A Comparison of Hunter Movement Activities and Opinions During Two Pennsylvania Hunting Seasons

APPENDIX F -- SUPPLEMENT

BIVARIATE ANALYSES

A.E. Luloff
J.C. Finley
D. Diefenbach
R.C. Stedman
G. San Julian
H. Zinn
C. Swope
M.A. Brennan
D. Matarrita

Final Report

August 2004

TABLE OF TABLES

Frequencies Year One

Bivariate Analysis Year One

Frequencies Year Two

Bivariate Year Two

Table 1: How many years have you been hunting deer?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	3	.5	.5	.5
2	9	1.4	1.4	1.9
3	4	.6	.6	2.5
4	8	1.3	1.3	3.8
5	4	.6	.6	4.5
6	6	.9	1.0	5.4
7	3	.5	.5	5.9
8	7	1.1	1.1	7.0
9	3	.5	.5	7.5
10	9	1.4	1.4	8.9
11	5	.8	.8	9.7
12	10	1.6	1.6	11.3
13	7	1.1	1.1	12.4
14	5	.8	.8	13.2
15	10	1.6	1.6	14.8
16	9	1.4	1.4	16.2
17	6	.9	1.0	17.2
18	8	1.3	1.3	18.4
19	10	1.6	1.6	20.0
20	21	3.3	3.3	23.4
21	10	1.6	1.6	25.0
22	14	2.2	2.2	27.2
23	5	.8	.8	28.0
24	14	2.2	2.2	30.2
25	21	3.3	3.3	33.5
26	16	2.5	2.5	36.1
27	12	1.9	1.9	38.0
28	21	3.3	3.3	41.3
29	14	2.2	2.2	43.6
30	42	6.6	6.7	50.2
31	5	.8	.8	51.0
32	18	2.8	2.9	53.9
33	11	1.7	1.7	55.6
34	9	1.4	1.4	57.1
35	29	4.6	4.6	61.7
36	15	2.4	2.4	64.1
37	10	1.6	1.6	65.7
38	9	1.4	1.4	67.1
39	10	1.6	1.6	68.7
40	33	5.2	5.2	73.9
41	8	1.3	1.3	75.2
42	15	2.4	2.4	77.6
43	9	1.4	1.4	79.0

	44	6	.9	1.0	80.0
	45	16	2.5	2.5	82.5
	46	9	1.4	1.4	83.9
	47	8	1.3	1.3	85.2
	48	5	.8	.8	86.0
	49	8	1.3	1.3	87.3
	50	22	3.5	3.5	90.8
	51	1	.2	.2	90.9
	52	11	1.7	1.7	92.7
	53	3	.5	.5	93.2
	54	4	.6	.6	93.8
	55	8	1.3	1.3	95.1
	56	4	.6	.6	95.7
	57	4	.6	.6	96.3
	58	2	.3	.3	96.7
	59	5	.8	.8	97.5
	60	6	.9	1.0	98.4
	62	2	.3	.3	98.7
	63	4	.6	.6	99.4
	64	3	.5	.5	99.8
	65	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	629	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.5		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 2: How many years have you hunted deer in Pennsylvania?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	4	.6	.6	.6
2	10	1.6	1.6	2.2
3	4	.6	.6	2.9
4	9	1.4	1.4	4.3
5	5	.8	.8	5.1
6	6	.9	1.0	6.0
7	5	.8	.8	6.8
8	7	1.1	1.1	7.9
9	4	.6	.6	8.6
10	11	1.7	1.7	10.3
11	6	.9	1.0	11.3
12	11	1.7	1.7	13.0
13	6	.9	1.0	14.0
14	5	.8	.8	14.8
15	13	2.1	2.1	16.9
16	9	1.4	1.4	18.3
17	6	.9	1.0	19.2
18	10	1.6	1.6	20.8
19	9	1.4	1.4	22.3
20	22	3.5	3.5	25.8
21	9	1.4	1.4	27.2
22	14	2.2	2.2	29.4
23	6	.9	1.0	30.4
24	17	2.7	2.7	33.1
25	19	3.0	3.0	36.1
26	16	2.5	2.5	38.6
27	12	1.9	1.9	40.5
28	20	3.2	3.2	43.7
29	14	2.2	2.2	45.9
30	39	6.2	6.2	52.1
31	5	.8	.8	52.9
32	19	3.0	3.0	56.0
33	9	1.4	1.4	57.4
34	9	1.4	1.4	58.8
35	28	4.4	4.5	63.3
36	15	2.4	2.4	65.7
37	10	1.6	1.6	67.2
38	10	1.6	1.6	68.8
39	10	1.6	1.6	70.4
40	33	5.2	5.2	75.7

