

LSU RESEARCHERS FIND THAT “THANK YOU” IMPACTS PERCEPTIONS OF LOUISIANA, ITS PEOPLE, PRODUCTS AND SERVICES, AND TRAVEL TO THE STATE

Baton Rouge, Louisiana: April 25, 2007.

At the dawn of the 2007 hurricane season, and nearly two years after the devastation caused by hurricanes Katrina and Rita, researchers at Louisiana State University now understand the benefits of saying “thank you” in response to the overwhelming support received from around the country in the aftermath of the hurricanes.

In two waves of surveys (April 2006 and again in November 2006), two professors in the Department of Marketing at LSU’s E. J. Ourso College of Business asked a nationwide panel of respondents if “people in Louisiana are greedy,” and if “people in Louisiana are ungrateful,” along with 15 other measures of perceptions of the state.

The answer?

It depends. And what it depends on is critically important to officials in state government and recovery agencies tasked with providing the fuel to reignite Louisiana’s tourism and economic development engines. The good news is that those who saw a “thank you” ad had higher attitudes toward the state, its people, products and services from Louisiana, and willingness to pay a premium for them.

Unfortunately, by November 2006, after the Louisiana Department of Tourism’s \$7 million “Come fall in love with Louisiana all over again” and the grassroots “Louisiana Thanks You!” campaigns, only 28% of people around the country reported seeing or hearing a “thank you” ad.

Randle D. Raggio, Assistant Professor of Marketing, and Judith Anne Garretson Folse, Associate Professor and Janet I. and E. Robert Theriot Professor, evaluated the impact of “thank you” campaigns such as the TV version of Louisiana Office of Tourism’s “Come Fall in Love with Louisiana All Over Again,” featuring well-known celebrities with strong ties to the state, such as Emeril Lagasse and Wynton Marsalis, saying “thank you.” “Louisiana Thanks You!” was proclaimed on 90 billboards and in radio PSAs around the country.

The researchers found significant changes in attitudes from Wave 1 (April 2006) to Wave 2 (November 2006).

Women were always more generous in their responses in Wave 1, but these *gender* effects disappeared in Wave 2. Men’s scores generally increased from Wave 1 to Wave 2, while women’s scores generally decreased.

Current *state of residence* also influenced attitudes and perceptions. Comparing responses from Louisiana residents vs. those from other states, across both waves, state of residence significantly impacted 12 of 14 measures (3 measures applied only to out-of-state, so no comparison was possible). In Wave 1, in-state residents were more generous in half (6) of the categories where significant differences existed, demonstrating, as expected, a much greater affection and willingness to pay for Louisiana products and services. In Wave 2, Louisiana residents were more generous in all 12 categories. In addition to a continued higher affection for Louisiana products and services, they were much more likely to volunteer or give money to recovery efforts, and to express higher attitudes toward, and satisfaction with, the people of the state.

A critical change occurred from Wave 1 to Wave 2 with respect to the perception that “Louisiana has appropriately *thanked* individuals, organizations and governmental bodies for the assistance it received after the hurricanes.” As expected, all scores improved from Wave 1 to Wave 2, but in Wave 1, scores from those out-of-state were higher than those of Louisiana residents. The opposite was true in Wave 2: Louisiana residents had a more positive perception than did those from out-of-state that Louisiana had appropriately thanked others.

Interestingly, in Wave 1, Louisiana residents rated their friends and neighbors as more “greedy” and “ungrateful” than did those out-of-state. Those from out-of-state rated people from Louisiana slightly more “greedy” and “ungrateful” in Wave 2 than they did in Wave 1, closing the gap in the measure of ungratefulness. But in Wave 2, Louisiana residents still rated their friends and neighbors as more “greedy” than did those from out-of-state, with no change in their attitude score on this measure between waves.

Surprisingly, *distance* from New Orleans had a very minimal impact on attitudes.

But the measure with the greatest impact was whether or not an individual had *seen* a “thank you” ad. “We found that the state’s ‘thank you’ ads had a significant impact on every measure we tested,” reported Judith Anne Garretson Folse, Associate Professor of Marketing in the E. J. Ourso College, one of the authors of the study. “In every measure, those who had seen an ad were more favorable toward the state than those who had not seen an ad.” For example, any effects of *distance*, though minimal, disappeared completely when a person saw an ad.

Furthermore, the researchers did not find the typical wearout effects found with traditional advertising. While the effectiveness of most advertising decreases after 8-12 exposures, the

researchers found positive effects of the “thank you” ads up to 50 exposures. “The more times they heard ‘thank you,’ the more positive they were in their responses,” said Folse.

