Over 64	12	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	123	43.9	44.4	44.4
	Not Married	154	55.0	55.6	100.0
	Total	277	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.1		
Total		280	100.0		

Highest Education Completed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High School Or Less	40	14.3	14.3	14.3
	1-3 Years College	81	28.9	28.9	43.2
	4 Years College	116	41.4	41.4	84.6
	Graduate School	43	15.4	15.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Household Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less Than \$40K	94	33.6	34.7	34.7
	\$40K - \$59K	69	24.6	25.5	60.1
	\$60K - \$80K	55	19.6	20.3	80.4
	Over \$80K	53	18.9	19.6	100.0
	Total	271	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.2		
Total		280	100.0		

Ethnic Background

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asian	42	15.0	15.1	15.1
	Black	26	9.3	9.3	24.4
	Hispanic	29	10.4	10.4	34.8
	Native American	1	.4	.4	35.1
	White	163	58.2	58.4	93.5
	Other	18	6.4	6.5	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Median Family Incomes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low Income Cities	48	17.1	17.8	17.8
	Middle Income Cities	119	42.5	44.1	61.9
	High Income Cities	103	36.8	38.1	100.0
	Total	270	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.6		
Total		280	100.0		

Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Supermarket	174	62.1	64.4	64.4
	Restaurant	96	34.3	35.6	100.0
	Total	270	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.6		
Total		280	100.0		

DESCRIPTIVES

VARIABLES=Times Freshness Taste safety Price Convenience Reputation
 Handling L
 ocal Where Process Regulations Fresh Flavor
 Handled Regulated Fresher Safer Branded Newspaper Internet TV Market Other
 /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX .

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fish Purchase Frequency	278	.00	5.00	1.2554	1.07291
Freshness Factor	280	1.00	7.00	6.4071	1.30561
Taste Factor	280	1.00	7.00	6.3536	1.29791
Safety Factor	278	1.00	7.00	6.0719	1.47244
Price Factor	280	1.00	7.00	5.3000	1.44778
Convenient Location Factor	280	1.00	7.00	4.8536	1.58736
Seller's Reputation Factor	278	1.00	7.00	5.3597	1.61896
Fish Handling Process Factor	279	1.00	7.00	5.4946	1.83858
Locally Caught Factor	279	1.00	7.00	4.4767	1.95599
Know Where Fish Was Caught	280	1.00	7.00	2.8286	1.70365
Know The Fish Handling Process	278	1.00	7.00	2.6727	1.80174
Know the Fishing Regulations	280	1.00	7.00	2.8929	1.81667
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	279	1.00	7.00	4.8638	1.67378
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	280	1.00	7.00	4.5464	1.58329
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	280	1.00	7.00	5.5500	1.40315
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	279	1.00	7.00	5.1756	1.41217
Pay More For Fresher Fish	278	1.00	7.00	5.6331	1.45520
Pay More For Safer Fish	280	1.00	7.00	5.8643	1.38714
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	280	1.00	7.00	4.8964	1.64611
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	280	1.00	2.00	1.7179	.45085
Find Brand Name On Internet	280	1.00	2.00	1.6143	.48764
Find Brand Name On TV	280	1.00	2.00	1.6714	.47053
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	280	1.00	2.00	1.3571	.48002
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	280	1.00	2.00	1.7786	.41595
Valid N (listwise)	270				

DESCRIPTIVES

VARIABLES=Willingness Confidence Attitude Probability Gender Age Status
 Educat
 ion Income Background Earnings Marketplace

/STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX .

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	277	.00	3.00	2.1191	.82328
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	271	1.00	7.00	5.0295	1.78446
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	280	1.00	7.00	5.2143	1.28004
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	279	1.00	7.00	5.3333	1.32763
Gender	279	1.00	2.00	1.5842	.49374
Age	280	1.00	4.00	2.1071	.88958
Marital Status	277	1.00	2.00	1.5560	.49776
Highest Education Completed	280	1.00	4.00	2.5786	.91634
Household Income	271	1.00	4.00	2.2472	1.12946
Ethnic Background	279	1.00	6.00	3.9713	1.63787
Median Family Incomes	270	1.00	3.00	2.2037	.72089
Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	270	1.00	2.00	1.3556	.47957
Valid N (listwise)	253				

FREQUENCIES

VARIABLES=Freshness Taste safety Price Convenience Reputation Handling
Local W

here Process Regulations Fresh Flavor Handled

Regulated Fresher Safer Branded Confidence Attitude Probability

/ORDER= ANALYSIS .

Frequency Table

Freshness Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	13	4.6	4.6	4.6
	Neutral	7	2.5	2.5	7.1
	Important	260	92.9	92.9	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Taste Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	15	5.4	5.4	5.4
	Neutral	4	1.4	1.4	6.8
	Important	261	93.2	93.2	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Safety Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	20	7.1	7.2	7.2
	Neutral	23	8.2	8.3	15.5
	Important	235	83.9	84.5	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
	Total	280	100.0		

Price Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	29	10.4	10.4	10.4
	Neutral	54	19.3	19.3	29.6
	Important	197	70.4	70.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Convenient Location Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	50	17.9	17.9	17.9
	Neutral	68	24.3	24.3	42.1
	Important	162	57.9	57.9	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Seller's Reputation Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	37	13.2	13.3	13.3
	Neutral	35	12.5	12.6	25.9
	Important	206	73.6	74.1	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Fish Handling Process Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	45	16.1	16.1	16.1
	Neutral	23	8.2	8.2	24.4
	Important	211	75.4	75.6	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Locally Caught Factor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	83	29.6	29.7	29.7
	Neutral	49	17.5	17.6	47.3
	Important	147	52.5	52.7	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Know Where Fish Was Caught

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Know Nothing	196	70.0	70.0	70.0
	Neutral	32	11.4	11.4	81.4
	Know Everything	52	18.6	18.6	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Know The Fish Handling Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Know Nothing	197	70.4	70.9	70.9
	Neutral	35	12.5	12.6	83.5
	Know Everything	46	16.4	16.5	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Know the Fishing Regulations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Know Nothing	182	65.0	65.0	65.0
	Neutral	40	14.3	14.3	79.3
	Know Everything	58	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	52	18.6	18.6	18.6
	Neutral	66	23.6	23.7	42.3
	Agree	161	57.5	57.7	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	60	21.4	21.4	21.4
	Neutral	79	28.2	28.2	49.6
	Agree	141	50.4	50.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	24	8.6	8.6	8.6
	Neutral	36	12.9	12.9	21.4
	Agree	220	78.6	78.6	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	34	12.1	12.2	12.2
	Neutral	49	17.5	17.6	29.7
	Agree	196	70.0	70.3	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Pay More For Fresher Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	26	9.3	9.4	9.4
	Neutral	31	11.1	11.2	20.5
	Agree	221	78.9	79.5	100.0
	Total	278	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		280	100.0		

Pay More For Safer Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	19	6.8	6.8	6.8
	Neutral	17	6.1	6.1	12.9
	Agree	244	87.1	87.1	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	50	17.9	17.9	17.9
	Neutral	63	22.5	22.5	40.4
	Agree	167	59.6	59.6	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	51	18.2	18.8	18.8
	Neutral	38	13.6	14.0	32.8
	Yes	182	65.0	67.2	100.0
	Total	271	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.2		
Total		280	100.0		

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Would Not Trust It	22	7.9	7.9	7.9
	Neutral	56	20.0	20.0	27.9
	Would Trust It	202	72.1	72.1	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unlikely	25	8.9	9.0	9.0
	Neutral	42	15.0	15.1	24.0
	Likely	212	75.7	76.0	100.0
	Total	279	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		280	100.0		

Appendix D1. Crosstabs with Gender

Fish Purchase Frequency * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	30	41	71
		% within Gender	26.1%	25.3%	25.6%
	1.00	Count	48	64	112
		% within Gender	41.7%	39.5%	40.4%
	2.00	Count	26	31	57
		% within Gender	22.6%	19.1%	20.6%
	3.00	Count	9	20	29
		% within Gender	7.8%	12.3%	10.5%
	4.00	Count	1	4	5
		% within Gender	.9%	2.5%	1.8%
	5.00	Count	1	2	3
		% within Gender	.9%	1.2%	1.1%
	Total	Count	115	162	277
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.841 ^a	5	.724
Likelihood Ratio	2.976	5	.704
Linear-by-Linear Association	.925	1	.336
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.25.

Freshness Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	6	7	13
		% within Gender	5.2%	4.3%	4.7%
	Neutral	Count	3	4	7
		% within Gender	2.6%	2.5%	2.5%
	Important	Count	107	152	259
		% within Gender	92.2%	93.3%	92.8%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.124 ^a	2	.940
Likelihood Ratio	.123	2	.940
Linear-by-Linear Association	.122	1	.727
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.91.

Taste Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	6	9	15
		% within Gender	5.2%	5.5%	5.4%
	Neutral	Count	2	2	4
		% within Gender	1.7%	1.2%	1.4%
	Important	Count	108	152	260
		% within Gender	93.1%	93.3%	93.2%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.132 ^a	2	.936
Likelihood Ratio	.131	2	.937
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.972
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.66.

Safety Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	10	10	20
		% within Gender	8.7%	6.2%	7.2%
	Neutral	Count	11	12	23
		% within Gender	9.6%	7.4%	8.3%
	Important	Count	94	140	234
		% within Gender	81.7%	86.4%	84.5%
Total	Count	115	162	277	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.144 ^a	2	.564
Likelihood Ratio	1.132	2	.568
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.086	1	.297
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.30.

Price Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	11	18	29
		% within Gender	9.5%	11.0%	10.4%
	Neutral	Count	26	28	54
		% within Gender	22.4%	17.2%	19.4%
	Important	Count	79	117	196
		% within Gender	68.1%	71.8%	70.3%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.249 ^a	2	.536
Likelihood Ratio	1.239	2	.538
Linear-by-Linear Association	.067	1	.795
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.06.

Convenient Location Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	27	23	50
		% within Gender	23.3%	14.1%	17.9%
	Neutral	Count	30	38	68
		% within Gender	25.9%	23.3%	24.4%
	Important	Count	59	102	161
		% within Gender	50.9%	62.6%	57.7%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.969 ^a	2	.083
Likelihood Ratio	4.933	2	.085
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.923	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.79.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	12	25	37
		% within Gender	10.3%	15.5%	13.4%
	Neutral	Count	18	17	35
		% within Gender	15.5%	10.6%	12.6%
	Important	Count	86	119	205
		% within Gender	74.1%	73.9%	74.0%
Total	Count	116	161	277	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.668 ^a	2	.263
Likelihood Ratio	2.688	2	.261
Linear-by-Linear Association	.388	1	.533
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.66.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	22	23	45
		% within Gender	19.0%	14.2%	16.2%
	Neutral	Count	13	10	23
		% within Gender	11.2%	6.2%	8.3%
	Important	Count	81	129	210
		% within Gender	69.8%	79.6%	75.5%
Total	Count	116	162	278	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.880 ^a	2	.144
Likelihood Ratio	3.837	2	.147
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.531	1	.112
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.60.

Locally Caught Factor * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	39	44	83
		% within Gender	33.6%	27.2%	29.9%
	Neutral	Count	27	22	49
		% within Gender	23.3%	13.6%	17.6%
	Important	Count	50	96	146
		% within Gender	43.1%	59.3%	52.5%
Total	Count	116	162	278	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.910 ^a	2	.019
Likelihood Ratio	7.909	2	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.460	1	.035
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.45.

Know Where Fish Was Caught * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	86	109	195
		% within Gender	74.1%	66.9%	69.9%
	Neutral	Count	11	21	32
		% within Gender	9.5%	12.9%	11.5%
	Know Everything	Count	19	33	52
		% within Gender	16.4%	20.2%	18.6%
Total		Count	116	163	279
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.739 ^a	2	.419
Likelihood Ratio	1.758	2	.415
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.344	1	.246
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.30.

Know The Fish Handling Process * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count	79	117	196
		% within Gender	68.7%	72.2%	70.8%
	Neutral	Count	20	15	35
		% within Gender	17.4%	9.3%	12.6%
	Know Everything	Count	16	30	46
		% within Gender	13.9%	18.5%	16.6%
Total		Count	115	162	277
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.497 ^a	2	.106
Likelihood Ratio	4.447	2	.108
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.908
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.53.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	78	103	181
		% within Gender	67.2%	63.2%	64.9%
	Neutral	Count	12	28	40
		% within Gender	10.3%	17.2%	14.3%
	Know Everything	Count	26	32	58
		% within Gender	22.4%	19.6%	20.8%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.631 ^a	2	.268
Likelihood Ratio	2.713	2	.258
Linear-by-Linear Association	.016	1	.898
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.63.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	26	26	52
		% within Gender	22.4%	16.0%	18.7%
	Neutral	Count	26	40	66
		% within Gender	22.4%	24.7%	23.7%
	Agree	Count	64	96	160
		% within Gender	55.2%	59.3%	57.6%
Total	Count	116	162	278	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.808 ^a	2	.405
Likelihood Ratio	1.789	2	.409
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.203	1	.273
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.70.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	32	28	60
		% within Gender	27.6%	17.2%	21.5%
	Neutral	Count	28	50	78
		% within Gender	24.1%	30.7%	28.0%
	Agree	Count	56	85	141
		% within Gender	48.3%	52.1%	50.5%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.651 ^a	2	.098
Likelihood Ratio	4.609	2	.100
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.165	1	.141
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.95.