	41	7	1.1	1.1	76.8
	42	13	2.1	2.1	78.9
	43	7	1.1	1.1	80.0
	44	5	.8	.8	80.8
	45	16	2.5	2.5	83.3
	46	9	1.4	1.4	84.7
	47	8	1.3	1.3	86.0
	48	6	.9	1.0	87.0
	49	7	1.1	1.1	88.1
	50	21	3.3	3.3	91.4
	51	1	.2	.2	91.6
	52	10	1.6	1.6	93.2
	53	4	.6	.6	93.8
	54	4	.6	.6	94.4
	55	8	1.3	1.3	95.7
	56	4	.6	.6	96.3
	57	4	.6	.6	97.0
	58	2	.3	.3	97.3
	59	6	.9	1.0	98.3
	60	3	.5	.5	98.7
	61	1	.2	.2	98.9
	62	1	.2	.2	99.0
	63	3	.5	.5	99.5
	64	2	.3	.3	99.8
	65	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	629	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.5		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 3: How many years have you hunted deer in the Sproul State Forest?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1	.2	.2	.2
1	24	3.8	3.8	4.0
2	32	5.1	5.1	9.1
3	20	3.2	3.2	12.3
4	16	2.5	2.6	14.8
5	22	3.5	3.5	18.3
6	15	2.4	2.4	20.7
7	9	1.4	1.4	22.2
8	9	1.4	1.4	23.6
9	6	.9	1.0	24.6
10	20	3.2	3.2	27.8
11	4	.6	.6	28.4
12	17	2.7	2.7	31.1
13	5	.8	.8	31.9
14	8	1.3	1.3	33.2
15	28	4.4	4.5	37.6
16	6	.9	1.0	38.6
17	1	.2	.2	38.8
18	12	1.9	1.9	40.7
19	8	1.3	1.3	41.9
20	31	4.9	4.9	46.9
21	9	1.4	1.4	48.3
22	18	2.8	2.9	51.2
23	5	.8	.8	52.0
24	12	1.9	1.9	53.9
25	34	5.4	5.4	59.3
26	15	2.4	2.4	61.7
27	14	2.2	2.2	64.0
28	12	1.9	1.9	65.9
29	12	1.9	1.9	67.8
30	34	5.4	5.4	73.2
31	5	.8	.8	74.0
32	7	1.1	1.1	75.1
33	9	1.4	1.4	76.6
34	11	1.7	1.8	78.3
35	20	3.2	3.2	81.5
36	8	1.3	1.3	82.8
37	5	.8	.8	83.6
38	5	.8	.8	84.4
39	4	.6	.6	85.0
40	18	2.8	2.9	87.9
41	4	.6	.6	88.5
42	6	.9	1.0	89.5

	43	1	.2	.2	89.6
	44	4	.6	.6	90.3
	45	8	1.3	1.3	91.5
	46	1	.2	.2	91.7
	47	2	.3	.3	92.0
	48	5	.8	.8	92.8
	49	6	.9	1.0	93.8
	50	10	1.6	1.6	95.4
	51	3	.5	.5	95.9
	52	4	.6	.6	96.5
	53	2	.3	.3	96.8
	54	2	.3	.3	97.1
	55	2	.3	.3	97.4
	56	1	.2	.2	97.6
	57	1	.2	.2	97.8
	58	1	.2	.2	97.9
	59	5	.8	.8	98.7
	60	3	.5	.5	99.2
	61	1	.2	.2	99.4
	63	2	.3	.3	99.7
	64	1	.2	.2	99.8
	65	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 4: How many years have you hunted antlerless deer in the Sproul?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	244	38.6	39.4	39.4
1	53	8.4	8.6	48.0
2	48	7.6	7.8	55.7
3	24	3.8	3.9	59.6
4	10	1.6	1.6	61.2
5	39	6.2	6.3	67.5
6	17	2.7	2.7	70.3
7	2	.3	.3	70.6
8	3	.5	.5	71.1
9	2	.3	.3	71.4
10	33	5.2	5.3	76.7
11	2	.3	.3	77.1
12	7	1.1	1.1	78.2
13	2	.3	.3	78.5
14	2	.3	.3	78.8
15	22	3.5	3.6	82.4
16	1	.2	.2	82.6
18	5	.8	.8	83.4
19	5	.8	.8	84.2
20	23	3.6	3.7	87.9
21	4	.6	.6	88.5
22	7	1.1	1.1	89.7
23	2	.3	.3	90.0
24	2	.3	.3	90.3
25	13	2.1	2.1	92.4
26	4	.6	.6	93.1
27	5	.8	.8	93.9
28	3	.5	.5	94.3
29	2	.3	.3	94.7
30	14	2.2	2.3	96.9
31	1	.2	.2	97.1
32	2	.3	.3	97.4
34	2	.3	.3	97.7
35	1	.2	.2	97.9
36	1	.2	.2	98.1
37	2	.3	.3	98.4
40	1	.2	.2	98.5
41	1	.2	.2	98.7
45	2	.3	.3	99.0
46	1	.2	.2	99.2
47	1	.2	.2	99.4
48	1	.2	.2	99.5
49	1	.2	.2	99.7

	52	1	.2	.2	99.8
	59	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	619	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	13	2.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 5: Compared to other years, how much time did you spend hunting deer on the Sproul in the 2001 season?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 more time	138	21.8	22.3	22.3
	2 about the same	347	54.9	56.1	78.4
	3 less time	134	21.2	21.6	100.0
	Total	619	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	13	2.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 6: In addition to the general hunting license, which other licenses or stamps do you have for the 2001 season?