Every 10 exposures to “thank you” increased the percent premium that out-of-state respondents were willing to pay for travel to Louisiana by 1.5%-3.22%. Given the fact that Louisiana’s tourism industry is roughly a \$9 billion industry, a 1% increase in what people pay for travel to the state would translate into an increase in economic activity related to tourism by about \$90 million, not an insignificant sum.

The researchers noted that not all expressions of “thank you” would have to come from paid advertisements. Coordinating messages across multiple state agencies and leaders could increase the effectiveness of dollars spent on paid advertising.

Wave 1 online surveys were administered to a national panel organized by Beta Research in New York and Survey Sampling in Connecticut soon after the Louisiana Department of Tourism launched its \$7 million national ad campaign (including both television ads that expressed a “thank you” and print ads that did not). Of the 1,782 surveys that were fully completed by respondents in all 50 states plus D. C., 328 or 18% of the respondents had seen “advertisements from Louisiana...that expressed a ‘thank you.’”

Wave 2 online surveys were administered to a national panel organized by Beta Research. Of the 2,689 surveys that were fully completed by respondents in all 50 states plus D. C., 328 or 28% of the respondents had seen a “thank you” ad.

On the question about Louisianians being “greedy,” responses from those who had seen an ad in Wave 2 were significantly more

positive than from those in Wave 1 who had not seen an ad. On a seven-point scale anchored by “Strongly Agree” at one (1) and anchored by “Strongly Disagree” at seven (7), the average of those who had seen an ad was a 2.70, versus 3.13 ($p=.000$) for those who had not seen an ad – a smaller number is better.

Similarly, on the question about whether “Louisiana has appropriately *thanked* [others],” the mean score for those who had seen an ad (Wave 2) was 5.24, while it was only 3.88 ($p=.000$), or just below the midpoint on the scale, for those who had not seen an ad – a bigger number is better on this item. More complete results are reported in the table below.

But the factors that cut across *state of residence*, *gender*, and whether a person had *seen* an ad were constructs called *cause involvement* and *affective commitment*. Affective Commitment is a sense of belonging or emotional attachment to the state. Cause Involvement is a belief that Louisiana’s recovery is relevant and of personal concern (questionnaire items listed below). After accounting for *gender*, *residence*, *seen*, and a wide range of other control variables, these two constructs significantly impacted measures across both waves, including the ones related to attitudes and perceptions toward Louisiana travel and its products and services, and willingness to pay for them. This is additional good news for the officials mentioned above.

This finding suggests that for the state’s efforts to be effective, people need to understand why Louisiana is important – for cultural, economic, environmental, industrial and infrastructure reasons – and to have an emotional attachment. “Basically, people need to feel like Louisiana is more than Mardi Gras and crawfish,” said Randle D. Raggio, Assistant Professor of Marketing in the E. J. Ourso College and one of the authors of the study. “If they believe, for example, that saving the last unspoiled marshes in North America is an important cause, and strongly

associate this cause with Louisiana, they may be more positively predisposed to visit the state and purchase its products or services, and pay more to do so. They may also have higher perceptions of the state and its people in general, and may be more supportive of governmental efforts to protect the wetlands, secure the levees, ensure the continued production and refining of oil and safe navigation of the lower Mississippi River, not to mention efforts to keep it clean for those who rely on it for drinking water.”

“We would never have asked for this, but 2005’s hurricanes offer the state a unique opportunity to demonstrate both the strategic importance and fragility of the state and its resources,” said Raggio. “People may associate Louisiana most strongly with its food, music and festivals, but the hurricanes demonstrated that these and a lot more are at risk if things are not fixed.”

Based on the findings from their research study, the authors suggest that officials concerned with rebuilding/recovery, tourism and economic development focus on communicating the importance of the state both to current residents and those who reside outside of the state. Interestingly, the results suggest that such a focus may improve attitudes and behavior toward the state and its efforts, and cause the people of Louisiana to be seen as less “greedy” and “ungrateful,” a very nice bit of lagniappe for officials currently struggling with managing concrete efforts about which others have perceptions which may or may not match the reality they find on the ground.

Qualitative Data: Themes and Meta-Themes

An open ended question (“Is there anything else you would like for us to know?”) was included in the Wave 1 survey. The researchers were able to identify the emerging themes, more overarching meta-themes, and

then categorize the degree to which each response fit the themes. There were three overarching meta-themes of *Connection*, *Decisions*, and *Conflict*. The researchers focused on the data of out-of-state respondents.