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	16	8	24
		% within Gender	13.8%	4.9%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	16	20	36
		% within Gender	13.8%	12.3%	12.9%
	Agree	Count	84	135	219
		% within Gender	72.4%	82.8%	78.5%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.277 ^a	2	.026
Likelihood Ratio	7.195	2	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.572	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.98.

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	20	14	34
		% within Gender	17.2%	8.6%	12.2%
	Neutral	Count	20	29	49
		% within Gender	17.2%	17.9%	17.6%
	Agree	Count	76	119	195
		% within Gender	65.5%	73.5%	70.1%
Total	Count	116	162	278	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.711 ^a	2	.095
Likelihood Ratio	4.641	2	.098
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.773	1	.052
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.19.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count	10	16	26
		% within Gender	8.6%	9.9%	9.4%
	Neutral	Count	13	18	31
		% within Gender	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%
	Agree	Count	93	127	220
		% within Gender	80.2%	78.9%	79.4%
Total	Count	116	161	277	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.139 ^a	2	.933
Likelihood Ratio	.140	2	.932
Linear-by-Linear Association	.115	1	.735
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.89.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	9	10	19
		% within Gender	7.8%	6.1%	6.8%
	Neutral	Count	9	8	17
		% within Gender	7.8%	4.9%	6.1%
	Agree	Count	98	145	243
		% within Gender	84.5%	89.0%	87.1%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.322 ^a	2	.516
Likelihood Ratio	1.304	2	.521
Linear-by-Linear Association	.853	1	.356
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.07.

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	26	24	50
		% within Gender	22.4%	14.7%	17.9%
	Neutral	Count	29	34	63
		% within Gender	25.0%	20.9%	22.6%
	Agree	Count	61	105	166
		% within Gender	52.6%	64.4%	59.5%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.345 ^a	2	.114
Likelihood Ratio	4.325	2	.115
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.279	1	.039
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.79.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	40	39	79
		% within Gender	34.5%	23.9%	28.3%
	Not Checked	Count	76	124	200
		% within Gender	65.5%	76.1%	71.7%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	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	3.721 ^b	1	.054		
Continuity Correction ^a	3.219	1	.073		
Likelihood Ratio	3.690	1	.055		
Fisher's Exact Test				.060	.037
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.707	1	.054		
N of Valid Cases	279				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.85.

Find Brand Name On Internet * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	47	60	107
		% within Gender	40.5%	36.8%	38.4%
	Not Checked	Count	69	103	172
		% within Gender	59.5%	63.2%	61.6%
Total		Count	116	163	279
		% within Gender	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	.394 ^b	1	.530		
Continuity Correction ^a	.253	1	.615		
Likelihood Ratio	.393	1	.531		
Fisher's Exact Test				.535	.307
Linear-by-Linear Association	.393	1	.531		
N of Valid Cases	279				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.49.

Find Brand Name On TV * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	43	48	91
		% within Gender	37.1%	29.4%	32.6%
	Not Checked	Count	73	115	188
		% within Gender	62.9%	70.6%	67.4%
Total		Count	116	163	279
		% within Gender	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	1.791 ^b	1	.181		
Continuity Correction ^a	1.461	1	.227		
Likelihood Ratio	1.782	1	.182		
Fisher's Exact Test				.197	.114
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.785	1	.182		
N of Valid Cases	279				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37.84.

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	71	108	179
		% within Gender	61.2%	66.3%	64.2%
	Not Checked	Count	45	55	100
		% within Gender	38.8%	33.7%	35.8%
Total		Count	116	163	279
		% within Gender	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	.752 ^b	1	.386		
Continuity Correction ^a	.548	1	.459		
Likelihood Ratio	.750	1	.387		
Fisher's Exact Test				.447	.229
Linear-by-Linear Association	.749	1	.387		
N of Valid Cases	279				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.58.

Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	26	36	62
		% within Gender	22.4%	22.1%	22.2%
	Not Checked	Count	90	127	217
		% within Gender	77.6%	77.9%	77.8%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	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	.004 ^b	1	.948		
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.004	1	.948		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.530
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.948		
N of Valid Cases	279				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.78.

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count	5	6	11
		% within Gender	4.3%	3.7%	4.0%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count	15	31	46
		% within Gender	13.0%	19.3%	16.7%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count	53	66	119
		% within Gender	46.1%	41.0%	43.1%
	More Than \$1.00	Count	42	58	100
		% within Gender	36.5%	36.0%	36.2%
Total		Count	115	161	276
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.026 ^a	3	.567
Likelihood Ratio	2.066	3	.559
Linear-by-Linear Association	.296	1	.586
N of Valid Cases	276		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.58.

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count	19	32	51
		% within Gender	17.0%	20.3%	18.9%
	Neutral	Count	12	26	38
		% within Gender	10.7%	16.5%	14.1%
	Yes	Count	81	100	181
		% within Gender	72.3%	63.3%	67.0%
Total		Count	112	158	270
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.708 ^a	2	.258
Likelihood Ratio	2.755	2	.252
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.579	1	.209
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.76.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	8	14	22
		% within Gender	6.9%	8.6%	7.9%
	Neutral	Count	30	26	56
		% within Gender	25.9%	16.0%	20.1%
	Would Trust It	Count	78	123	201
		% within Gender	67.2%	75.5%	72.0%
Total	Count	116	163	279	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.198 ^a	2	.123
Likelihood Ratio	4.148	2	.126
Linear-by-Linear Association	.742	1	.389
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.15.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	12	13	25
		% within Gender	10.3%	8.0%	9.0%
	Neutral	Count	22	20	42
		% within Gender	19.0%	12.3%	15.1%
	Likely	Count	82	129	211
		% within Gender	70.7%	79.6%	75.9%
Total	Count	116	162	278	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.077 ^a	2	.215
Likelihood Ratio	3.046	2	.218
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.128	1	.145
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.43.

Appendix D2. Crosstabs with Age

Fish Purchase Frequency * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	26	23	21	1	71
		% within Age	30.6%	25.3%	23.3%	8.3%	25.5%
	1.00	Count	36	36	35	6	113
		% within Age	42.4%	39.6%	38.9%	50.0%	40.6%
	2.00	Count	13	15	25	4	57
		% within Age	15.3%	16.5%	27.8%	33.3%	20.5%
	3.00	Count	5	16	7	1	29
		% within Age	5.9%	17.6%	7.8%	8.3%	10.4%
	4.00	Count	4	1	0	0	5
		% within Age	4.7%	1.1%	.0%	.0%	1.8%
	5.00	Count	1	0	2	0	3
		% within Age	1.2%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	1.1%
	Total	Count	85	91	90	12	278
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.047 ^a	15	.083
Likelihood Ratio	24.353	15	.059
Linear-by-Linear Association	.960	1	.327
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 12 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .13.

Freshness Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	5	3	5	0	13
		% within Age	5.9%	3.3%	5.5%	.0%	4.6%
	Neutral	Count	1	5	1	0	7
		% within Age	1.2%	5.4%	1.1%	.0%	2.5%
	Important	Count	79	84	85	12	260
		% within Age	92.9%	91.3%	93.4%	100.0%	92.9%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.232 ^a	6	.398
Likelihood Ratio	6.636	6	.356
Linear-by-Linear Association	.287	1	.592
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

Taste Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	5	3	7	0	15
		% within Age	5.9%	3.3%	7.7%	.0%	5.4%
	Neutral	Count	1	2	1	0	4
		% within Age	1.2%	2.2%	1.1%	.0%	1.4%
	Important	Count	79	87	83	12	261
		% within Age	92.9%	94.6%	91.2%	100.0%	93.2%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.121 ^a	6	.794
Likelihood Ratio	3.904	6	.690
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.959
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

Safety Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	8	3	8	1	20
		% within Age	9.4%	3.3%	8.8%	9.1%	7.2%
	Neutral	Count	8	9	6	0	23
		% within Age	9.4%	9.9%	6.6%	.0%	8.3%
	Important	Count	69	79	77	10	235
		% within Age	81.2%	86.8%	84.6%	90.9%	84.5%
Total	Count	85	91	91	11	278	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.743 ^a	6	.577
Likelihood Ratio	6.066	6	.416
Linear-by-Linear Association	.271	1	.602
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .79.

Price Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	9	10	9	1	29
		% within Age	10.6%	10.9%	9.9%	8.3%	10.4%
	Neutral	Count	14	16	22	2	54
		% within Age	16.5%	17.4%	24.2%	16.7%	19.3%
	Important	Count	62	66	60	9	197
		% within Age	72.9%	71.7%	65.9%	75.0%	70.4%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.181 ^a	6	.902
Likelihood Ratio	2.130	6	.907
Linear-by-Linear Association	.161	1	.688
N of Valid Cases	280		

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

Convenient Location Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	14	21	13	2	50
		% within Age	16.5%	22.8%	14.3%	16.7%	17.9%
	Neutral	Count	21	23	21	3	68
		% within Age	24.7%	25.0%	23.1%	25.0%	24.3%
	Important	Count	50	48	57	7	162
		% within Age	58.8%	52.2%	62.6%	58.3%	57.9%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.993 ^a	6	.810
Likelihood Ratio	2.949	6	.815
Linear-by-Linear Association	.272	1	.602
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	10	16	9	2	37
		% within Age	11.8%	17.8%	9.9%	16.7%	13.3%
	Neutral	Count	19	9	6	1	35
		% within Age	22.4%	10.0%	6.6%	8.3%	12.6%
	Important	Count	56	65	76	9	206
		% within Age	65.9%	72.2%	83.5%	75.0%	74.1%
Total	Count	85	90	91	12	278	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.998 ^a	6	.030
Likelihood Ratio	13.328	6	.038
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.514	1	.113
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.51.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	13	18	13	1	45
		% within Age	15.3%	19.8%	14.3%	8.3%	16.1%
	Neutral	Count	5	11	4	3	23
		% within Age	5.9%	12.1%	4.4%	25.0%	8.2%
	Important	Count	67	62	74	8	211
		% within Age	78.8%	68.1%	81.3%	66.7%	75.6%
Total	Count	85	91	91	12	279	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.669 ^a	6	.099
Likelihood Ratio	9.485	6	.148
Linear-by-Linear Association	.079	1	.778
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .99.

Locally Caught Factor * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	29	34	17	3	83
		% within Age	34.1%	37.4%	18.7%	25.0%	29.7%
	Neutral	Count	18	17	13	1	49
		% within Age	21.2%	18.7%	14.3%	8.3%	17.6%
	Important	Count	38	40	61	8	147
		% within Age	44.7%	44.0%	67.0%	66.7%	52.7%
Total	Count	85	91	91	12	279	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.336 ^a	6	.026
Likelihood Ratio	14.714	6	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.497	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.11.

Know Where Fish Was Caught * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	62	65	60	9	196
		% within Age	72.9%	70.7%	65.9%	75.0%	70.0%
	Neutral	Count	7	10	13	2	32
		% within Age	8.2%	10.9%	14.3%	16.7%	11.4%
	Know Everything	Count	16	17	18	1	52
		% within Age	18.8%	18.5%	19.8%	8.3%	18.6%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.842 ^a	6	.828
Likelihood Ratio	3.018	6	.807
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.770
N of Valid Cases	280		

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

Know The Fish Handling Process * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count	62	62	63	10	197
		% within Age	72.9%	68.1%	70.0%	83.3%	70.9%
	Neutral	Count	15	11	8	1	35
		% within Age	17.6%	12.1%	8.9%	8.3%	12.6%
	Know Everything	Count	8	18	19	1	46
		% within Age	9.4%	19.8%	21.1%	8.3%	16.5%
Total	Count	85	91	90	12	278	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.130 ^a	6	.229
Likelihood Ratio	8.530	6	.202
Linear-by-Linear Association	.470	1	.493
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.51.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	55	58	59	10	182
		% within Age	64.7%	63.0%	64.8%	83.3%	65.0%
	Neutral	Count	15	15	9	1	40
		% within Age	17.6%	16.3%	9.9%	8.3%	14.3%
	Know Everything	Count	15	19	23	1	58
		% within Age	17.6%	20.7%	25.3%	8.3%	20.7%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.327 ^a	6	.503
Likelihood Ratio	5.643	6	.464
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.953
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.71.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	19	15	16	2	52
		% within Age	22.4%	16.5%	17.6%	16.7%	18.6%
	Neutral	Count	21	20	24	1	66
		% within Age	24.7%	22.0%	26.4%	8.3%	23.7%
	Agree	Count	45	56	51	9	161
		% within Age	52.9%	61.5%	56.0%	75.0%	57.7%
Total	Count	85	91	91	12	279	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.790 ^a	6	.705
Likelihood Ratio	4.106	6	.662
Linear-by-Linear Association	.940	1	.332
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.24.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	21	20	17	2	60
		% within Age	24.7%	21.7%	18.7%	16.7%	21.4%
	Neutral	Count	25	21	27	6	79
		% within Age	29.4%	22.8%	29.7%	50.0%	28.2%
	Agree	Count	39	51	47	4	141
		% within Age	45.9%	55.4%	51.6%	33.3%	50.4%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.484 ^a	6	.483
Likelihood Ratio	5.263	6	.511
Linear-by-Linear Association	.381	1	.537
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.57.