6A Archery license		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1	220	34.8	35.1	35.1
	2	407	64.4	64.9	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

6B Flintlock/muzzleloader		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1	190	30.1	30.3	30.3
	2	437	69.1	69.7	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

6C Combination license		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	1	.2	.2	.2
	1	39	6.2	6.2	6.4
	2	587	92.9	93.6	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

6D Antlerless license		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1	365	57.8	58.2	58.2
	2	262	41.5	41.8	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 7: What kind of hunter do you consider yourself to primarily be?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 archery hunter	88	13.9	14.1	14.1
	2 firearm hunter	522	82.6	83.7	97.8
	3 flintlock/muzzleloader hunter	14	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 8: Did you kill an antlered deer killed in 2001?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	466	73.7	74.4	74.4
	2 yes	160	25.3	25.6	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 9: In what season did you kill this antlered deer (2001)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 early archery	11	1.7	6.8	6.8
	3 firearm	145	22.9	89.5	96.3
	4 late archery	4	.6	2.5	98.8
	5 late flintlock/muzzleloader	2	.3	1.2	100.0
	Total	162	25.6	100.0	
Missing	System	470	74.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 10: Did you kill an antlered deer in 2000?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 no	436	69.0	70.3	70.3
	2 yes	184	29.1	29.7	100.0
	Total	620	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	12	1.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 11: In what season did you kill this antlered deer (2000)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 early archery	21	3.3	11.4	11.4
	2 firearm	159	25.2	86.4	97.8
	3 flintlock/muzzleloader	2	.3	1.1	98.9
	4 late archery	2	.3	1.1	100.0
	Total	184	29.1	100.0	
Missing	System	448	70.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 12: Did you kill an antlered deer in 1999?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	419	66.3	67.7	67.7
	2 yes	200	31.6	32.3	100.0
	Total	619	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	13	2.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 13: In what season did you kill this antlered deer (1999)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 early archery	20	3.2	10.0	10.0
	2 firearm	178	28.2	88.6	98.5
	3 flintlock/muzzleloader	1	.2	.5	99.0
	4 late archery	2	.3	1.0	100.0
	Total	201	31.8	100.0	
Missing	System	431	68.2		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 14: Did you kill an antlerless deer in 2001?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	463	73.3	74.8	74.8
	2 yes	156	24.7	25.2	100.0
	Total	619	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	13	2.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 15: In what season did you kill this antlerless (2001)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 early archery	15	2.4	9.5	9.5
	2 firearm	114	18.0	72.2	81.6
	3 October firearm season	4	.6	2.5	84.2
	4 early flintlock/muzzleloader	2	.3	1.3	85.4
	5 late flintlock/muzzleloader	20	3.2	12.7	98.1
	6 late archery	3	.5	1.9	100.0
	Total	158	25.0	100.0	
Missing	System	474	75.0		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 16: Did you kill an antlerless deer in 2000?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	442	69.9	71.6	71.6
	2 yes	175	27.7	28.4	100.0
	Total	617	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	15	2.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 17: In what season did you kill this antlerless deer (2000)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 early archery	19	3.0	10.7	10.7
	2 firearm	124	19.6	70.1	80.8
	3 flintlock/muzzleloader	32	5.1	18.1	98.9
	4 late archery	2	.3	1.1	100.0
	Total	177	28.0	100.0	
Missing	System	455	72.0		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 18: Did you kill an antlerless deer in 1999?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	438	69.3	71.6	71.6
	2 yes	174	27.5	28.4	100.0
	Total	612	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	20	3.2		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 19: In what season did you kill this antlerless (1999)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 early archery	19	3.0	11.0	11.0
	2 firearm	126	19.9	72.8	83.8
	3 flintlock/muzzleloader	26	4.1	15.0	98.8
	4 late archery	2	.3	1.2	100.0
	Total	173	27.4	100.0	
Missing	System	459	72.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 20: What is the furthest you are willing to travel from your home to hunt antlered deer in a concurrent season?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	2	.3	.3	.3
1	1	.2	.2	.5
3	1	.2	.2	.7
5	1	.2	.2	.8
10	2	.3	.3	1.2
11	2	.3	.3	1.5
12	1	.2	.2	1.7
13	1	.2	.2	1.9
14	1	.2	.2	2.0
15	4	.6	.7	2.7
16	1	.2	.2	2.9
17	1	.2	.2	3.0
20	19	3.0	3.2	6.2
25	14	2.2	2.4	8.6
28	1	.2	.2	8.8
28	1	.2	.2	8.9
30	22	3.5	3.7	12.6
35	2	.3	.3	13.0
37	1	.2	.2	13.1
38	1	.2	.2	13.3
40	16	2.5	2.7	16.0
43	1	.2	.2	16.2
44	1	.2	.2	16.3
45	1	.2	.2	16.5
50	74	11.7	12.5	29.0
60	16	2.5	2.7	31.6
65	1	.2	.2	31.8
70	7	1.1	1.2	33.0
75	10	1.6	1.7	34.7
80	6	.9	1.0	35.7
84	1	.2	.2	35.9
85	1	.2	.2	36.0
86	1	.2	.2	36.2
90	4	.6	.7	36.9
100	66	10.4	11.1	48.0
105	1	.2	.2	48.1
110	1	.2	.2	48.3
111	1	.2	.2	48.5
116	2	.3	.3	48.8
120	6	.9	1.0	49.8
125	6	.9	1.0	50.8
130	7	1.1	1.2	52.0