For the first meta-theme of *Connection*, the underlying themes were Involvement, Attachment and Preservation. Here, many subjects mentioned the degree to which they participated in relief/recovery efforts, felt connected to those affected by the hurricane, and hoped the area would be preserved. The vast majority of those under this meta-theme were categorized under Involvement (14%), indicating that the individual, or someone the individual knows, participated in any type of relief effort, and Attachment (13%), indicating that individuals outside the state felt affection toward those impacted by the hurricane.

For the second meta-theme of *Decisions*, the underlying themes concerned those involved in, and outcomes of, decisions, and included Inadequacy, Disapproval, and Solutions. Unfavorable evaluations of the decision-making that occurred at all levels were emphasized. They criticized the federal government, state government and/or local leaders. For instance, 16% believed inadequacy at the federal level existed, and 23% cited disapproval of decision makers in Louisiana.

The final meta-theme of *Conflict* highlights the mixed emotions stemming from the tragedy and recovery efforts. The underlying themes included Sympathy/Empathy, Entitlement and Self-Concern. In general, there was a high level of Sympathy/Empathy for those affected by the hurricane (20%), but that compassion was met with high levels of perceived Entitlement (21%), as well. Many believed many New Orleans residents behaved inappropriately and were ungrateful for the assistance they were provided, acting as though they were entitled to all they received. Others mentioned their own

personal problems, which were a priority for them. Results are presented in the tables on pages 11-13.

Public Policy and Marketing:

This research seeks to understand the impact of post-hurricanes “thank you” campaigns such as “Come Fall In Love With Louisiana All Over Again” and “Louisiana Thanks You!” on individuals’ overall perceptions of and attitudes toward the state, its citizens and brands, and the willingness on the part of individuals to visit the state, buy its brands and contribute additional resources to the state’s rebuilding efforts.

In his introduction to *The Psychology of Gratitude* Robert Emmons (2004, p. 3) states, “Adam Smith, the legendary economist and philosopher, proposed that gratitude is a vital civic virtue, absolutely essential for the healthy functioning of societies.” But if efforts to express gratitude do not have a positive impact on perceptions of the state and intentions to support the state in the future, then their appropriateness as uses of public funds may be questioned.

“Come fall in love with Louisiana all over again,” was the theme for the Louisiana Department of Tourism’s \$7 million campaign, which began in April 2006 and included television ads featuring celebrities saying “thank you” to people around the country.

A coalition of Louisiana governmental and business leaders developed the integrated “Louisiana Thanks You!” campaign to “[extend] the gratitude of the people of Louisiana to all Americans and to friends around the globe and commends those who gave service, assistance, and unselfish sacrifice toward the recovery effort in Louisiana...” (Schedler, et al. 2006). Elements of the campaign included the resolution by the state legislature, and a national promotion

campaign involving outdoor advertisements, radio PSAs, “Louisiana Thanks You!” activities, and public relations.

Both of the “thank you” campaigns sought to express the gratitude of the people of the state of Louisiana. However, it was not clear whether that message or other factors would positively influence individuals to support the state in the future.

According to Emmons (2004), “The consensus among the world’s religious and ethical writers is that people are morally obligated to feel and express gratitude in response to received benefits” (p.3). Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1967) said, “In ordinary life we hardly realize that we receive a great deal more than we give, and that it is only with gratitude that life becomes rich” (p.370). Coming at the issue from the opposite direction, Hume (1888) called *ingratitude*, “The most horrid and unnatural of all crimes that humans are capable of committing” (p. 466), and Kant (1797/1964) included ingratitude in a short list of 3 vices that are the ‘essence of vileness and wickedness’ (p. 7). Research in psychology indicates that expressions of gratitude maintain a “dynamic equilibrium between donor and receiver” (Heilbrunn 1972), and that expressing gratitude helps the expressor by focusing attention outward (c.f., Emmons and McCullough 2004). Research in consumer behavior has found that the addition of the words “thank you” to a diner’s check increased tip percentage (Lynn and McCall 2000; Rind and Bordia 1995).

This research indicates that the state’s expressions of gratitude may positively impact the willingness of both corporate and private citizens to continue to support the state in its ongoing efforts in the future. No other research to-date has addressed the impact of such goodwill campaigns (i.e., ones not primarily focused on tourism or economic development) from a public policy standpoint.

Methodology:

Wave 1 online surveys were conducted between April 20-30, 2006. More than 2,200 respondents participated resulting in 1,783 complete surveys from all 50 states, plus D.C. Of those, 615 were from Louisiana residents; 1,165 were from out-of-state.

Beta Research Corp. of Syosset, NY hosted and managed the online survey. The respondents for the survey were gathered from 2 different sources – national respondents were recruited from the Beta Research Panel, a panel comprised of over 50,000 persons across the U.S. Additional respondents living in Louisiana were recruited by Survey Sampling Inc. (SSI) of Connecticut. The online sample used for the study was a nationally representative sample (as per the U.S. census) of respondents between the ages of 18 and 65. Respondents were screened for the state they lived in, to ensure at least 500 respondents from Louisiana, but otherwise there were no quotas for the study.