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	11	10	3	0	24
		% within Age	12.9%	10.9%	3.3%	.0%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	15	7	12	2	36
		% within Age	17.6%	7.6%	13.2%	16.7%	12.9%
	Agree	Count	59	75	76	10	220
		% within Age	69.4%	81.5%	83.5%	83.3%	78.6%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.401 ^a	6	.077
Likelihood Ratio	13.240	6	.039
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.815	1	.009
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03.

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	10	16	6	2	34
		% within Age	11.8%	17.4%	6.7%	16.7%	12.2%
	Neutral	Count	18	11	19	1	49
		% within Age	21.2%	12.0%	21.1%	8.3%	17.6%
	Agree	Count	57	65	65	9	196
		% within Age	67.1%	70.7%	72.2%	75.0%	70.3%
Total	Count	85	92	90	12	279	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.225 ^a	6	.222
Likelihood Ratio	8.684	6	.192
Linear-by-Linear Association	.780	1	.377
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.46.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count	11	7	6	2	26
		% within Age	12.9%	7.7%	6.7%	16.7%	9.4%
	Neutral	Count	10	10	10	1	31
		% within Age	11.8%	11.0%	11.1%	8.3%	11.2%
	Agree	Count	64	74	74	9	221
		% within Age	75.3%	81.3%	82.2%	75.0%	79.5%
Total	Count	85	91	90	12	278	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.277 ^a	6	.773
Likelihood Ratio	3.126	6	.793
Linear-by-Linear Association	.856	1	.355
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.12.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	8	7	3	1	19
		% within Age	9.4%	7.6%	3.3%	8.3%	6.8%
	Neutral	Count	7	5	3	2	17
		% within Age	8.2%	5.4%	3.3%	16.7%	6.1%
	Agree	Count	70	80	85	9	244
		% within Age	82.4%	87.0%	93.4%	75.0%	87.1%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.557 ^a	6	.272
Likelihood Ratio	7.293	6	.295
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.174	1	.140
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .73.

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	16	14	15	5	50
		% within Age	18.8%	15.2%	16.5%	41.7%	17.9%
	Neutral	Count	17	25	19	2	63
		% within Age	20.0%	27.2%	20.9%	16.7%	22.5%
	Agree	Count	52	53	57	5	167
		% within Age	61.2%	57.6%	62.6%	41.7%	59.6%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.611 ^a	6	.358
Likelihood Ratio	5.630	6	.466
Linear-by-Linear Association	.321	1	.571
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	16	23	34	6	79
		% within Age	18.8%	25.0%	37.4%	50.0%	28.2%
	Not Checked	Count	69	69	57	6	201
		% within Age	81.2%	75.0%	62.6%	50.0%	71.8%
Total		Count	85	92	91	12	280
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.743 ^a	3	.013
Likelihood Ratio	10.578	3	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.334	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.39.

Find Brand Name On Internet * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	34	41	32	1	108
		% within Age	40.0%	44.6%	35.2%	8.3%	38.6%
	Not Checked	Count	51	51	59	11	172
		% within Age	60.0%	55.4%	64.8%	91.7%	61.4%
Total		Count	85	92	91	12	280
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.545 ^a	3	.088
Likelihood Ratio	7.638	3	.054
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.550	1	.110
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.63.

Find Brand Name On TV * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	33	24	30	5	92
		% within Age	38.8%	26.1%	33.0%	41.7%	32.9%
	Not Checked	Count	52	68	61	7	188
		% within Age	61.2%	73.9%	67.0%	58.3%	67.1%
Total		Count	85	92	91	12	280
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.706 ^a	3	.295
Likelihood Ratio	3.731	3	.292
Linear-by-Linear Association	.167	1	.683
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.94.

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	61	56	56	7	180
		% within Age	71.8%	60.9%	61.5%	58.3%	64.3%
	Not Checked	Count	24	36	35	5	100
		% within Age	28.2%	39.1%	38.5%	41.7%	35.7%
Total		Count	85	92	91	12	280
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.023 ^a	3	.388
Likelihood Ratio	3.086	3	.378
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.080	1	.149
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.29.

Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	22	19	19	2	62
		% within Age	25.9%	20.7%	20.9%	16.7%	22.1%
	Not Checked	Count	63	73	72	10	218
		% within Age	74.1%	79.3%	79.1%	83.3%	77.9%
Total		Count	85	92	91	12	280
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.101 ^a	3	.777
Likelihood Ratio	1.093	3	.779
Linear-by-Linear Association	.834	1	.361
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.66.

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count	2	4	4	1	11
		% within Age	2.4%	4.4%	4.4%	8.3%	4.0%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count	12	16	15	3	46
		% within Age	14.1%	17.8%	16.7%	25.0%	16.6%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count	45	35	36	3	119
		% within Age	52.9%	38.9%	40.0%	25.0%	43.0%
	More Than \$1.00	Count	26	35	35	5	101
		% within Age	30.6%	38.9%	38.9%	41.7%	36.5%
Total		Count	85	90	90	12	277
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.725 ^a	9	.666
Likelihood Ratio	6.702	9	.668
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.905
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 6 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .48.

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count	15	15	17	4	51
		% within Age	18.5%	17.2%	18.7%	33.3%	18.8%
	Neutral	Count	15	13	9	1	38
		% within Age	18.5%	14.9%	9.9%	8.3%	14.0%
	Yes	Count	51	59	65	7	182
		% within Age	63.0%	67.8%	71.4%	58.3%	67.2%
Total		Count	81	87	91	12	271
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.673 ^a	6	.586
Likelihood Ratio	4.496	6	.610
Linear-by-Linear Association	.018	1	.893
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.68.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	10	7	4	1	22
		% within Age	11.8%	7.6%	4.4%	8.3%	7.9%
	Neutral	Count	22	17	14	3	56
		% within Age	25.9%	18.5%	15.4%	25.0%	20.0%
	Would Trust It	Count	53	68	73	8	202
		% within Age	62.4%	73.9%	80.2%	66.7%	72.1%
Total	Count	85	92	91	12	280	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.789 ^a	6	.254
Likelihood Ratio	7.810	6	.252
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.007	1	.025
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .94.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Age

Crosstab

			Age				Total
			Under 25	25-44	45-64	Over 64	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	11	8	6	0	25
		% within Age	12.9%	8.8%	6.6%	.0%	9.0%
	Neutral	Count	18	13	8	3	42
		% within Age	21.2%	14.3%	8.8%	25.0%	15.1%
	Likely	Count	56	70	77	9	212
		% within Age	65.9%	76.9%	84.6%	75.0%	76.0%
Total	Count	85	91	91	12	279	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.508 ^a	6	.105
Likelihood Ratio	11.530	6	.073
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.437	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.08.

Appendix D3. Crosstabs with Marital Status

Fish Purchase Frequency * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	27	44	71
		% within Marital Status	22.1%	28.8%	25.8%
	1.00	Count	47	64	111
		% within Marital Status	38.5%	41.8%	40.4%
	2.00	Count	32	25	57
		% within Marital Status	26.2%	16.3%	20.7%
	3.00	Count	12	16	28
		% within Marital Status	9.8%	10.5%	10.2%
	4.00	Count	1	4	5
		% within Marital Status	.8%	2.6%	1.8%
	5.00	Count	3	0	3
		% within Marital Status	2.5%	.0%	1.1%
Total	Count	122	153	275	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.532 ^a	5	.090
Likelihood Ratio	10.744	5	.057
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.292	1	.130
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.33.

Freshness Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	6	7	13
		% within Marital Status	4.9%	4.5%	4.7%
	Neutral	Count	1	6	7
		% within Marital Status	.8%	3.9%	2.5%
	Important	Count	116	141	257
		% within Marital Status	94.3%	91.6%	92.8%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.644 ^a	2	.267
Likelihood Ratio	2.999	2	.223
Linear-by-Linear Association	.200	1	.654
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.11.

Taste Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	8	7	15
		% within Marital Status	6.5%	4.5%	5.4%
	Neutral	Count	2	2	4
		% within Marital Status	1.6%	1.3%	1.4%
	Important	Count	113	145	258
		% within Marital Status	91.9%	94.2%	93.1%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.574 ^a	2	.751
Likelihood Ratio	.569	2	.752
Linear-by-Linear Association	.568	1	.451
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.78.

Safety Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	9	11	20
		% within Marital Status	7.4%	7.1%	7.3%
	Neutral	Count	10	13	23
		% within Marital Status	8.3%	8.4%	8.4%
	Important	Count	102	130	232
		% within Marital Status	84.3%	84.4%	84.4%
Total	Count	121	154	275	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.011 ^a	2	.995
Likelihood Ratio	.011	2	.995
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.952
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.80.

Price Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	16	13	29
		% within Marital Status	13.0%	8.4%	10.5%
	Neutral	Count	28	26	54
		% within Marital Status	22.8%	16.9%	19.5%
	Important	Count	79	115	194
		% within Marital Status	64.2%	74.7%	70.0%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.641 ^a	2	.162
Likelihood Ratio	3.628	2	.163
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.411	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.88.

Convenient Location Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	23	27	50
		% within Marital Status	18.7%	17.5%	18.1%
	Neutral	Count	26	42	68
		% within Marital Status	21.1%	27.3%	24.5%
	Important	Count	74	85	159
		% within Marital Status	60.2%	55.2%	57.4%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.394 ^a	2	.498
Likelihood Ratio	1.406	2	.495
Linear-by-Linear Association	.164	1	.685
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.20.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	21	16	37
		% within Marital Status	17.2%	10.5%	13.5%
	Neutral	Count	10	25	35
		% within Marital Status	8.2%	16.3%	12.7%
	Important	Count	91	112	203
		% within Marital Status	74.6%	73.2%	73.8%
Total	Count	122	153	275	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.857 ^a	2	.053
Likelihood Ratio	5.993	2	.050
Linear-by-Linear Association	.383	1	.536
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.53.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	21	24	45
		% within Marital Status	17.1%	15.7%	16.3%
	Neutral	Count	11	12	23
		% within Marital Status	8.9%	7.8%	8.3%
	Important	Count	91	117	208
		% within Marital Status	74.0%	76.5%	75.4%
Total	Count	123	153	276	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.235 ^a	2	.889
Likelihood Ratio	.235	2	.889
Linear-by-Linear Association	.180	1	.672
N of Valid Cases	276		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.25.

Locally Caught Factor * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	35	48	83
		% within Marital Status	28.7%	31.2%	30.1%
	Neutral	Count	15	34	49
		% within Marital Status	12.3%	22.1%	17.8%
	Important	Count	72	72	144
		% within Marital Status	59.0%	46.8%	52.2%
Total		Count	122	154	276
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.771 ^a	2	.056
Likelihood Ratio	5.890	2	.053
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.906	1	.167
N of Valid Cases	276		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.66.

Know Where Fish Was Caught * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	84	111	195
		% within Marital Status	68.3%	72.1%	70.4%
	Neutral	Count	14	17	31
		% within Marital Status	11.4%	11.0%	11.2%
	Know Everything	Count	25	26	51
		% within Marital Status	20.3%	16.9%	18.4%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.586 ^a	2	.746
Likelihood Ratio	.584	2	.747
Linear-by-Linear Association	.576	1	.448
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.77.

Know The Fish Handling Process * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count	83	114	197
		% within Marital Status	67.5%	75.0%	71.6%
	Neutral	Count	10	23	33
		% within Marital Status	8.1%	15.1%	12.0%
	Know Everything	Count	30	15	45
		% within Marital Status	24.4%	9.9%	16.4%
Total		Count	123	152	275
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.075 ^a	2	.002
Likelihood Ratio	12.194	2	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.729	1	.017
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.76.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	77	104	181
		% within Marital Status	62.6%	67.5%	65.3%
	Neutral	Count	16	23	39
		% within Marital Status	13.0%	14.9%	14.1%
	Know Everything	Count	30	27	57
		% within Marital Status	24.4%	17.5%	20.6%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.998 ^a	2	.368
Likelihood Ratio	1.987	2	.370
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.437	1	.231
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.32.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	22	30	52
		% within Marital Status	17.9%	19.5%	18.8%
	Neutral	Count	32	34	66
		% within Marital Status	26.0%	22.1%	23.8%
	Agree	Count	69	90	159
		% within Marital Status	56.1%	58.4%	57.4%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.603 ^a	2	.740
Likelihood Ratio	.601	2	.740
Linear-by-Linear Association	.006	1	.937
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.09.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	28	32	60
		% within Marital Status	22.8%	20.8%	21.7%
	Neutral	Count	36	43	79
		% within Marital Status	29.3%	27.9%	28.5%
	Agree	Count	59	79	138
		% within Marital Status	48.0%	51.3%	49.8%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.320 ^a	2	.852
Likelihood Ratio	.320	2	.852
Linear-by-Linear Association	.303	1	.582
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.64.