	140	2	.3	.3	52.4
	145	2	.3	.3	52.7
	150	71	11.2	12.0	64.6
	160	11	1.7	1.9	66.5
	161	1	.2	.2	66.7
	165	1	.2	.2	66.8
	170	3	.5	.5	67.3
	175	9	1.4	1.5	68.9
	180	13	2.1	2.2	71.0
	186	1	.2	.2	71.2
	200	76	12.0	12.8	84.0
	210	1	.2	.2	84.2
	220	3	.5	.5	84.7
	225	4	.6	.7	85.4
	230	1	.2	.2	85.5
	235	1	.2	.2	85.7
	240	1	.2	.2	85.9
	250	32	5.1	5.4	91.2
	300	21	3.3	3.5	94.8
	325	1	.2	.2	94.9
	350	5	.8	.8	95.8
	400	2	.3	.3	96.1
	450	1	.2	.2	96.3
	465	1	.2	.2	96.5
	500	8	1.3	1.3	97.8
	600	2	.3	.3	98.1
	700	1	.2	.2	98.3
	756	1	.2	.2	98.5
	760	1	.2	.2	98.7
	1000	1	.2	.2	98.8
	2000	3	.5	.5	99.3
	2300	1	.2	.2	99.5
	3000	2	.3	.3	99.8
	5000	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	594	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	38	6.0		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 21: What is the furthest you are willing to travel from your home to hunt antlerless deer in a concurrent season?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	92	14.6	15.8	15.8
1	4	.6	.7	16.5
2	4	.6	.7	17.2
3	3	.5	.5	17.7
4	1	.2	.2	17.9
5	11	1.7	1.9	19.8
10	18	2.8	3.1	22.9
11	2	.3	.3	23.2
12	2	.3	.3	23.5
15	9	1.4	1.5	25.1
17	1	.2	.2	25.3
20	36	5.7	6.2	31.4
25	18	2.8	3.1	34.5
28	1	.2	.2	34.7
30	35	5.5	6.0	40.7
35	2	.3	.3	41.1
38	1	.2	.2	41.2
40	19	3.0	3.3	44.5
44	1	.2	.2	44.7
45	1	.2	.2	44.8
50	85	13.4	14.6	59.5
60	9	1.4	1.5	61.0
70	5	.8	.9	61.9
75	8	1.3	1.4	63.2
80	6	.9	1.0	64.3
85	1	.2	.2	64.4
86	1	.2	.2	64.6
100	46	7.3	7.9	72.5
116	2	.3	.3	72.9
120	4	.6	.7	73.5
125	3	.5	.5	74.1
130	4	.6	.7	74.7
140	2	.3	.3	75.1
145	1	.2	.2	75.3
149	1	.2	.2	75.4
150	32	5.1	5.5	80.9
160	7	1.1	1.2	82.1
165	1	.2	.2	82.3
170	2	.3	.3	82.6
175	3	.5	.5	83.2
180	8	1.3	1.4	84.5
186	1	.2	.2	84.7

	200	46	7.3	7.9	92.6
	210	1	.2	.2	92.8
	225	2	.3	.3	93.1
	230	1	.2	.2	93.3
	250	15	2.4	2.6	95.9
	280	1	.2	.2	96.0
	300	12	1.9	2.1	98.1
	350	3	.5	.5	98.6
	400	1	.2	.2	98.8
	450	1	.2	.2	99.0
	465	1	.2	.2	99.1
	500	3	.5	.5	99.7
	700	1	.2	.2	99.8
	5000	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	582	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	50	7.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 22: How many days did you spend afield in each of the following 2001 hunting seasons?