Wave 2 online surveys were conducted between November 9-17, 2006. More than 3,000 respondents participated resulting in 2,689 complete surveys from all 50 states, plus D.C. Of those, 364 were from Louisiana residents; 2,325 were from out-of-state. No requirement on the number of Louisiana residents was imposed.

Potential respondents from the study (from both the Beta and SSI panels, both waves) were e-mailed an invitation to participate in the study, which included a hyperlink to the survey site, as well as a password unique to that participant, insuring that each respondent could only take the survey one time.

Researchers analyzed the following 17 dependent variables (data descriptions and complete scales available from authors): appropriately thanked, appreciates my efforts, Louisianians are ungrateful, Louisianians are

greedy, willingness to volunteer, willingness to contribute money, people attitude, state attitude, product/service attitude, product/service affect, travel affect (out-of-state only), willingness to pay price premium for product/service, price premium amount for product/service, willingness to pay price premium for travel (out-of-state only), price premium amount for travel (out-of-state only), state satisfaction, people satisfaction, word-of-mouth.

The following predictors and control variables were used (data descriptions and complete scales available from authors): age, sex, distance, former resident, participated, la-focus, number of visits, related, physical damage (in-state only), emotional stress (in-state only), seen ad, cause involvement, organizational commitment (in-state only), affective commitment.

Since gender, residence and exposure to ads significantly impacted most measures, the data were divided into eight (8) groups (2³) according to how they differed on these three predictor variables, and the data for each group were analyzed separately.

Because of the quantity of results available, for each dependent measure the authors report selected statistics on pages 8-9.

Development of Themes and Meta-Themes. Consistent with qualitative research methods, these data were analyzed using a content analysis process conducted by four independent coders not associated with the research project. The goal of this process was to identify the emerging themes, more overarching meta-themes, and then categorize the degree to which each response fit the themes. First, as a practice round, the four coders examined the first 20 responses and identified initial themes emerging from these data. Next, the four coders met and discussed these themes, ensuring they were all comfortable with the process. They then each

analyzed the remainder of the responses and identified a set of themes. Once they completed this stage of the process, they reconvened to discuss the themes, search for commonalities that allowed for the most accurate representation of each theme, and devised a final set of themes. For each theme, the coders chose a descriptive name, conceptualized/defined the theme, and selected verbatim comments that illustrated the theme. Meta-themes emerged from discussions of the final set of themes with one of the primary researchers.

Quantitative Coding for Themes. The four independent coders next examined each response and determined (1) whether the theme was present or absent in the response and (2) the degree to which each of the themes was present in the responses. For the second task, the coders used a five-point, single item measure anchored by a 1 (theme is not emphasized at all) to 5 (theme is emphasized to a great extent). Since responses included a variety of different issues, it is possible for responses to be categorized into several different themes.

Once the coders completed the qualitative coding, these data were analyzed for inter-rater reliability and then subjected to overall analyses.

Contact:

Randle D. Raggio
Assistant Professor of Marketing
3122C CEBA Building
E.J. Ourso College of Business
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA
70803-6314
Phone: (225) 578-6539
Fax: (225) 578-8616
raggio@lsu.edu

The researchers would like to express their gratitude to Beta Research and Survey Sampling for their significant support of this research project, and to the Louisiana Department of Culture,

Recreation, & Tourism, and the Department of Marketing at the E.J. Ourso College of Business, Louisiana State University, for their financial support.