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	4	20	24
		% within Marital Status	3.3%	13.0%	8.7%
	Neutral	Count	16	20	36
		% within Marital Status	13.0%	13.0%	13.0%
	Agree	Count	103	114	217
		% within Marital Status	83.7%	74.0%	78.3%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.303 ^a	2	.016
Likelihood Ratio	9.171	2	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.702	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.66.

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	11	23	34
		% within Marital Status	8.9%	15.0%	12.3%
	Neutral	Count	19	30	49
		% within Marital Status	15.4%	19.6%	17.8%
	Agree	Count	93	100	193
		% within Marital Status	75.6%	65.4%	69.9%
Total	Count	123	153	276	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.742 ^a	2	.154
Likelihood Ratio	3.805	2	.149
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.697	1	.054
N of Valid Cases	276		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.15.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count	9	17	26
		% within Marital Status	7.4%	11.1%	9.5%
	Neutral	Count	12	19	31
		% within Marital Status	9.8%	12.4%	11.3%
	Agree	Count	101	117	218
		% within Marital Status	82.8%	76.5%	79.3%
Total	Count	122	153	275	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.744 ^a	2	.418
Likelihood Ratio	1.770	2	.413
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.709	1	.191
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.53.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	7	12	19
		% within Marital Status	5.7%	7.8%	6.9%
	Neutral	Count	6	11	17
		% within Marital Status	4.9%	7.1%	6.1%
	Agree	Count	110	131	241
		% within Marital Status	89.4%	85.1%	87.0%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.161 ^a	2	.559
Likelihood Ratio	1.180	2	.554
Linear-by-Linear Association	.962	1	.327
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.55.

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	19	30	49
		% within Marital Status	15.4%	19.5%	17.7%
	Neutral	Count	29	34	63
		% within Marital Status	23.6%	22.1%	22.7%
	Agree	Count	75	90	165
		% within Marital Status	61.0%	58.4%	59.6%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.770 ^a	2	.680
Likelihood Ratio	.777	2	.678
Linear-by-Linear Association	.492	1	.483
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.76.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	41	36	77
		% within Marital Status	33.3%	23.4%	27.8%
	Not Checked	Count	82	118	200
		% within Marital Status	66.7%	76.6%	72.2%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	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	3.378 ^b	1	.066		
Continuity Correction ^a	2.900	1	.089		
Likelihood Ratio	3.364	1	.067		
Fisher's Exact Test				.079	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.365	1	.067		
N of Valid Cases	277				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.19.

Find Brand Name On Internet * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	49	59	108
		% within Marital Status	39.8%	38.3%	39.0%
	Not Checked	Count	74	95	169
		% within Marital Status	60.2%	61.7%	61.0%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	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	.067 ^b	1	.796		
Continuity Correction ^a	.018	1	.893		
Likelihood Ratio	.067	1	.796		
Fisher's Exact Test				.805	.446
Linear-by-Linear Association	.067	1	.796		
N of Valid Cases	277				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 47.96.

Find Brand Name On TV * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	40	51	91
		% within Marital Status	32.5%	33.1%	32.9%
	Not Checked	Count	83	103	186
		% within Marital Status	67.5%	66.9%	67.1%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	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	.011 ^b	1	.916		
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.011	1	.916		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.510
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.916		
N of Valid Cases	277				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.41.

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	82	95	177
		% within Marital Status	66.7%	61.7%	63.9%
	Not Checked	Count	41	59	100
		% within Marital Status	33.3%	38.3%	36.1%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	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	.735 ^b	1	.391		
Continuity Correction ^a	.535	1	.465		
Likelihood Ratio	.737	1	.391		
Fisher's Exact Test				.450	.233
Linear-by-Linear Association	.732	1	.392		
N of Valid Cases	277				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.40.

Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	27	35	62
		% within Marital Status	22.0%	22.7%	22.4%
	Not Checked	Count	96	119	215
		% within Marital Status	78.0%	77.3%	77.6%
Total		Count	123	154	277
		% within Marital Status	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	.024 ^b	1	.878		
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	.993		
Likelihood Ratio	.024	1	.878		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.498
Linear-by-Linear Association	.024	1	.878		
N of Valid Cases	277				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.53.

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count	3	8	11
		% within Marital Status	2.5%	5.2%	4.0%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count	24	22	46
		% within Marital Status	19.7%	14.4%	16.7%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count	48	70	118
		% within Marital Status	39.3%	45.8%	42.9%
	More Than \$1.00	Count	47	53	100
		% within Marital Status	38.5%	34.6%	36.4%
Total		Count	122	153	275
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.370 ^a	3	.338
Likelihood Ratio	3.429	3	.330
Linear-by-Linear Association	.170	1	.680
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.88.

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count	22	27	49
		% within Marital Status	18.0%	18.5%	18.3%
	Neutral	Count	14	24	38
		% within Marital Status	11.5%	16.4%	14.2%
	Yes	Count	86	95	181
		% within Marital Status	70.5%	65.1%	67.5%
Total	Count	122	146	268	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.452 ^a	2	.484
Likelihood Ratio	1.469	2	.480
Linear-by-Linear Association	.372	1	.542
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.30.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	7	15	22
		% within Marital Status	5.7%	9.7%	7.9%
	Neutral	Count	20	35	55
		% within Marital Status	16.3%	22.7%	19.9%
	Would Trust It	Count	96	104	200
		% within Marital Status	78.0%	67.5%	72.2%
Total	Count	123	154	277	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.900 ^a	2	.142
Likelihood Ratio	3.964	2	.138
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.721	1	.054
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.77.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Marital Status

Crosstab

			Marital Status		Total
			Married	Not Married	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	7	18	25
		% within Marital Status	5.7%	11.8%	9.1%
	Neutral	Count	14	27	41
		% within Marital Status	11.4%	17.6%	14.9%
	Likely	Count	102	108	210
		% within Marital Status	82.9%	70.6%	76.1%
Total	Count	123	153	276	
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.943 ^a	2	.051
Likelihood Ratio	6.108	2	.047
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.727	1	.017
N of Valid Cases	276		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.14.

Appendix D4. Crosstabs with Education Completed

Fish Purchase Frequency * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	7	27	25	12	71
		% within Highest Education Completed	17.5%	33.3%	21.6%	29.3%	25.5%
	1.00	Count	19	30	50	14	113
		% within Highest Education Completed	47.5%	37.0%	43.1%	34.1%	40.6%
	2.00	Count	9	11	26	11	57
		% within Highest Education Completed	22.5%	13.6%	22.4%	26.8%	20.5%
	3.00	Count	5	11	12	1	29
		% within Highest Education Completed	12.5%	13.6%	10.3%	2.4%	10.4%
	4.00	Count	0	1	2	2	5
		% within Highest Education Completed	.0%	1.2%	1.7%	4.9%	1.8%
	5.00	Count	0	1	1	1	3
		% within Highest Education Completed	.0%	1.2%	.9%	2.4%	1.1%
Total		Count	40	81	116	41	278
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.859 ^a	15	.391
Likelihood Ratio	17.379	15	.297
Linear-by-Linear Association	.082	1	.775
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 10 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Freshness Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	1	3	4	5	13
		% within Highest Education Completed	2.5%	3.7%	3.4%	11.6%	4.6%
	Neutral	Count	0	2	4	1	7
		% within Highest Education Completed	.0%	2.5%	3.4%	2.3%	2.5%
	Important	Count	39	76	108	37	260
		% within Highest Education Completed	97.5%	93.8%	93.1%	86.0%	92.9%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.164 ^a	6	.306
Likelihood Ratio	6.906	6	.330
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.600	1	.058
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 7 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.00.

Taste Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	1	4	5	5	15
		% within Highest Education Completed	2.5%	4.9%	4.3%	11.6%	5.4%
	Neutral	Count	0	3	1	0	4
		% within Highest Education Completed	.0%	3.7%	.9%	.0%	1.4%
	Important	Count	39	74	110	38	261
		% within Highest Education Completed	97.5%	91.4%	94.8%	88.4%	93.2%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.660 ^a	6	.194
Likelihood Ratio	8.356	6	.213
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.731	1	.188
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 7 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .57.

Safety Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	2	9	6	3	20
		% within Highest Education Completed	5.1%	11.1%	5.2%	7.0%	7.2%
	Neutral	Count	1	10	8	4	23
		% within Highest Education Completed	2.6%	12.3%	7.0%	9.3%	8.3%
	Important	Count	36	62	101	36	235
		% within Highest Education Completed	92.3%	76.5%	87.8%	83.7%	84.5%
Total	Count	39	81	115	43	278	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.084 ^a	6	.313
Likelihood Ratio	7.308	6	.293
Linear-by-Linear Association	.040	1	.842
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.81.

Price Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	3	7	11	8	29
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.5%	8.6%	9.5%	18.6%	10.4%
	Neutral	Count	6	17	22	9	54
		% within Highest Education Completed	15.0%	21.0%	19.0%	20.9%	19.3%
	Important	Count	31	57	83	26	197
		% within Highest Education Completed	77.5%	70.4%	71.6%	60.5%	70.4%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.936 ^a	6	.552
Likelihood Ratio	4.488	6	.611
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.814	1	.093
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.14.

Convenient Location Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	7	14	21	8	50
		% within Highest Education Completed	17.5%	17.3%	18.1%	18.6%	17.9%
	Neutral	Count	6	20	25	17	68
		% within Highest Education Completed	15.0%	24.7%	21.6%	39.5%	24.3%
	Important	Count	27	47	70	18	162
		% within Highest Education Completed	67.5%	58.0%	60.3%	41.9%	57.9%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.604 ^a	6	.197
Likelihood Ratio	8.351	6	.214
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.778	1	.182
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.14.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	4	14	10	9	37
		% within Highest Education Completed	10.3%	17.3%	8.7%	20.9%	13.3%
	Neutral	Count	6	9	13	7	35
		% within Highest Education Completed	15.4%	11.1%	11.3%	16.3%	12.6%
	Important	Count	29	58	92	27	206
		% within Highest Education Completed	74.4%	71.6%	80.0%	62.8%	74.1%
Total	Count	39	81	115	43	278	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.299 ^a	6	.294
Likelihood Ratio	7.201	6	.303
Linear-by-Linear Association	.256	1	.613
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.91.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	5	11	18	11	45
		% within Highest Education Completed	12.8%	13.6%	15.5%	25.6%	16.1%
	Neutral	Count	3	5	9	6	23
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.7%	6.2%	7.8%	14.0%	8.2%
	Important	Count	31	65	89	26	211
		% within Highest Education Completed	79.5%	80.2%	76.7%	60.5%	75.6%
Total	Count	39	81	116	43	279	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.800 ^a	6	.340
Likelihood Ratio	6.313	6	.389
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.686	1	.055
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.22.

Locally Caught Factor * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	11	26	31	15	83
		% within Highest Education Completed	28.2%	32.1%	26.7%	34.9%	29.7%
	Neutral	Count	3	15	22	9	49
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.7%	18.5%	19.0%	20.9%	17.6%
	Important	Count	25	40	63	19	147
		% within Highest Education Completed	64.1%	49.4%	54.3%	44.2%	52.7%
Total	Count	39	81	116	43	279	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.313 ^a	6	.504
Likelihood Ratio	5.839	6	.442
Linear-by-Linear Association	.723	1	.395
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.85.

Know Where Fish Was Caught * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	26	59	84	27	196
		% within Highest Education Completed	65.0%	72.8%	72.4%	62.8%	70.0%
	Neutral	Count	5	9	14	4	32
		% within Highest Education Completed	12.5%	11.1%	12.1%	9.3%	11.4%
	Know Everything	Count	9	13	18	12	52
		% within Highest Education Completed	22.5%	16.0%	15.5%	27.9%	18.6%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.121 ^a	6	.660
Likelihood Ratio	3.899	6	.690
Linear-by-Linear Association	.127	1	.721
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.57.

Know The Fish Handling Process * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count	23	61	82	31	197
		% within Highest Education Completed	59.0%	75.3%	70.7%	73.8%	70.9%
	Neutral	Count	5	11	17	2	35
		% within Highest Education Completed	12.8%	13.6%	14.7%	4.8%	12.6%
	Know Everything	Count	11	9	17	9	46
		% within Highest Education Completed	28.2%	11.1%	14.7%	21.4%	16.5%
Total		Count	39	81	116	42	278
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.063 ^a	6	.170
Likelihood Ratio	9.311	6	.157
Linear-by-Linear Association	.683	1	.409
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.91.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	21	54	79	28	182
		% within Highest Education Completed	52.5%	66.7%	68.1%	65.1%	65.0%
	Neutral	Count	5	15	18	2	40
		% within Highest Education Completed	12.5%	18.5%	15.5%	4.7%	14.3%
	Know Everything	Count	14	12	19	13	58
		% within Highest Education Completed	35.0%	14.8%	16.4%	30.2%	20.7%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.425 ^a	6	.037
Likelihood Ratio	13.722	6	.033
Linear-by-Linear Association	.815	1	.367
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.71.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	4	21	20	7	52
		% within Highest Education Completed	10.3%	25.9%	17.2%	16.3%	18.6%
	Neutral	Count	5	21	30	10	66
		% within Highest Education Completed	12.8%	25.9%	25.9%	23.3%	23.7%
	Agree	Count	30	39	66	26	161
		% within Highest Education Completed	76.9%	48.1%	56.9%	60.5%	57.7%
Total	Count	39	81	116	43	279	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.230 ^a	6	.115
Likelihood Ratio	10.491	6	.105
Linear-by-Linear Association	.227	1	.634
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.27.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	7	24	23	6	60
		% within Highest Education Completed	17.5%	29.6%	19.8%	14.0%	21.4%
	Neutral	Count	12	23	35	9	79
		% within Highest Education Completed	30.0%	28.4%	30.2%	20.9%	28.2%
	Agree	Count	21	34	58	28	141
		% within Highest Education Completed	52.5%	42.0%	50.0%	65.1%	50.4%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.132 ^a	6	.229
Likelihood Ratio	8.026	6	.236
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.206	1	.137
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.57.