22A Days afield early archery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	413	65.3	66.6	66.6
1	9	1.4	1.5	68.1
2	9	1.4	1.5	69.5
3	19	3.0	3.1	72.6
4	11	1.7	1.8	74.4
5	23	3.6	3.7	78.1
6	10	1.6	1.6	79.7
7	6	.9	1.0	80.6
8	10	1.6	1.6	82.3
9	4	.6	.6	82.9
10	36	5.7	5.8	88.7
11	6	.9	1.0	89.7
12	12	1.9	1.9	91.6
13	1	.2	.2	91.8
14	11	1.7	1.8	93.5
15	13	2.1	2.1	95.6
16	1	.2	.2	95.8
17	1	.2	.2	96.0
18	2	.3	.3	96.3
20	6	.9	1.0	97.3
21	1	.2	.2	97.4
22	2	.3	.3	97.7
23	1	.2	.2	97.9
24	1	.2	.2	98.1

	25	5	.8	.8	98.9
	26	1	.2	.2	99.0
	28	1	.2	.2	99.2
	30	4	.6	.6	99.8
	32	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	620	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	12	1.9		
Total		632	100.0		

22B Days afield early flintlock		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	523	82.8	84.2	84.2
	1	28	4.4	4.5	88.7
	2	28	4.4	4.5	93.2
	3	22	3.5	3.5	96.8
	4	9	1.4	1.4	98.2
	5	5	.8	.8	99.0
	6	4	.6	.6	99.7
	10	2	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	621	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	1.7		
Total		632	100.0		

22C Days afield October antlerless		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	560	88.6	90.2	90.2
	1	20	3.2	3.2	93.4
	2	25	4.0	4.0	97.4
	3	12	1.9	1.9	99.4
	4	1	.2	.2	99.5
	5	2	.3	.3	99.8
	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	621	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	1.7		
Total		632	100.0		

22 Days afield firearm		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	15	2.4	2.4	2.4
	1	19	3.0	3.1	5.5
	2	40	6.3	6.5	12.0
	3	85	13.4	13.8	25.7
	4	77	12.2	12.5	38.2
	5	105	16.6	17.0	55.2
	6	70	11.1	11.3	66.5
	7	46	7.3	7.4	73.9
	8	1	.2	.2	74.1
	8	37	5.9	6.0	80.1
	9	15	2.4	2.4	82.5
	10	55	8.7	8.9	91.4
	11	7	1.1	1.1	92.6
	12	37	5.9	6.0	98.5
	13	2	.3	.3	98.9
	14	3	.5	.5	99.4
	18	1	.2	.2	99.5
	20	1	.2	.2	99.7
	25	1	.2	.2	99.8
	30	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	618	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.2		
Total		632	100.0		

22E Days afield late flintlock/muzzleloader	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	454	71.8	73.5	73.5
1	14	2.2	2.3	75.7
2	22	3.5	3.6	79.3
3	31	4.9	5.0	84.3
4	22	3.5	3.6	87.9
5	29	4.6	4.7	92.6
6	16	2.5	2.6	95.1
7	6	.9	1.0	96.1
8	4	.6	.6	96.8
9	4	.6	.6	97.4
10	7	1.1	1.1	98.5
11	1	.2	.2	98.7
12	3	.5	.5	99.2
13	1	.2	.2	99.4
15	1	.2	.2	99.5
16	2	.3	.3	99.8

	21	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	618	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.2		
Total		632	100.0		

22F Days afield late archery		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	569	90.0	92.1	92.1
	1	12	1.9	1.9	94.0
	2	13	2.1	2.1	96.1
	3	7	1.1	1.1	97.2
	4	2	.3	.3	97.6
	5	5	.8	.8	98.4
	6	1	.2	.2	98.5
	7	2	.3	.3	98.9
	8	1	.2	.2	99.0
	10	4	.6	.6	99.7
	12	1	.2	.2	99.8
	13	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	618	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.2		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 23: How many days, in total, did you spend visiting your hunting areas, in the 2001 hunting season, when you were not hunting deer?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	32	5.1	5.3	5.3
1	68	10.8	11.3	16.6
2	64	10.1	10.6	27.2
3	1	.2	.2	27.4
3	54	8.5	9.0	36.3
4	1	.2	.2	36.5
4	55	8.7	9.1	45.6
5	46	7.3	7.6	53.2
6	32	5.1	5.3	58.5
7	20	3.2	3.3	61.9
8	20	3.2	3.3	65.2
9	6	.9	1.0	66.2
10	1	.2	.2	66.3
10	48	7.6	8.0	74.3
12	14	2.2	2.3	76.6
14	9	1.4	1.5	78.1
15	18	2.8	3.0	81.1

	16	2	.3	.3	81.4
	17	1	.2	.2	81.6
	18	2	.3	.3	81.9
	20	34	5.4	5.6	87.6
	23	2	.3	.3	87.9
	24	2	.3	.3	88.2
	25	16	2.5	2.7	90.9
	26	1	.2	.2	91.0
	28	1	.2	.2	91.2
	30	25	4.0	4.1	95.4
	33	1	.2	.2	95.5
	35	1	.2	.2	95.7
	36	1	.2	.2	95.9
	37	1	.2	.2	96.0
	40	7	1.1	1.2	97.2
	45	3	.5	.5	97.7
	50	5	.8	.8	98.5
	60	4	.6	.7	99.2
	82	1	.2	.2	99.3
	86	1	.2	.2	99.5
	90	1	.2	.2	99.7
	100	1	.2	.2	99.8
	200	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	603	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	29	4.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 24: For each of the following 2001 hunting seasons, where did you primarily hunt?