WAVE 1 vs. WAVE 2 PARTIAL RESULTS BY MAJOR GROUP

DV	Condition	N	Mean	Condition	N	Mean	p-value*
Thanked	Wave 1	1782	4.079	Wave 2	2689	4.354	0.000
	W1 In State	617	3.940	W2 In State	364	4.637	0.000
	W1 Out of State	1165	4.152	W2 Out of State	2325	4.310	0.012
	W1 Men	630	3.876	W2 men	1200	4.263	0.000
	W1 Women	1152	4.189	W2 Women	1489	4.427	0.001
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.876	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.010	0.026
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.876	W2 Seen	752	5.241	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	4.979	W2 Seen	752	5.241	0.011
	Ungrateful	Wave 1	1782	3.092	Wave 2	2689	3.104
W1 In State		617	3.361	W2 In State	364	3.223	0.296 *
W1 Out of State		1165	2.949	W2 Out of State	2325	3.085	0.043
W1 Men		630	3.140	W2 men	1200	3.218	0.401 *
W1 Women		1152	3.066	W2 Women	1489	3.012	0.473 *
W1 Not Seen		1454	3.215	W2 Not Seen	1937	3.281	0.311 *
W1 Not Seen		1454	3.215	W2 Seen	752	2.648	0.000
W1 Seen		328	2.549	W2 Seen	752	2.648	0.427 *
Greedy		Wave 1	1782	3.028	Wave 2	2689	3.021
	W1 In State	617	3.402	W2 In State	364	3.228	0.189 *
	W1 Out of State	1165	2.829	W2 Out of State	2325	2.989	0.015
	W1 Men	630	3.113	W2 men	1200	3.193	0.385 *
	W1 Women	1152	2.981	W2 Women	1489	2.883	0.180 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.130	W2 Not Seen	1937	3.148	0.785 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.130	W2 Seen	752	2.696	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	2.573	W2 Seen	752	2.696	0.325 *
	Volunteer	Wave 1	1782	3.916	Wave 2	2689	3.821
W1 In State		617	4.574	W2 In State	364	4.838	0.030
W1 Out of State		1165	3.567	W2 Out of State	2325	3.662	0.143 *
W1 Men		630	3.925	W2 men	1200	3.885	0.654 *
W1 Women		1152	3.911	W2 Women	1489	3.770	0.056
W1 Not Seen		1454	3.787	W2 Not Seen	1937	3.535	0.000
W1 Not Seen		1454	3.787	W2 Seen	752	4.559	0.000
W1 Seen		328	4.488	W2 Seen	752	4.559	0.562 *
Money		Wave 1	1782	4.061	Wave 2	2689	4.125
	W1 In State	617	4.125	W2 In State	364	4.442	0.015
	W1 Out of State	1165	4.028	W2 Out of State	2325	4.075	0.469 *
	W1 Men	630	3.959	W2 men	1200	4.098	0.118 *
	W1 Women	1152	4.117	W2 Women	1489	4.146	0.700 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.940	W2 Not Seen	1937	3.873	0.291 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.940	W2 Seen	752	4.773	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	4.598	W2 Seen	752	4.773	0.141 *
	People Att.	Wave 1	1782	5.219	Wave 2	2689	5.266
W1 In State		617	5.255	W2 In State	364	5.652	0.000
W1 Out of State		1165	5.201	W2 Out of State	2325	5.205	0.930 *
W1 Men		630	5.100	W2 men	1200	5.106	0.935 *
W1 Women		1152	5.285	W2 Women	1489	5.395	0.053
W1 Not Seen		1454	5.127	W2 Not Seen	1937	5.064	0.220 *
W1 Not Seen		1454	5.127	W2 Seen	752	5.786	0.000
W1 Seen		328	5.631	W2 Seen	752	5.786	0.077
State Att.		Wave 1	1782	4.791	Wave 2	2689	5.048
	W1 In State	617	4.546	W2 In State	364	5.126	0.000
	W1 Out of State	1165	4.920	W2 Out of State	2325	5.035	0.032
	W1 Men	630	4.540	W2 men	1200	4.863	0.000
	W1 Women	1152	4.928	W2 Women	1489	5.197	0.000
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.696	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.868	0.001
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.696	W2 Seen	752	5.512	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	5.210	W2 Seen	752	5.512	0.002
	Prod/Svc. Att.	Wave 1	1782	5.156	Wave 2	2689	5.224
W1 In State		617	5.152	W2 In State	364	5.567	0.000
W1 Out of State		1165	5.158	W2 Out of State	2325	5.171	0.797 *
W1 Men		630	4.986	W2 men	1200	5.071	0.207 *
W1 Women		1152	5.249	W2 Women	1489	5.348	0.070
W1 Not Seen		1454	5.070	W2 Not Seen	1937	5.035	0.456 *
W1 Not Seen		1454	5.070	W2 Seen	752	5.712	0.000
W1 Seen		328	5.537	W2 Seen	752	5.712	0.044
Prod/Svc Affect		Wave 1	1782	4.795	Wave 2	2689	4.749
	W1 In State	617	4.434	W2 In State	364	5.756	0.001
	W1 Out of State	1165	4.456	W2 Out of State	2325	4.592	0.003
	W1 Men	630	4.692	W2 men	1200	4.589	0.112 *
	W1 Women	1152	4.851	W2 Women	1489	4.878	0.615 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.642	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.500	0.002
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.642	W2 Seen	752	5.391	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	5.473	W2 Seen	752	5.391	0.337 *

WAVE 1 vs. WAVE 2 PARTIAL RESULTS BY MAJOR GROUP (cont'd):