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	2	11	7	4	24
		% within Highest Education Completed	5.0%	13.6%	6.0%	9.3%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	6	10	14	6	36
		% within Highest Education Completed	15.0%	12.3%	12.1%	14.0%	12.9%
	Agree	Count	32	60	95	33	220
		% within Highest Education Completed	80.0%	74.1%	81.9%	76.7%	78.6%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.520 ^a	6	.607
Likelihood Ratio	4.360	6	.628
Linear-by-Linear Association	.075	1	.784
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.43.

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	4	14	8	8	34
		% within Highest Education Completed	10.0%	17.3%	7.0%	18.6%	12.2%
	Neutral	Count	6	13	22	8	49
		% within Highest Education Completed	15.0%	16.0%	19.1%	18.6%	17.6%
	Agree	Count	30	54	85	27	196
		% within Highest Education Completed	75.0%	66.7%	73.9%	62.8%	70.3%
Total	Count	40	81	115	43	279	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.198 ^a	6	.303
Likelihood Ratio	7.296	6	.294
Linear-by-Linear Association	.176	1	.675
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.87.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count	7	7	9	3	26
		% within Highest Education Completed	17.5%	8.6%	7.9%	7.0%	9.4%
	Neutral	Count	6	15	10	0	31
		% within Highest Education Completed	15.0%	18.5%	8.8%	.0%	11.2%
	Agree	Count	27	59	95	40	221
		% within Highest Education Completed	67.5%	72.8%	83.3%	93.0%	79.5%
Total	Count	40	81	114	43	278	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.626 ^a	6	.016
Likelihood Ratio	19.207	6	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.285	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.74.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	3	6	7	3	19
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.5%	7.4%	6.0%	7.0%	6.8%
	Neutral	Count	3	8	6	0	17
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.5%	9.9%	5.2%	.0%	6.1%
	Agree	Count	34	67	103	40	244
		% within Highest Education Completed	85.0%	82.7%	88.8%	93.0%	87.1%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.416 ^a	6	.492
Likelihood Ratio	7.716	6	.260
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.127	1	.288
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.43.

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	7	14	22	7	50
		% within Highest Education Completed	17.5%	17.3%	19.0%	16.3%	17.9%
	Neutral	Count	7	24	22	10	63
		% within Highest Education Completed	17.5%	29.6%	19.0%	23.3%	22.5%
	Agree	Count	26	43	72	26	167
		% within Highest Education Completed	65.0%	53.1%	62.1%	60.5%	59.6%
Total	Count	40	81	116	43	280	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.983 ^a	6	.679
Likelihood Ratio	3.905	6	.690
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.912
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.14.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	10	17	38	14	79
		% within Highest Education Completed	25.0%	21.0%	32.8%	32.6%	28.2%
	Not Checked	Count	30	64	78	29	201
		% within Highest Education Completed	75.0%	79.0%	67.2%	67.4%	71.8%
Total		Count	40	81	116	43	280
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.876 ^a	3	.275
Likelihood Ratio	3.963	3	.265
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.225	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.29.

Find Brand Name On Internet * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	10	31	52	15	108
		% within Highest Education Completed	25.0%	38.3%	44.8%	34.9%	38.6%
	Not Checked	Count	30	50	64	28	172
		% within Highest Education Completed	75.0%	61.7%	55.2%	65.1%	61.4%
Total		Count	40	81	116	43	280
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.275 ^a	3	.153
Likelihood Ratio	5.441	3	.142
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.625	1	.202
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.43.

Find Brand Name On TV * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	16	18	42	16	92
		% within Highest Education Completed	40.0%	22.2%	36.2%	37.2%	32.9%
	Not Checked	Count	24	63	74	27	188
		% within Highest Education Completed	60.0%	77.8%	63.8%	62.8%	67.1%
Total		Count	40	81	116	43	280
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.037 ^a	3	.110
Likelihood Ratio	6.285	3	.099
Linear-by-Linear Association	.439	1	.508
N of Valid Cases	280		

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

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	24	53	76	27	180
		% within Highest Education Completed	60.0%	65.4%	65.5%	62.8%	64.3%
	Not Checked	Count	16	28	40	16	100
		% within Highest Education Completed	40.0%	34.6%	34.5%	37.2%	35.7%
Total		Count	40	81	116	43	280
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.485 ^a	3	.922
Likelihood Ratio	.480	3	.923
Linear-by-Linear Association	.064	1	.800
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.29.

Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	10	20	25	7	62
		% within Highest Education Completed	25.0%	24.7%	21.6%	16.3%	22.1%
	Not Checked	Count	30	61	91	36	218
		% within Highest Education Completed	75.0%	75.3%	78.4%	83.7%	77.9%
Total		Count	40	81	116	43	280
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.376 ^a	3	.711
Likelihood Ratio	1.426	3	.699
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.165	1	.280
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.86.

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count	2	5	4	0	11
		% within Highest Education Completed	5.1%	6.2%	3.5%	.0%	4.0%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count	12	14	18	2	46
		% within Highest Education Completed	30.8%	17.3%	15.7%	4.8%	16.6%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count	12	41	50	16	119
		% within Highest Education Completed	30.8%	50.6%	43.5%	38.1%	43.0%
	More Than \$1.00	Count	13	21	43	24	101
		% within Highest Education Completed	33.3%	25.9%	37.4%	57.1%	36.5%
Total		Count	39	81	115	42	277
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.421 ^a	9	.011
Likelihood Ratio	23.033	9	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.978	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	277		

a. 4 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.55.

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count	13	20	17	1	51
		% within Highest Education Completed	32.5%	26.3%	15.0%	2.4%	18.8%
	Neutral	Count	3	16	15	4	38
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.5%	21.1%	13.3%	9.5%	14.0%
	Yes	Count	24	40	81	37	182
		% within Highest Education Completed	60.0%	52.6%	71.7%	88.1%	67.2%
Total		Count	40	76	113	42	271
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.456 ^a	6	.001
Likelihood Ratio	26.111	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.681	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.61.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	3	11	8	0	22
		% within Highest Education Completed	7.5%	13.6%	6.9%	.0%	7.9%
	Neutral	Count	8	22	19	7	56
		% within Highest Education Completed	20.0%	27.2%	16.4%	16.3%	20.0%
	Would Trust It	Count	29	48	89	36	202
		% within Highest Education Completed	72.5%	59.3%	76.7%	83.7%	72.1%
Total		Count	40	81	116	43	280
		% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.033 ^a	6	.043
Likelihood Ratio	15.743	6	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.746	1	.017
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.14.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Highest Education Completed

Crosstab

			Highest Education Completed				Total
			High School Or Less	1-3 Years College	4 Years College	Graduate School	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	4	8	11	2	25
		% within Highest Education Completed	10.0%	9.9%	9.6%	4.7%	9.0%
	Neutral	Count	9	20	10	3	42
		% within Highest Education Completed	22.5%	24.7%	8.7%	7.0%	15.1%
	Likely	Count	27	53	94	38	212
		% within Highest Education Completed	67.5%	65.4%	81.7%	88.4%	76.0%
Total	Count	40	81	115	43	279	
	% within Highest Education Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.420 ^a	6	.017
Likelihood Ratio	15.639	6	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.172	1	.013
N of Valid Cases	279		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.58.

Appendix D5. Crosstabs with Household Income

Fish Purchase Frequency * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	20	17	14	13	64
		% within Household Income	21.5%	24.6%	25.5%	25.0%	23.8%
	1.00	Count	43	29	24	17	113
		% within Household Income	46.2%	42.0%	43.6%	32.7%	42.0%
	2.00	Count	16	14	9	16	55
		% within Household Income	17.2%	20.3%	16.4%	30.8%	20.4%
	3.00	Count	11	7	8	3	29
		% within Household Income	11.8%	10.1%	14.5%	5.8%	10.8%
	4.00	Count	1	2	0	2	5
		% within Household Income	1.1%	2.9%	.0%	3.8%	1.9%
	5.00	Count	2	0	0	1	3
		% within Household Income	2.2%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	1.1%
Total	Count	93	69	55	52	269	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.935 ^a	15	.607
Likelihood Ratio	14.775	15	.468
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.945
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 8 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .58.

Freshness Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	5	1	3	3	12
		% within Household Income	5.3%	1.4%	5.5%	5.7%	4.4%
	Neutral	Count	2	3	0	1	6
		% within Household Income	2.1%	4.3%	.0%	1.9%	2.2%
	Important	Count	87	65	52	49	253
		% within Household Income	92.6%	94.2%	94.5%	92.5%	93.4%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.554 ^a	6	.602
Likelihood Ratio	5.919	6	.432
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.942
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.17.

Taste Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	5	2	3	5	15
		% within Household Income	5.3%	2.9%	5.5%	9.4%	5.5%
	Neutral	Count	2	2	0	0	4
		% within Household Income	2.1%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
	Important	Count	87	65	52	48	252
		% within Household Income	92.6%	94.2%	94.5%	90.6%	93.0%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.202 ^a	6	.518
Likelihood Ratio	6.482	6	.371
Linear-by-Linear Association	.411	1	.522
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 7 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .78.

Safety Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	8	2	5	5	20
		% within Household Income	8.6%	2.9%	9.1%	9.6%	7.4%
	Neutral	Count	8	4	7	3	22
		% within Household Income	8.6%	5.8%	12.7%	5.8%	8.2%
	Important	Count	77	63	43	44	227
		% within Household Income	82.8%	91.3%	78.2%	84.6%	84.4%
Total	Count	93	69	55	52	269	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.545 ^a	6	.476
Likelihood Ratio	5.967	6	.427
Linear-by-Linear Association	.129	1	.719
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.87.

Price Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	7	6	7	9	29
		% within Household Income	7.4%	8.7%	12.7%	17.0%	10.7%
	Neutral	Count	21	7	10	12	50
		% within Household Income	22.3%	10.1%	18.2%	22.6%	18.5%
	Important	Count	66	56	38	32	192
		% within Household Income	70.2%	81.2%	69.1%	60.4%	70.8%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.096 ^a	6	.168
Likelihood Ratio	9.337	6	.155
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.170	1	.075
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.67.

Convenient Location Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	14	15	10	10	49
		% within Household Income	14.9%	21.7%	18.2%	18.9%	18.1%
	Neutral	Count	22	11	11	19	63
		% within Household Income	23.4%	15.9%	20.0%	35.8%	23.2%
	Important	Count	58	43	34	24	159
		% within Household Income	61.7%	62.3%	61.8%	45.3%	58.7%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.528 ^a	6	.202
Likelihood Ratio	8.354	6	.213
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.768	1	.184
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.58.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	14	7	6	8	35
		% within Household Income	15.1%	10.1%	11.1%	15.1%	13.0%
	Neutral	Count	13	4	6	10	33
		% within Household Income	14.0%	5.8%	11.1%	18.9%	12.3%
	Important	Count	66	58	42	35	201
		% within Household Income	71.0%	84.1%	77.8%	66.0%	74.7%
Total	Count	93	69	54	53	269	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.161 ^a	6	.306
Likelihood Ratio	7.476	6	.279
Linear-by-Linear Association	.066	1	.798
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.50.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	15	7	10	13	45
		% within Household Income	16.1%	10.1%	18.2%	24.5%	16.7%
	Neutral	Count	3	8	4	5	20
		% within Household Income	3.2%	11.6%	7.3%	9.4%	7.4%
	Important	Count	75	54	41	35	205
		% within Household Income	80.6%	78.3%	74.5%	66.0%	75.9%
Total	Count	93	69	55	53	270	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.960 ^a	6	.176
Likelihood Ratio	9.350	6	.155
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.235	1	.072
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.93.

Locally Caught Factor * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	25	19	19	16	79
		% within Household Income	26.9%	27.5%	34.5%	30.2%	29.3%
	Neutral	Count	16	15	10	5	46
		% within Household Income	17.2%	21.7%	18.2%	9.4%	17.0%
	Important	Count	52	35	26	32	145
		% within Household Income	55.9%	50.7%	47.3%	60.4%	53.7%
Total	Count	93	69	55	53	270	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.590 ^a	6	.597
Likelihood Ratio	4.846	6	.564
Linear-by-Linear Association	.081	1	.776
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.03.