24A Archery		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Bureau of Forestry	70	11.1	34.5	34.5
	2 PA Game Commission	40	6.3	19.7	54.2
	4 Other Public	16	2.5	7.9	62.1
	5 Hunting Club Lands	4	.6	2.0	64.0
	6 Posted Lands	37	5.9	18.2	82.3
	7 Not posted lands	36	5.7	17.7	100.0
	Total	203	32.1	100.0	
Missing	System	429	67.9		
Total		632	100.0		

24B Early Flintlock		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Bureau of Forestry	32	5.1	34.8	34.8
	2 PA Game Commission	18	2.8	19.6	54.3
	3 Allegheny National Forest	1	.2	1.1	55.4
	4 Other Public	8	1.3	8.7	64.1
	5 Hunting Club Lands	3	.5	3.3	67.4
	6 Posted Lands	9	1.4	9.8	77.2
	7 Not posted lands	21	3.3	22.8	100.0
	Total	92	14.6	100.0	
Missing	System	540	85.4		
Total		632	100.0		

24C October Antlerless Firearm		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Bureau of Forestry	21	3.3	26.9	26.9
	2 PA Game Commission	20	3.2	25.6	52.6
	3 Allegheny National Forest	3	.5	3.8	56.4
	4 Other Public	9	1.4	11.5	67.9
	5 Hunting Club Lands	2	.3	2.6	70.5
	6 Posted Lands	6	.9	7.7	78.2
	7 Not posted lands	17	2.7	21.8	100.0
	Total	78	12.3	100.0	
Missing	System	554	87.7		
Total		632	100.0		

24D Firearm		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Bureau of Forestry	305	48.3	51.8	51.8
	2 PA Game Commission	165	26.1	28.0	79.8
	3 Allegheny National Forest	28	4.4	4.8	84.6
	4 Other Public	46	7.3	7.8	92.4
	5 Hunting Club Lands	13	2.1	2.2	94.6
	6 Posted Lands	14	2.2	2.4	96.9
	7 Not posted lands	18	2.8	3.1	100.0
	Total	589	93.2	100.0	
Missing	System	43	6.8		
Total		632	100.0		

24E Late Flintlock		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Bureau of Forestry	49	7.8	30.6	30.6
	2 PA Game Commission	34	5.4	21.3	51.9
	3 Allegheny National Forest	2	.3	1.3	53.1
	4 Other Public	12	1.9	7.5	60.6
	5 Hunting Club Lands	7	1.1	4.4	65.0
	6 Posted Lands	26	4.1	16.3	81.3
	7 Not posted lands	30	4.7	18.8	100.0
	Total	160	25.3	100.0	
Missing	System	472	74.7		
Total		632	100.0		

24D Late Archery		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Bureau of Forestry	13	2.1	26.0	26.0
	2 PA Game Commission	8	1.3	16.0	42.0
	3 Allegheny National Forest	1	.2	2.0	44.0
	4 Other Public	4	.6	8.0	52.0
	6 Posted Lands	12	1.9	24.0	76.0
	7 Not posted lands	12	1.9	24.0	100.0
	Total	50	7.9	100.0	
Missing	System	582	92.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 25: How far do you travel from your home to hunt deer in the Sproul?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	1	.2	.2	.2
4	1	.2	.2	.3
5	5	.8	.8	1.1
6	3	.5	.5	1.6
7	1	.2	.2	1.8
8	1	.2	.2	1.9
10	14	2.2	2.3	4.2
11	2	.3	.3	4.5
12	5	.8	.8	5.3
13	1	.2	.2	5.5
13	3	.5	.5	6.0
14	1	.2	.2	6.2
15	14	2.2	2.3	8.4
16	3	.5	.5	8.9