DV	Condition	N	Mean	Condition	N	Mean	p-value*
WTP Prod/Svc	Wave 1	1782	3.237	Wave 2	2689	3.291	0.247 *
	W1 In State	617	3.896	W2 In State	364	4.195	0.008
	W1 Out of State	1165	2.888	W2 Out of State	2325	3.149	0.000
	W1 Men	630	3.156	W2 men	1200	3.183	0.722 *
	W1 Women	1152	3.281	W2 Women	1489	3.378	0.136 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.092	W2 Not Seen	1937	3.023	0.198 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	3.092	W2 Seen	752	3.980	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	3.878	W2 Seen	752	3.980	0.356 *
WTP Prod/Svc AMT	Wave 1	1782	1.878	Wave 2	2689	1.754	0.003
	W1 In State	617	2.410	W2 In State	364	2.684	0.009
	W1 Out of State	1165	1.596	W2 Out of State	2325	1.609	0.769 *
	W1 Men	630	1.827	W2 men	1200	1.749	0.235 *
	W1 Women	1152	1.905	W2 Women	1489	1.758	0.007
	W1 Not Seen	1454	1.772	W2 Not Seen	1937	1.521	0.000
	W1 Not Seen	1454	1.772	W2 Seen	752	2.355	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	2.345	W2 Seen	752	2.355	0.923 *
State Sat.	Wave 1	1782	4.476	Wave 2	2689	4.659	0.000
	W1 In State	617	4.389	W2 In State	364	4.784	0.001
	W1 Out of State	1165	4.523	W2 Out of State	2325	4.639	0.025
	W1 Men	630	4.343	W2 men	1200	4.551	0.005
	W1 Women	1152	4.550	W2 Women	1489	4.746	0.001
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.378	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.458	0.118 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.378	W2 Seen	752	5.177	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	4.915	W2 Seen	752	5.177	0.009
People Sat.	Wave 1	1782	4.758	Wave 2	2689	4.834	0.089
	W1 In State	617	4.882	W2 In State	364	5.294	0.000
	W1 Out of State	1165	4.689	W2 Out of State	2325	4.763	0.155 *
	W1 Men	630	4.706	W2 men	1200	4.755	0.490 *
	W1 Women	1152	4.787	W2 Women	1489	4.898	0.055
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.644	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.597	0.340 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.644	W2 Seen	752	5.447	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	5.262	W2 Seen	752	5.447	0.046
WOM	Wave 1	1782	4.951	Wave 2	2689	4.752	0.000
	W1 In State	617	5.558	W2 In State	364	5.621	0.533 *
	W1 Out of State	1165	1.617	W2 Out of State	2325	1.585	0.820 *
	W1 Men	630	4.940	W2 men	1200	4.704	0.002
	W1 Women	1152	4.957	W2 Women	1489	4.791	0.011
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.780	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.437	0.000
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.779	W2 Seen	752	5.565	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	5.707	W2 Seen	752	5.565	0.127 *
Out-of-State Only							
Travel Affect	Wave 1	1782	4.470	Wave 2	2689	4.642	0.001
	W1 Out of State	1165	1.443	W2 Out of State	2325	1.453	0.001
	W1 Men	630	4.335	W2 men	1200	4.632	0.000
	W1 Women	1152	4.529	W2 Women	1489	4.649	0.073
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.378	W2 Not Seen	1937	4.466	0.116 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	4.378	W2 Seen	752	5.209	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	5.085	W2 Seen	752	5.209	0.332 *
WTP Travel	Wave 1	1782	2.798	Wave 2	2689	2.711	0.110 *
	W1 Out of State	1165	1.501	W2 Out of State	2325	1.536	0.110 *
	W1 Men	630	2.639	W2 men	1200	2.756	0.211 *
	W1 Women	1152	2.867	W2 Women	1489	2.674	0.005
	W1 Not Seen	1454	2.732	W2 Not Seen	1937	2.523	0.000
	W1 Not Seen	1454	2.732	W2 Seen	752	3.316	0.000
WTP Travel AMT	Wave 1	1782	1.510	Wave 2	2689	1.516	0.882 *
	W1 Out of State	1165	1.177	W2 Out of State	2325	1.174	0.882 *
	W1 Men	630	1.375	W2 men	1200	1.550	0.014
	W1 Women	1152	1.568	W2 Women	1489	1.488	0.134 *
	W1 Not Seen	1454	1.459	W2 Not Seen	1937	1.365	0.019
	W1 Not Seen	1454	1.459	W2 Seen	752	2.004	0.000
	W1 Seen	328	1.850	W2 Seen	752	2.004	0.292 *

* Note: p-values >= .10 indicate that the numbers are statistically equivalent.