Know Where Fish Was Caught * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	67	49	39	34	189
		% within Household Income	71.3%	71.0%	70.9%	64.2%	69.7%
	Neutral	Count	9	9	5	7	30
		% within Household Income	9.6%	13.0%	9.1%	13.2%	11.1%
	Know Everything	Count	18	11	11	12	52
		% within Household Income	19.1%	15.9%	20.0%	22.6%	19.2%
Total	Count	94	69	55	53	271	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.869 ^a	6	.931
Likelihood Ratio	1.876	6	.931
Linear-by-Linear Association	.539	1	.463
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.87.

Know The Fish Handling Process * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count	68	48	36	38	190
		% within Household Income	73.9%	69.6%	65.5%	71.7%	70.6%
	Neutral	Count	13	12	5	3	33
		% within Household Income	14.1%	17.4%	9.1%	5.7%	12.3%
	Know Everything	Count	11	9	14	12	46
		% within Household Income	12.0%	13.0%	25.5%	22.6%	17.1%
Total	Count	92	69	55	53	269	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.728 ^a	6	.137
Likelihood Ratio	9.914	6	.128
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.964	1	.161
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.50.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	62	49	34	33	178
		% within Household Income	66.0%	71.0%	61.8%	62.3%	65.7%
	Neutral	Count	13	6	11	7	37
		% within Household Income	13.8%	8.7%	20.0%	13.2%	13.7%
	Know Everything	Count	19	14	10	13	56
		% within Household Income	20.2%	20.3%	18.2%	24.5%	20.7%
Total	Count	94	69	55	53	271	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.955 ^a	6	.683
Likelihood Ratio	3.916	6	.688
Linear-by-Linear Association	.367	1	.544
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.24.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	23	11	10	7	51
		% within Household Income	24.5%	16.2%	18.2%	13.2%	18.9%
	Neutral	Count	17	15	16	15	63
		% within Household Income	18.1%	22.1%	29.1%	28.3%	23.3%
	Agree	Count	54	42	29	31	156
		% within Household Income	57.4%	61.8%	52.7%	58.5%	57.8%
Total	Count	94	68	55	53	270	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.670 ^a	6	.461
Likelihood Ratio	5.662	6	.462
Linear-by-Linear Association	.465	1	.495
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.01.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	22	14	13	8	57
		% within Household Income	23.4%	20.3%	23.6%	15.1%	21.0%
	Neutral	Count	24	23	15	14	76
		% within Household Income	25.5%	33.3%	27.3%	26.4%	28.0%
	Agree	Count	48	32	27	31	138
		% within Household Income	51.1%	46.4%	49.1%	58.5%	50.9%
Total	Count	94	69	55	53	271	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.210 ^a	6	.782
Likelihood Ratio	3.242	6	.778
Linear-by-Linear Association	.896	1	.344
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.15.

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	10	4	6	2	22
		% within Household Income	10.6%	5.8%	10.9%	3.8%	8.1%
	Neutral	Count	17	6	5	7	35
		% within Household Income	18.1%	8.7%	9.1%	13.2%	12.9%
	Agree	Count	67	59	44	44	214
		% within Household Income	71.3%	85.5%	80.0%	83.0%	79.0%
Total	Count	94	69	55	53	271	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.672 ^a	6	.263
Likelihood Ratio	7.906	6	.245
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.410	1	.121
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.30.

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	11	8	8	4	31
		% within Household Income	11.7%	11.8%	14.5%	7.5%	11.5%
	Neutral	Count	18	9	11	8	46
		% within Household Income	19.1%	13.2%	20.0%	15.1%	17.0%
	Agree	Count	65	51	36	41	193
		% within Household Income	69.1%	75.0%	65.5%	77.4%	71.5%
Total		Count	94	68	55	53	270
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.122 ^a	6	.793
Likelihood Ratio	3.214	6	.782
Linear-by-Linear Association	.375	1	.540
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.09.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count	9	7	6	1	23
		% within Household Income	9.6%	10.1%	11.1%	1.9%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	14	4	8	5	31
		% within Household Income	14.9%	5.8%	14.8%	9.6%	11.5%
	Agree	Count	71	58	40	46	215
		% within Household Income	75.5%	84.1%	74.1%	88.5%	79.9%
Total	Count	94	69	54	52	269	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.047 ^a	6	.235
Likelihood Ratio	9.555	6	.145
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.075	1	.150
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.45.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	8	5	4	1	18
		% within Household Income	8.5%	7.2%	7.3%	1.9%	6.6%
	Neutral	Count	6	6	5	0	17
		% within Household Income	6.4%	8.7%	9.1%	.0%	6.3%
	Agree	Count	80	58	46	52	236
		% within Household Income	85.1%	84.1%	83.6%	98.1%	87.1%
Total	Count	94	69	55	53	271	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.968 ^a	6	.240
Likelihood Ratio	11.786	6	.067
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.267	1	.071
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.32.

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	19	7	13	9	48
		% within Household Income	20.2%	10.1%	23.6%	17.0%	17.7%
	Neutral	Count	16	15	16	14	61
		% within Household Income	17.0%	21.7%	29.1%	26.4%	22.5%
	Agree	Count	59	47	26	30	162
		% within Household Income	62.8%	68.1%	47.3%	56.6%	59.8%
Total	Count	94	69	55	53	271	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.833 ^a	6	.183
Likelihood Ratio	9.209	6	.162
Linear-by-Linear Association	.841	1	.359
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.39.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	22	19	18	18	77
		% within Household Income	23.4%	27.5%	32.7%	34.0%	28.4%
	Not Checked	Count	72	50	37	35	194
		% within Household Income	76.6%	72.5%	67.3%	66.0%	71.6%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.491 ^a	3	.477
Likelihood Ratio	2.496	3	.476
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.390	1	.122
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.06.

Find Brand Name On Internet * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	33	27	20	27	107
		% within Household Income	35.1%	39.1%	36.4%	50.9%	39.5%
	Not Checked	Count	61	42	35	26	164
		% within Household Income	64.9%	60.9%	63.6%	49.1%	60.5%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.894 ^a	3	.273
Likelihood Ratio	3.839	3	.279
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.561	1	.109
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.93.

Find Brand Name On TV * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	27	19	22	22	90
		% within Household Income	28.7%	27.5%	40.0%	41.5%	33.2%
	Not Checked	Count	67	50	33	31	181
		% within Household Income	71.3%	72.5%	60.0%	58.5%	66.8%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.644 ^a	3	.200
Likelihood Ratio	4.606	3	.203
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.658	1	.056
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.60.

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	59	43	39	34	175
		% within Household Income	62.8%	62.3%	70.9%	64.2%	64.6%
	Not Checked	Count	35	26	16	19	96
		% within Household Income	37.2%	37.7%	29.1%	35.8%	35.4%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.257 ^a	3	.739
Likelihood Ratio	1.285	3	.733
Linear-by-Linear Association	.283	1	.594
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.77.

Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	25	16	9	10	60
		% within Household Income	26.6%	23.2%	16.4%	18.9%	22.1%
	Not Checked	Count	69	53	46	43	211
		% within Household Income	73.4%	76.8%	83.6%	81.1%	77.9%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.520 ^a	3	.472
Likelihood Ratio	2.563	3	.464
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.970	1	.160
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.73.

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count	8	0	2	1	11
		% within Household Income	8.5%	.0%	3.8%	1.9%	4.1%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count	12	12	17	4	45
		% within Household Income	12.8%	17.6%	32.1%	7.5%	16.8%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count	47	33	15	20	115
		% within Household Income	50.0%	48.5%	28.3%	37.7%	42.9%
	More Than \$1.00	Count	27	23	19	28	97
		% within Household Income	28.7%	33.8%	35.8%	52.8%	36.2%
Total		Count	94	68	53	53	268
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.072 ^a	9	.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.086	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.435	1	.020
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 4 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.18.

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count	19	18	5	8	50
		% within Household Income	20.9%	28.1%	9.3%	15.1%	19.1%
	Neutral	Count	14	8	10	5	37
		% within Household Income	15.4%	12.5%	18.5%	9.4%	14.1%
	Yes	Count	58	38	39	40	175
		% within Household Income	63.7%	59.4%	72.2%	75.5%	66.8%
Total	Count	91	64	54	53	262	
	% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.345 ^a	6	.155
Likelihood Ratio	9.707	6	.138
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.168	1	.075
N of Valid Cases	262		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.48.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	9	8	1	2	20
		% within Household Income	9.6%	11.6%	1.8%	3.8%	7.4%
	Neutral	Count	20	20	12	3	55
		% within Household Income	21.3%	29.0%	21.8%	5.7%	20.3%
	Would Trust It	Count	65	41	42	48	196
		% within Household Income	69.1%	59.4%	76.4%	90.6%	72.3%
Total		Count	94	69	55	53	271
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.064 ^a	6	.006
Likelihood Ratio	20.852	6	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.644	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	271		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.91.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Household Income

Crosstab

			Household Income				Total
			Less Than \$40K	\$40K - \$59K	\$60K - \$80K	Over \$80K	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	13	7	2	2	24
		% within Household Income	13.8%	10.1%	3.7%	3.8%	8.9%
	Neutral	Count	16	14	7	3	40
		% within Household Income	17.0%	20.3%	13.0%	5.7%	14.8%
	Likely	Count	65	48	45	48	206
		% within Household Income	69.1%	69.6%	83.3%	90.6%	76.3%
Total		Count	94	69	54	53	270
		% within Household Income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.530 ^a	6	.035
Likelihood Ratio	14.767	6	.022
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.811	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.71.

Appendix D6. Crosstabs with Towns of Different Median Family Incomes

Fish Purchase Frequency * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	14	26	28	68
		% within Median Family Incomes	29.8%	21.8%	27.5%	25.4%
	1.00	Count	21	51	39	111
		% within Median Family Incomes	44.7%	42.9%	38.2%	41.4%
	2.00	Count	8	25	22	55
		% within Median Family Incomes	17.0%	21.0%	21.6%	20.5%
	3.00	Count	4	14	9	27
		% within Median Family Incomes	8.5%	11.8%	8.8%	10.1%
	4.00	Count	0	2	2	4
		% within Median Family Incomes	.0%	1.7%	2.0%	1.5%
	5.00	Count	0	1	2	3
		% within Median Family Incomes	.0%	.8%	2.0%	1.1%
Total		Count	47	119	102	268
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.639 ^a	10	.914
Likelihood Ratio	5.761	10	.835
Linear-by-Linear Association	.736	1	.391
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 7 cells (38.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .53.

Freshness Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	1	5	7	13
		% within Median Family Incomes	2.1%	4.2%	6.8%	4.8%
	Neutral	Count	0	4	3	7
		% within Median Family Incomes	.0%	3.4%	2.9%	2.6%
	Important	Count	47	110	93	250
		% within Median Family Incomes	97.9%	92.4%	90.3%	92.6%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.439 ^a	4	.487
Likelihood Ratio	4.767	4	.312
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.399	1	.121
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.24.

Taste Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	1	5	9	15
		% within Median Family Incomes	2.1%	4.2%	8.7%	5.6%
	Neutral	Count	1	1	2	4
		% within Median Family Incomes	2.1%	.8%	1.9%	1.5%
	Important	Count	46	113	92	251
		% within Median Family Incomes	95.8%	95.0%	89.3%	93.0%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.147 ^a	4	.386
Likelihood Ratio	4.269	4	.371
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.270	1	.071
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .71.

Safety Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	5	7	8	20
		% within Median Family Incomes	10.4%	5.9%	7.9%	7.5%
	Neutral	Count	1	13	9	23
		% within Median Family Incomes	2.1%	10.9%	8.9%	8.6%
	Important	Count	42	99	84	225
		% within Median Family Incomes	87.5%	83.2%	83.2%	84.0%
Total	Count	48	119	101	268	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.211 ^a	4	.378
Likelihood Ratio	5.163	4	.271
Linear-by-Linear Association	.052	1	.820
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.58.

Price Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	3	13	13	29
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	10.9%	12.6%	10.7%
	Neutral	Count	9	23	21	53
		% within Median Family Incomes	18.8%	19.3%	20.4%	19.6%
	Important	Count	36	83	69	188
		% within Median Family Incomes	75.0%	69.7%	67.0%	69.6%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.601 ^a	4	.809
Likelihood Ratio	1.740	4	.783
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.375	1	.241
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.16.

Convenient Location Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	4	23	23	50
		% within Median Family Incomes	8.3%	19.3%	22.3%	18.5%
	Neutral	Count	14	20	31	65
		% within Median Family Incomes	29.2%	16.8%	30.1%	24.1%
	Important	Count	30	76	49	155
		% within Median Family Incomes	62.5%	63.9%	47.6%	57.4%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.036 ^a	4	.026
Likelihood Ratio	11.920	4	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.362	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.89.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	4	15	18	37
		% within Median Family Incomes	8.3%	12.7%	17.6%	13.8%
	Neutral	Count	4	11	19	34
		% within Median Family Incomes	8.3%	9.3%	18.6%	12.7%
	Important	Count	40	92	65	197
		% within Median Family Incomes	83.3%	78.0%	63.7%	73.5%
Total		Count	48	118	102	268
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.119 ^a	4	.058
Likelihood Ratio	9.083	4	.059
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.252	1	.012
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.09.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	6	22	16	44
		% within Median Family Incomes	12.5%	18.5%	15.7%	16.4%
	Neutral	Count	2	8	13	23
		% within Median Family Incomes	4.2%	6.7%	12.7%	8.6%
	Important	Count	40	89	73	202
		% within Median Family Incomes	83.3%	74.8%	71.6%	75.1%
Total		Count	48	119	102	269
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.042 ^a	4	.283
Likelihood Ratio	5.069	4	.280
Linear-by-Linear Association	.955	1	.328
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.10.