17	3	.5	.5	9.4
18	1	.2	.2	9.6
20	22	3.5	3.6	13.1
22	1	.2	.2	13.3
23	1	.2	.2	13.5
23	1	.2	.2	13.6
24	1	.2	.2	13.8
25	19	3.0	3.1	16.9
26	2	.3	.3	17.2
27	2	.3	.3	17.5
28	1	.2	.2	17.7
28	2	.3	.3	18.0
30	22	3.5	3.6	21.6
32	1	.2	.2	21.7
33	3	.5	.5	22.2
35	19	3.0	3.1	25.3
37	1	.2	.2	25.4
38	1	.2	.2	25.6
38	1	.2	.2	25.8
40	21	3.3	3.4	29.2
42	1	.2	.2	29.3
43	1	.2	.2	29.5
45	11	1.7	1.8	31.3
48	2	.3	.3	31.6
50	36	5.7	5.8	37.4
52	1	.2	.2	37.6
55	4	.6	.6	38.2
60	11	1.7	1.8	40.0
62	1	.2	.2	40.2
65	2	.3	.3	40.5
70	2	.3	.3	40.8
71	1	.2	.2	41.0
71	1	.2	.2	41.2
72	1	.2	.2	41.3
74	1	.2	.2	41.5
75	9	1.4	1.5	42.9
78	1	.2	.2	43.1
80	13	2.1	2.1	45.2
84	1	.2	.2	45.4
85	2	.3	.3	45.7
86	2	.3	.3	46.0
90	9	1.4	1.5	47.5
92	1	.2	.2	47.6
95	1	.2	.2	47.8
98	1	.2	.2	48.0
100	23	3.6	3.7	51.7
105	1	.2	.2	51.9

106	1	.2	.2	52.0
110	3	.5	.5	52.5
111	1	.2	.2	52.7
115	2	.3	.3	53.0
116	2	.3	.3	53.3
120	19	3.0	3.1	56.4
125	13	2.1	2.1	58.5
128	1	.2	.2	58.7
130	15	2.4	2.4	61.1
135	3	.5	.5	61.6
137	1	.2	.2	61.8
138	1	.2	.2	61.9
140	10	1.6	1.6	63.5
142	1	.2	.2	63.7
144	1	.2	.2	63.9
145	3	.5	.5	64.3
146	1	.2	.2	64.5
147	1	.2	.2	64.7
150	55	8.7	8.9	73.6
155	2	.3	.3	73.9
156	1	.2	.2	74.1
160	15	2.4	2.4	76.5
161	1	.2	.2	76.7
165	6	.9	1.0	77.6
168	1	.2	.2	77.8
170	8	1.3	1.3	79.1
173	1	.2	.2	79.3
175	11	1.7	1.8	81.0
176	1	.2	.2	81.2
179	1	.2	.2	81.4
180	18	2.8	2.9	84.3
181	1	.2	.2	84.4
186	1	.2	.2	84.6
187	1	.2	.2	84.8
190	1	.2	.2	84.9
195	1	.2	.2	85.1
200	34	5.4	5.5	90.6
210	3	.5	.5	91.1
215	1	.2	.2	91.2
220	3	.5	.5	91.7
225	5	.8	.8	92.5
230	2	.3	.3	92.9
235	2	.3	.3	93.2
240	1	.2	.2	93.4
250	19	3.0	3.1	96.4
268	1	.2	.2	96.6
300	6	.9	1.0	97.6

	325	1	.2	.2	97.7
	350	2	.3	.3	98.1
	375	1	.2	.2	98.2
	400	1	.2	.2	98.4
	450	1	.2	.2	98.5
	460	1	.2	.2	98.7
	465	1	.2	.2	98.9
	505	1	.2	.2	99.0
	600	2	.3	.3	99.4
	700	1	.2	.2	99.5
	760	1	.2	.2	99.7
	1500	1	.2	.2	99.8
	3000	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	617	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	15	2.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 26: When hunting deer in the Sproul, do you normally stay away from home?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	101	16.0	16.2	16.2
	2 yes	522	82.6	83.8	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 27: Do you own, belong to, or use a camp in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 own camp	116	18.4	18.7	18.7
	2 belong to camp	268	42.4	43.2	61.9
	3 use camp	91	14.4	14.7	76.6
	4 none of the above	145	22.9	23.4	100.0
	Total	620	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	12	1.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 28: When hunting deer in the Sproul, how would you best describe the topography where you most often hunt?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 upper plateau flats	109	17.2	17.5	17.5
	2 side hills	100	15.8	16.1	33.5
	3 valley bottoms	17	2.7	2.7	36.3
	4 mixed topography	397	62.8	63.7	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 29: Please rank the most frequently hunted habitat types.