Selected Scales used in the study. (Complete questionnaire available from authors)

Cause Involvement – Lichtenstein, Netemeyer & Burton 1990; Landreth & Folse, working paper

- a. Helping Louisiana recover from the hurricanes means a lot to me.
- b. Helping Louisiana recover from the hurricanes matters a great deal to me.
- c. Helping Louisiana recover from the hurricanes is personally relevant to me.
- d. Helping Louisiana recover from the hurricanes is of great concern to me.
- e. Helping Louisiana recover from the hurricanes is important to me.

Affective Commitment – Gruen, Summers, & Acito 2000

- a. I feel a strong sense of belonging to Louisiana.
- b. I feel as if Louisiana's problems are my own.
- c. Louisiana has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
- d. I enjoy discussing Louisiana with other people.
- e. I feel like part of the "Louisiana family."
- f. I have little, if any emotional attachment with Louisiana (reversed scored).

NEXT PAGE: Summary of Qualitative (open-ended) Results

Meta-Themes	Theme	Definition	Percent and Theme Emphasis ¹			Examples
			Overall	In-State	Out-of-State	
Connection	Involvement	The degree to which the respondent, or someone the respondent knows, participated in any type of relief effort.	9% 2.74	3% 2.67	14% 2.75	<i>I don't personally know anyone displaced by the hurricane, but I organized a fundraiser for the people & made sure the money would be given to THE PEOPLE not the govt.</i> <i>Church contributions have been fairly effective in my area.</i> <i>I did help with the animal rescue and help foster and reunite 4 dogs with their families.</i>
	Attachment	The degree to which the respondent has a connection to the people, New Orleans, or Louisiana.	17% 3.74	21% 4.25	13% 2.92	<i>I have visited Louisiana and was very happy with my visit. I am looking forward to returning in the future. I hope all goes well and everything goes back to normal for everyone. Or as close to normal as possible.</i> <i>My late husband and I spent a wonderful night in the French Quarter of N.O. in the spring of 1997. I am grateful that I had a chance to share that experience with him. The people were all very gracious and we had a wonderful time. My mom and I had hoped to include N.O. in our vacation plans in spring of 2005, but had to cut our trip short for personal reasons. After Katrina hit, we were very sorry that we hadn't gone ahead with our original plans, as the last time we had been there had been before either my husband or my dad passed away.</i>
	Preservation	The level of belief that culture of New Orleans/ Louisiana is unique and should be preserved	2% 2.45	3% 2.22	2% 2.80	<i>(I) would like to see the state back to where it was before the hurricanes. (I) always enjoyed my visits to the state and the people there. (I) spent my military time long ago and have never forgotten the times -- good times I had. (I) have been back many times since and love the people and the culture. It must not be lost...</i> <i>I believe Louisiana is a beautiful state and has a unique history and culture that should be preserved at any cost. We would lose a valuable part of the history of this country if we allow the architecture and artifacts of Louisiana to go unrestored.</i> <i>What does Louisiana mean to the country. It would be a tragedy if the culture, customs, and physical characteristics were lost and not preserved for the history of the US.</i>

¹ The degree to which each respondent's statement emphasized the theme. Based on a scale of 1 (not emphasized at all) to 5 (emphasized to a great extent).

Decisions (Past & Pending)	Inadequacy	The degree of feeling that the federal government response was substandard.	15% 3.29	14% 3.12	16% 3.43	<p><i>If you had asked me if recovery efforts by the Federal Government have been fast enough I would have said "no".</i></p> <p><i>I am disgusted, especially with the Fed. government for the lack of responsiveness to LA people.</i></p> <p>I WISH PRESIDENT BUSH WOULD SPEND MORE ON THE HURRICANE STATES THAN OVERSEAS ON WAR.</p> <p><i>The whole mess with Katrina, particularly the incidents in New Orleans, were completely the fault of bad planning and implementation of the state and local governmental agencies. Yet instead of stepping up and doing their jobs they decided to get on National television to tell lies and exaggerations, and to blame the federal government for not doing things that were the sole responsibilities of the state/local governments.</i></p> <p><i>I feel the Katrina situation was handled very unprofessionally. People walked away from their responsibilities to enforce the law, assist the ones that their homes were demolished and control of those peoples. No plan, worth using, was involved. The State officials evidently did not communicate with each other. They continued to throw mud at each other for months. Anyone can do anything they make up their minds to do. I know from personal experience. You don't just sit down and wait for someone to give you money and homes, etc. It does not work that way!!</i></p> <p><i>Ask me how I feel about the government officials in Louisiana. (They are) responsible for planning and more importantly implementing evacuation and relief efforts. Personally I feel that the government and the mayor of New Orleans willfully abandoned their people and if I lived there I would start an immediate recall petition and ask that they be tried for treason.</i></p> <p><i>I believe the old houses should be torn down and a village built in a section for those who want to live there. We should take care of our own!</i></p> <p><i>I think Louisiana is making a mistake trying to put it back the way it was. I believe that much of the flooded are should not be rebuilt because I feel these types of storms will happen again. Things must be done to put the buffer zones that have been destroyed back.</i></p> <p><i>I think the levees, etc., should be completed to prevent any more losses and that the government and state should shoulder the responsibility.</i></p>
	Disapproval	The degree to which Louisiana local and/or state government leaders behaved inappropriately.	27% 3.64	31% 3.49	23% 3.83	
	Solutions	The degree of concern with rebuilding process/progress.	12% 2.93	12% 2.92	12% 2.94	