Locally Caught Factor * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	14	35	32	81
		% within Median Family Incomes	29.2%	29.4%	31.4%	30.1%
	Neutral	Count	11	19	18	48
		% within Median Family Incomes	22.9%	16.0%	17.6%	17.8%
	Important	Count	23	65	52	140
		% within Median Family Incomes	47.9%	54.6%	51.0%	52.0%
Total	Count	48	119	102	269	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.348 ^a	4	.853
Likelihood Ratio	1.301	4	.861
Linear-by-Linear Association	.007	1	.935
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.57.

Know Where Fish Was Caught * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	33	89	66	188
		% within Median Family Incomes	68.8%	74.8%	64.1%	69.6%
	Neutral	Count	3	7	20	30
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	5.9%	19.4%	11.1%
	Know Everything	Count	12	23	17	52
		% within Median Family Incomes	25.0%	19.3%	16.5%	19.3%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.489 ^a	4	.014
Likelihood Ratio	12.068	4	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.975
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.33.

Know The Fish Handling Process * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count	31	85	74	190
		% within Median Family Incomes	66.0%	71.4%	72.5%	70.9%
	Neutral	Count	7	7	18	32
		% within Median Family Incomes	14.9%	5.9%	17.6%	11.9%
	Know Everything	Count	9	27	10	46
		% within Median Family Incomes	19.1%	22.7%	9.8%	17.2%
Total		Count	47	119	102	268
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.432 ^a	4	.014
Likelihood Ratio	13.293	4	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.894	1	.169
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.61.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	26	84	67	177
		% within Median Family Incomes	54.2%	70.6%	65.0%	65.6%
	Neutral	Count	4	17	16	37
		% within Median Family Incomes	8.3%	14.3%	15.5%	13.7%
	Know Everything	Count	18	18	20	56
		% within Median Family Incomes	37.5%	15.1%	19.4%	20.7%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.101 ^a	4	.025
Likelihood Ratio	10.228	4	.037
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.217	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.58.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	7	25	20	52
		% within Median Family Incomes	14.9%	21.0%	19.4%	19.3%
	Neutral	Count	12	34	18	64
		% within Median Family Incomes	25.5%	28.6%	17.5%	23.8%
	Agree	Count	28	60	65	153
		% within Median Family Incomes	59.6%	50.4%	63.1%	56.9%
Total		Count	47	119	103	269
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.217 ^a	4	.266
Likelihood Ratio	5.370	4	.251
Linear-by-Linear Association	.103	1	.749
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.09.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count % within Median Family Incomes	13 27.1%	26 21.8%	21 20.4%	60 22.2%
	Neutral	Count % within Median Family Incomes	13 27.1%	39 32.8%	24 23.3%	76 28.1%
	Agree	Count % within Median Family Incomes	22 45.8%	54 45.4%	58 56.3%	134 49.6%
Total	Count % within Median Family Incomes	48 100.0%	119 100.0%	103 100.0%	270 100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.956 ^a	4	.412
Likelihood Ratio	3.913	4	.418
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.851	1	.174
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.67.

Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	2	11	11	24
		% within Median Family Incomes	4.2%	9.2%	10.7%	8.9%
	Neutral	Count	4	19	13	36
		% within Median Family Incomes	8.3%	16.0%	12.6%	13.3%
	Agree	Count	42	89	79	210
		% within Median Family Incomes	87.5%	74.8%	76.7%	77.8%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.886 ^a	4	.422
Likelihood Ratio	4.244	4	.374
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.777	1	.182
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.27.

Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	3	15	16	34
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	12.7%	15.5%	12.6%
	Neutral	Count	8	21	19	48
		% within Median Family Incomes	16.7%	17.8%	18.4%	17.8%
	Agree	Count	37	82	68	187
		% within Median Family Incomes	77.1%	69.5%	66.0%	69.5%
Total	Count	48	118	103	269	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.869 ^a	4	.580
Likelihood Ratio	3.170	4	.530
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.525	1	.112
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.07.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count % within Median Family Incomes	3 6.3%	11 9.4%	11 10.7%	25 9.3%
	Neutral	Count % within Median Family Incomes	5 10.4%	14 12.0%	12 11.7%	31 11.6%
	Agree	Count % within Median Family Incomes	40 83.3%	92 78.6%	80 77.7%	212 79.1%
Total	Count % within Median Family Incomes	48 100.0%	117 100.0%	103 100.0%	268 100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.900 ^a	4	.925
Likelihood Ratio	.956	4	.916
Linear-by-Linear Association	.730	1	.393
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.48.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	3	6	9	18
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	5.0%	8.7%	6.7%
	Neutral	Count	3	5	9	17
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	4.2%	8.7%	6.3%
	Agree	Count	42	108	85	235
		% within Median Family Incomes	87.5%	90.8%	82.5%	87.0%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.382 ^a	4	.496
Likelihood Ratio	3.373	4	.497
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.270	1	.260
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.02.

Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	7	21	22	50
		% within Median Family Incomes	14.6%	17.6%	21.4%	18.5%
	Neutral	Count	12	26	23	61
		% within Median Family Incomes	25.0%	21.8%	22.3%	22.6%
	Agree	Count	29	72	58	159
		% within Median Family Incomes	60.4%	60.5%	56.3%	58.9%
Total	Count	48	119	103	270	
	% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.242 ^a	4	.871
Likelihood Ratio	1.251	4	.870
Linear-by-Linear Association	.785	1	.376
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.89.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	18	39	20	77
		% within Median Family Incomes	37.5%	32.8%	19.4%	28.5%
	Not Checked	Count	30	80	83	193
		% within Median Family Incomes	62.5%	67.2%	80.6%	71.5%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.141 ^a	2	.028
Likelihood Ratio	7.347	2	.025
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.547	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.69.

Find Brand Name On Internet * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	14	47	40	101
		% within Median Family Incomes	29.2%	39.5%	38.8%	37.4%
	Not Checked	Count	34	72	63	169
		% within Median Family Incomes	70.8%	60.5%	61.2%	62.6%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.703 ^a	2	.427
Likelihood Ratio	1.752	2	.416
Linear-by-Linear Association	.896	1	.344
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.96.

Find Brand Name On TV * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	15	43	29	87
		% within Median Family Incomes	31.3%	36.1%	28.2%	32.2%
	Not Checked	Count	33	76	74	183
		% within Median Family Incomes	68.8%	63.9%	71.8%	67.8%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.635 ^a	2	.442
Likelihood Ratio	1.638	2	.441
Linear-by-Linear Association	.452	1	.501
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.47.

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	33	82	60	175
		% within Median Family Incomes	68.8%	68.9%	58.3%	64.8%
	Not Checked	Count	15	37	43	95
		% within Median Family Incomes	31.3%	31.1%	41.7%	35.2%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.145 ^a	2	.208
Likelihood Ratio	3.121	2	.210
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.337	1	.126
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.89.

Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	10	22	28	60
		% within Median Family Incomes	20.8%	18.5%	27.2%	22.2%
	Not Checked	Count	38	97	75	210
		% within Median Family Incomes	79.2%	81.5%	72.8%	77.8%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.481 ^a	2	.289
Likelihood Ratio	2.455	2	.293
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.376	1	.241
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.67.

How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count	2	4	5	11
		% within Median Family Incomes	4.3%	3.4%	4.9%	4.1%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count	6	23	15	44
		% within Median Family Incomes	12.8%	19.7%	14.6%	16.5%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count	21	50	41	112
		% within Median Family Incomes	44.7%	42.7%	39.8%	41.9%
	More Than \$1.00	Count	18	40	42	100
		% within Median Family Incomes	38.3%	34.2%	40.8%	37.5%
Total		Count	47	117	103	267
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.476 ^a	6	.871
Likelihood Ratio	2.480	6	.871
Linear-by-Linear Association	.037	1	.848
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.94.

Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count % within Median Family Incomes	10 20.8%	18 15.1%	22 21.4%	50 18.5%
	Neutral	Count % within Median Family Incomes	3 6.3%	21 17.6%	14 13.6%	38 14.1%
	Yes	Count % within Median Family Incomes	35 72.9%	80 67.2%	67 65.0%	182 67.4%
Total	Count % within Median Family Incomes	48 100.0%	119 100.0%	103 100.0%	270 100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.813 ^a	4	.307
Likelihood Ratio	5.303	4	.258
Linear-by-Linear Association	.545	1	.460
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.76.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	3	5	10	18
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	4.2%	9.7%	6.7%
	Neutral	Count	6	27	19	52
		% within Median Family Incomes	12.5%	22.7%	18.4%	19.3%
	Would Trust It	Count	39	87	74	200
		% within Median Family Incomes	81.3%	73.1%	71.8%	74.1%
Total		Count	48	119	103	270
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.845 ^a	4	.304
Likelihood Ratio	4.948	4	.293
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.662	1	.197
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.20.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Median Family Incomes

Crosstab

			Median Family Incomes			Total
			Low Income Cities	Middle Income Cities	High Income Cities	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	3	7	13	23
		% within Median Family Incomes	6.3%	5.9%	12.6%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	8	18	15	41
		% within Median Family Incomes	16.7%	15.3%	14.6%	15.2%
	Likely	Count	37	93	75	205
		% within Median Family Incomes	77.1%	78.8%	72.8%	76.2%
Total		Count	48	118	103	269
		% within Median Family Incomes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.600 ^a	4	.463
Likelihood Ratio	3.488	4	.480
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.552	1	.213
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.10.

Appendix D7. Crosstabs with Supermarket Or Restaurant

Fish Purchase Frequency * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Fish Purchase Frequency	Less Than 1	Count	34	34	68
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	19.8%	35.4%	25.4%
	1.00	Count	81	29	110
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	47.1%	30.2%	41.0%
	2.00	Count	34	22	56
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	19.8%	22.9%	20.9%
	3.00	Count	19	8	27
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	11.0%	8.3%	10.1%
	4.00	Count	2	2	4
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	1.2%	2.1%	1.5%
	5.00	Count	2	1	3
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
Total		Count	172	96	268
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.327 ^a	5	.045
Likelihood Ratio	11.286	5	.046
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.344	1	.246
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.07.

Freshness Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Freshness Factor	Unimportant	Count	11	2	13
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	6.3%	2.1%	4.8%
	Neutral	Count	3	4	7
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	1.7%	4.2%	2.6%
	Important	Count	160	90	250
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	92.0%	93.8%	92.6%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.754 ^a	2	.153
Likelihood Ratio	4.010	2	.135
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.103	1	.294
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.49.

Taste Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Taste Factor	Unimportant	Count	12	3	15
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	6.9%	3.1%	5.6%
	Neutral	Count	2	2	4
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	1.1%	2.1%	1.5%
	Important	Count	160	91	251
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	92.0%	94.8%	93.0%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.002 ^a	2	.368
Likelihood Ratio	2.139	2	.343
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.217	1	.270
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.42.

Safety Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Safety Factor	Unimportant	Count	15	5	20
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	8.7%	5.2%	7.4%
	Neutral	Count	11	12	23
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	6.4%	12.5%	8.6%
	Important	Count	147	79	226
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	85.0%	82.3%	84.0%
Total		Count	173	96	269
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.772 ^a	2	.152
Likelihood Ratio	3.704	2	.157
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.915
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.14.

Price Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Price Factor	Unimportant	Count	19	10	29
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	10.9%	10.4%	10.7%
	Neutral	Count	34	18	52
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	19.5%	18.8%	19.3%
	Important	Count	121	68	189
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	69.5%	70.8%	70.0%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.049 ^a	2	.976
Likelihood Ratio	.050	2	.976
Linear-by-Linear Association	.044	1	.835
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.31.

Convenient Location Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Convenient Location Factor	Unimportant	Count	33	17	50
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	19.0%	17.7%	18.5%
	Neutral	Count	36	29	65
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	20.7%	30.2%	24.1%
	Important	Count	105	50	155
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	60.3%	52.1%	57.4%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.117 ^a	2	.210
Likelihood Ratio	3.057	2	.217
Linear-by-Linear Association	.497	1	.481
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.78.

Seller's Reputation Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Seller's Reputation Factor	Unimportant	Count	23	14	37
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	13.3%	14.6%	13.8%
	Neutral	Count	29	6	35
% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		16.8%	6.3%	13.0%	
Important	Count	121	76	197	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	69.9%	79.2%	73.2%	
Total		Count	173	96	269
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.036 ^a	2	.049
Likelihood Ratio	6.680	2	.035
Linear-by-Linear Association	.751	1	.386
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.49.