<p align="center">Conflict (I feel bad BUT)</p>	<p>Sympathy/ empathy</p>	<p>The degree of understanding or compassion extended to people affected by the hurricane.</p>	<p>13% 3.35</p>	<p>3% 2.90</p>	<p>20% 3.42</p>	<p><i>The people from Louisiana went through devastation. They are working hard in rebuilding their lives and I can appreciate that having lived through Andrew in Miami and Wilma this year in Ft Lauderdale/Broward County.</i></p> <p><i>It's just very sad to see what they are still dealing with and it's not long to the next hurricane season.</i></p> <p><i>I feel very bad for the people whose homes were destroyed by hurricanes. I don't see how those poor people can ever recover from their huge losses.</i></p>
	<p>Entitlement</p>	<p>The degree to which New Orleans residents behaved inappropriately before, during, or after the hurricane.</p>	<p>22% 3.72</p>	<p>25% 3.67</p>	<p>21% 3.78</p>	<p><i>It's been months and it just seems, a FEW of the former resident don't want to get out on their own, they want to continue to live off the government.</i></p> <p><i>I work in Baker, were one of the FEMA trailer parks is. I've watched the 9th ward people come in the stores, fill a buggy with beer then run out the door with it. My negative feelings aren't for all the people of LA. Just the ones who aren't willing to work, or try and help themselves. We seem to have a whole class of people who think the rest of us taxpayers should support them. They don't work because they don't want to, and it kind of seems like they don't have to. I work three jobs to afford to live, why shouldn't everyone else be able to work at least one?</i></p> <p><i>People are going to have to STOP waiting for the government to take care of them and do it themselves.</i></p>
	<p>Self-Concern</p>	<p>The degree to which respondents acknowledge the situation, but do not appear to be sympathetic, although they have been in similar situations.</p>	<p>7% 3.44</p>	<p>7% 3.27</p>	<p>7% 3.60</p>	<p><i>Sorry for the problems, we have some too.</i></p> <p><i>I was also affected by the storms (Wilma).</i></p> <p><i>Louisiana is just one of the states that have been affected ... I would rather help the ones in (my) own area.</i></p>

REFERENCES:

- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich (1967). *Letters and Papers From Prison*, (E. Bethge, Ed.), New York: Macmillan.
- Emmons, Robert A. (2004). "The Psychology of Gratitude: An Introduction," in Robert A. Emmons and Michael E. McCullough (Eds.), *The Psychology of Gratitude* (pp. 3-16), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emmons, Robert A., Michael E. McCullough, and Jo-Ann Tsang (2003). "The Assessment of Gratitude," in Lopez, Shane J. and C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive Psychological Assessment: A Handbook of Models and Measures*, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Emmons, Robert A. and Michael E. McCullough (Eds.), (2004). *The Psychology of Gratitude* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hume, D. (1888). *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Heilbrunn, Gert (1972). "Thank You," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, Vol. 20(July), p. 512-516.
- Kant, I (1964). *The Metaphysical Principles of Virtue: Part II of The Metaphysics of Morals* (J. Ellington, Trans.), Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill (original work published 1797).
- Lynn, Michael and Michael McCall (2000). "Gratitude and Gratitude: a Meta-Analysis of Research on the Service-Tipping Relationship," *Journal of Socioeconomics*, Vol. 29(2), p. 203-214.
- Rind, Bruce and Prashant Bordia (1995). "Effect of Server's 'Thank You' and Personalization on Restaurant Tipping," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 25(May), p. 745-751.
- Schedler, Tom, et al. (2006). Louisiana Senate Concurrent Resolution 129, passed June 16, 2006.
- Smith, Adam (1976). *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (6th ed.), Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press (original work published in 1790).