Fish Handling Process Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Fish Handling Process Factor	Unimportant	Count	26	18	44
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	15.0%	18.8%	16.4%
	Neutral	Count	15	8	23
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	8.7%	8.3%	8.6%
	Important	Count	132	70	202
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	76.3%	72.9%	75.1%
Total		Count	173	96	269
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.625 ^a	2	.732
Likelihood Ratio	.615	2	.735
Linear-by-Linear Association	.545	1	.460
N of Valid Cases	269		

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

Locally Caught Factor * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Locally Caught Factor	Unimportant	Count	52	30	82
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	29.9%	31.3%	30.4%
	Neutral	Count	27	21	48
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	15.5%	21.9%	17.8%
	Important	Count	95	45	140
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	54.6%	46.9%	51.9%
Total	Count	174	96	270	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.156 ^a	2	.340
Likelihood Ratio	2.127	2	.345
Linear-by-Linear Association	.656	1	.418
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.07.

**Know Where Fish Was Caught * Supermarket Or Restaurant the
survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Know Where Fish Was Caught	Know Nothing	Count	128	61	189
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	73.6%	63.5%	70.0%
	Neutral	Count	15	14	29
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	8.6%	14.6%	10.7%
	Know Everything	Count	31	21	52
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	17.8%	21.9%	19.3%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.465 ^a	2	.177
Likelihood Ratio	3.388	2	.184
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.924	1	.165
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.31.

**Know The Fish Handling Process * Supermarket Or Restaurant the
survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Know The Fish Handling Process	Know Nothing	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	136 79.1%	55 57.3%	191 71.3%
	Neutral	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	18 10.5%	13 13.5%	31 11.6%
	Know Everything	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	18 10.5%	28 29.2%	46 17.2%
Total		Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	172 100.0%	96 100.0%	268 100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.159 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	16.613	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.002	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.10.

Know the Fishing Regulations * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Know the Fishing Regulations	Know Nothing	Count	125	53	178
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	71.8%	55.2%	65.9%
	Neutral	Count	17	19	36
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	9.8%	19.8%	13.3%
	Know Everything	Count	32	24	56
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	18.4%	25.0%	20.7%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.558 ^a	2	.014
Likelihood Ratio	8.375	2	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.025	1	.025
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.80.

Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Freshness Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count	33	18	51
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	19.0%	18.9%	19.0%
	Neutral	Count	39	25	64
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	22.4%	26.3%	23.8%
	Agree	Count	102	52	154
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	58.6%	54.7%	57.2%
Total	Count	174	95	269	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.555 ^a	2	.758
Likelihood Ratio	.551	2	.759
Linear-by-Linear Association	.149	1	.700
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.01.

Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Taste or Flavor Depends on Where Fish Was Caught	Disagree	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	43 24.7%	16 16.7%	59 21.9%
	Neutral	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	55 31.6%	21 21.9%	76 28.1%
	Agree	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	76 43.7%	59 61.5%	135 50.0%
Total		Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	174 100.0%	96 100.0%	270 100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.827 ^a	2	.020
Likelihood Ratio	7.880	2	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.431	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.98.

**Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process * Supermarket Or
Restaurant the survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	Disagree	Count	17	7	24
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	9.8%	7.3%	8.9%
	Neutral	Count	24	12	36
% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		13.8%	12.5%	13.3%	
Agree	Count	133	77	210	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	76.4%	80.2%	77.8%	
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.618 ^a	2	.734
Likelihood Ratio	.632	2	.729
Linear-by-Linear Association	.614	1	.433
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.53.

**Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations * Supermarket Or
Restaurant the survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	Disagree	Count	27	7	34
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	15.6%	7.3%	12.6%
	Neutral	Count	20	28	48
% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		11.6%	29.2%	17.8%	
Agree	Count	126	61	187	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	72.8%	63.5%	69.5%	
Total		Count	173	96	269
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.869 ^a	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	14.619	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.914
N of Valid Cases	269		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.13.

Pay More For Fresher Fish * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Pay More For Fresher Fish	Disagree	Count	20	5	25
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	11.6%	5.3%	9.3%
	Neutral	Count	15	16	31
% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		8.7%	16.8%	11.6%	
Agree	Count	138	74	212	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	79.8%	77.9%	79.1%	
Total		Count	173	95	268
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.175 ^a	2	.046
Likelihood Ratio	6.262	2	.044
Linear-by-Linear Association	.301	1	.583
N of Valid Cases	268		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.86.

Pay More For Safer Fish * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Pay More For Safer Fish	Disagree	Count	16	2	18
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	9.2%	2.1%	6.7%
	Neutral	Count	10	7	17
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	5.7%	7.3%	6.3%
	Agree	Count	148	87	235
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	85.1%	90.6%	87.0%
Total	Count	174	96	270	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.149 ^a	2	.076
Likelihood Ratio	6.087	2	.048
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.404	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.04.

**Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name * Supermarket Or Restaurant
the survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	Disagree	Count	35	15	50
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	20.1%	15.6%	18.5%
	Neutral	Count	36	25	61
% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		20.7%	26.0%	22.6%	
Agree	Count	103	56	159	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	59.2%	58.3%	58.9%	
Total	Count	174	96	270	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.466 ^a	2	.481
Likelihood Ratio	1.468	2	.480
Linear-by-Linear Association	.133	1	.716
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.78.

Find Brand Name In Newspaper * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Find Brand Name In Newspaper	Checked	Count	54	24	78
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	31.0%	25.0%	28.9%
	Not Checked	Count	120	72	192
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	69.0%	75.0%	71.1%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	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	1.097 ^b	1	.295		
Continuity Correction ^a	.823	1	.364		
Likelihood Ratio	1.112	1	.292		
Fisher's Exact Test				.328	.183
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.093	1	.296		
N of Valid Cases	270				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.
73.

**Find Brand Name On Internet * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey
was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Find Brand Name On Internet	Checked	Count	57	44	101
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	32.8%	45.8%	37.4%
	Not Checked	Count	117	52	169
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	67.2%	54.2%	62.6%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	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	4.517 ^b	1	.034		
Continuity Correction ^a	3.976	1	.046		
Likelihood Ratio	4.476	1	.034		
Fisher's Exact Test				.036	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.500	1	.034		
N of Valid Cases	270				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 35.91.

Find Brand Name On TV * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Find Brand Name On TV	Checked	Count	61	27	88
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	35.1%	28.1%	32.6%
	Not Checked	Count	113	69	182
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	64.9%	71.9%	67.4%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	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	1.353 ^b	1	.245		
Continuity Correction ^a	1.056	1	.304		
Likelihood Ratio	1.370	1	.242		
Fisher's Exact Test				.279	.152
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.348	1	.246		
N of Valid Cases	270				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.29.

Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Find Brand Name In Supermarket And Restaurants	Checked	Count	113	63	176
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	64.9%	65.6%	65.2%
	Not Checked	Count	61	33	94
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	35.1%	34.4%	34.8%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	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	.013 ^b	1	.910		
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.013	1	.910		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.510
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.910		
N of Valid Cases	270				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.
42.

**Find Brand Name Elsewhere * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey
was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Find Brand Name Elsewhere	Checked	Count	34	26	60
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	19.5%	27.1%	22.2%
	Not Checked	Count	140	70	210
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	80.5%	72.9%	77.8%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	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	2.037 ^b	1	.154		
Continuity Correction ^a	1.624	1	.203		
Likelihood Ratio	1.998	1	.158		
Fisher's Exact Test				.170	.102
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.029	1	.154		
N of Valid Cases	270				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.33.

**How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand *
Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand	\$0.00	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	7 4.1%	4 4.2%	11 4.1%
	\$0.01 - \$0.50	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	30 17.4%	14 14.7%	44 16.5%
	\$0.50 - \$1.00	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	61 35.5%	51 53.7%	112 41.9%
	More Than \$1.00	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	74 43.0%	26 27.4%	100 37.5%
Total		Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	172 100.0%	95 100.0%	267 100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.122 ^a	3	.028
Likelihood Ratio	9.170	3	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.552	1	.213
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.91.

**Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name *
Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted**

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name	No	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	29 16.7%	22 22.9%	51 18.9%
	Neutral	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	26 14.9%	12 12.5%	38 14.1%
	Yes	Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	119 68.4%	62 64.6%	181 67.0%
Total		Count % within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	174 100.0%	96 100.0%	270 100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.675 ^a	2	.433
Likelihood Ratio	1.647	2	.439
Linear-by-Linear Association	.994	1	.319
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.51.

How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish	Would Not Trust It	Count	13	5	18
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	7.5%	5.2%	6.7%
	Neutral	Count	31	21	52
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	17.8%	21.9%	19.3%
	Would Trust It	Count	130	70	200
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	74.7%	72.9%	74.1%
Total		Count	174	96	270
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.031 ^a	2	.597
Likelihood Ratio	1.041	2	.594
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.951
N of Valid Cases	270		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.40.

How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish * Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted

Crosstab

			Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		Total
			Supermarket	Restaurant	
How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish	Unlikely	Count	17	6	23
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	9.8%	6.3%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	26	15	41
% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted		15.0%	15.6%	15.2%	
Likely	Count	130	75	205	
	% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	75.1%	78.1%	76.2%	
Total		Count	173	96	269
		% within Supermarket Or Restaurant the survey was conducted	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.010 ^a	2	.603
Likelihood Ratio	1.056	2	.590
Linear-by-Linear Association	.678	1	.410
N of Valid Cases	269		

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

Appendix E. Regression Analysis

Regression 1

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.312 ^a	.098	.094	.78665
2	.338 ^b	.114	.107	.78089
3	.370 ^c	.137	.127	.77210
4	.402 ^d	.162	.149	.76254

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish, Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations
- c. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish, Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations, Price Factor
- d. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish, Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations, Price Factor, Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.991	.213		4.656	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.189	.035	.312	5.372	.000
2	(Constant)	.741	.239		3.100	.002
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.160	.037	.264	4.288	.000
	Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	.081	.037	.137	2.226	.027
3	(Constant)	1.147	.281		4.078	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.150	.037	.247	4.038	.000
	Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	.106	.037	.180	2.853	.005
	Price Factor	-.089	.034	-.157	-2.663	.008
4	(Constant)	1.369	.289		4.735	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.180	.038	.297	4.709	.000
	Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	.168	.043	.283	3.901	.000
	Price Factor	-.098	.033	-.172	-2.943	.004
	Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	-.121	.043	-.202	-2.772	.006

- a. Dependent Variable: How Much More to Spend Per Pound for a Trusted Brand

```
REGRESSION
/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
```

```

/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Confidence
/METHOD=STEPWISE Times Freshness Taste safety Price Convenience Reputation
Han

```

```

dling Local Where Process Regulations Fresh
Flavor Handled Regulated Fresher Safer Branded .

```

Regression 2

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.344 ^a	.118	.115	1.68006
2	.374 ^b	.140	.133	1.66262
3	.397 ^c	.158	.148	1.64841

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name, Fish Purchase Frequency
- c. Predictors: (Constant), Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name, Fish Purchase Frequency, Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.151	.331		9.515	.000
	Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	.378	.064	.344	5.891	.000
2	(Constant)	3.453	.349		9.906	.000
	Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	.379	.064	.345	5.972	.000
	Fish Purchase Frequency	-.246	.097	-.147	-2.542	.012
3	(Constant)	2.830	.436		6.488	.000
	Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	.308	.070	.280	4.404	.000
	Fish Purchase Frequency	-.249	.096	-.149	-2.595	.010
	Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	.189	.081	.149	2.338	.020

- a. Dependent Variable: Confidence with a Government Certification on Brand Name

REGRESSION

```

/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Attitude
/METHOD=STEPWISE Times Freshness Taste safety Price Convenience Reputation
Han

```

```

dling Local Where Process Regulations Fresh
Flavor Handled Regulated Fresher Safer Branded .

```

Regression 3

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.358 ^a	.128	.125	1.19073
2	.393 ^b	.154	.148	1.17504

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish, Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.255	.319		10.205	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.332	.053	.358	6.274	.000
2	(Constant)	2.773	.357		7.769	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.275	.056	.297	4.933	.000
	Safety Determined by Fishing Regulations	.157	.055	.172	2.864	.005

- a. Dependent Variable: How much They trust NEM for a Brand Name Fish

REGRESSION

```

/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Probability
/METHOD=STEPWISE Times Freshness Taste safety Price Convenience Reputation

```

Han

```

dling Local Where Process Regulations Fresh
Flavor Handled Regulated Fresher Safer Branded .

```

Regression 4

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.411 ^a	.169	.166	1.20516
2	.442 ^b	.196	.190	1.18767
3	.462 ^c	.213	.204	1.17691

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish, Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process
 c. Predictors: (Constant), Pay More For Safer Fish, Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process, Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.996	.323		9.282	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.395	.054	.411	7.375	.000
2	(Constant)	2.475	.363		6.825	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.319	.059	.332	5.458	.000
	Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	.174	.058	.182	2.992	.003
3	(Constant)	2.373	.362		6.559	.000
	Pay More For Safer Fish	.245	.066	.254	3.726	.000
	Safety Determined by Fish Handling Process	.156	.058	.164	2.700	.007
	Prefer Fish under a Trusted Brand Name	.129	.053	.158	2.429	.016

a. Dependent Variable: How likely They Would Buy the Brand Name Fish