29A Most frequently hunted habitat		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Oak dominated area, open wooded	183	29.0	29.4	29.4
	2 Maple and other hardwood dominated area, open wooded	25	4.0	4.0	33.4
	3 Pine and hemlock dominated area, open wooded	24	3.8	3.9	37.3
	4 Wooded area with dense stands of Mt. Laurel or rhododendron	281	44.5	45.2	82.5
	5 Dense wooded area, limited visibility	48	7.6	7.7	90.2
	6 Large areas with no undergrowth and patchy tree	7	1.1	1.1	91.3
	7 Forest with mixed ages, open area	33	5.2	5.3	96.6
	8 Mixed low vegetation, open area	21	3.3	3.4	100.0
	Total	622	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.6		
Total		632	100.0		

29B Second most frequently hunted habitat		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Oak dominated area, open wooded	87	13.8	14.0	14.0
	2 Maple and other hardwood dominated area, open wooded	62	9.8	10.0	24.0
	3 Pine and hemlock dominated area, open wooded	31	4.9	5.0	28.9
	4 Wooded area with dense stands of Mt. Laurel or rhododendron	168	26.6	27.0	55.9
	5 Dense wooded area, limited visibility	149	23.6	24.0	79.9
	6 Large areas with no undergrowth and patchy trees	15	2.4	2.4	82.3
	7 Forest with mixed ages, open area	72	11.4	11.6	93.9
	8 Mixed low vegetation, open area	38	6.0	6.1	100.0
	Total	622	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 30: How supportive would you be of a statewide antler restriction that requires bucks to have at least three points on one side?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly oppose	136	21.5	21.7	21.7
	2 oppose	158	25.0	25.2	47.0
	3 slightly oppose	65	10.3	10.4	57.3
	4 neither support nor oppose	56	8.9	8.9	66.3
	5 slightly support	56	8.9	8.9	75.2
	6 support	67	10.6	10.7	85.9
	7 strongly support	88	13.9	14.1	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 31: How supportive would you be of antler restriction in the Sproul that requires bucks to have at least three points on one side?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly oppose	146	23.1	23.4	23.4
	2 oppose	149	23.6	23.9	47.3
	3 slightly oppose	74	11.7	11.9	59.1
	4 neither support nor oppose	38	6.0	6.1	65.2
	5 slightly support	44	7.0	7.1	72.3
	6 support	83	13.1	13.3	85.6
	7 strongly support	90	14.2	14.4	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 32: While in the field, do you typically hunt alone?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	281	44.5	45.0	45.0
	2 yes	344	54.4	55.0	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 33: During the 2001 rifle season, how did you typically hunt?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 drives with 9 or less hunters	60	9.5	9.6	9.6
	2 drives with ten or more hunters	39	6.2	6.2	15.8
	3 in ground stand	167	26.4	26.6	42.4
	4 in tree stand	134	21.2	21.4	63.8
	5 stalking	134	21.2	21.4	85.2
	6 small quiet pushes	71	11.2	11.3	96.5
	7 other	22	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 34: Compared to other years, how much time you spend driving deer on the Sproul in the 2001 rifle season?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 did not drive deer	304	48.1	48.9	48.9
	2 less time	103	16.3	16.6	65.4
	3 about the same amount of time	175	27.7	28.1	93.6
	4 more time	40	6.3	6.4	100.0
	Total	622	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 35: With the changes to concurrent seasons are you now more likely to buy an antlerless license to hunt in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	258	40.8	41.2	41.2
	2 no	368	58.2	58.8	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 36: Did the new concurrent season change the way you hunted deer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	109	17.2	17.4	17.4
	2 no	519	82.1	82.6	100.0
	Total	628	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 37: Did the new concurrent season change the way your group or camp hunted deer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	65	10.3	10.8	10.8
	2 no	536	84.8	89.2	100.0
	Total	601	95.1	100.0	
Missing	System	31	4.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 38: Percent of time spent monitoring youth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	60	9.5	41.4	41.4
	0.5	1	.2	.7	42.1
	1.0	1	.2	.7	42.8
	3.0	1	.2	.7	43.4
	5.0	5	.8	3.4	46.9
	10.0	12	1.9	8.3	55.2
	15.0	3	.5	2.1	57.2
	20.0	6	.9	4.1	61.4
	25.0	3	.5	2.1	63.4
	30.0	6	.9	4.1	67.6
	35.0	1	.2	.7	68.3
	40.0	6	.9	4.1	72.4
	50.0	14	2.2	9.7	82.1
	60.0	1	.2	.7	82.8
	70.0	2	.3	1.4	84.1
	75.0	3	.5	2.1	86.2
	80.0	2	.3	1.4	87.6
	90.0	5	.8	3.4	91.0
	95.0	3	.5	2.1	93.1
	100.0	10	1.6	6.9	100.0
	Total	145	22.9	100.0	
Missing	System	487	77.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 39: In total, during the 2001 hunting season, how many people purchased hunting licenses in your household?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	7	1.1	1.2	1.2
	1	397	62.8	65.8	67.0
	2	143	22.6	23.7	90.7
	3	43	6.8	7.1	97.8
	4	10	1.6	1.7	99.5
	5	2	.3	.3	99.8
	6	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	603	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	29	4.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 40: How many were junior licenses holders?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	509	80.5	86.6	86.6
	1	59	9.3	10.0	96.6
	2	20	3.2	3.4	100.0
	Total	588	93.0	100.0	
Missing	System	44	7.0		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 41: In the 2001 hunting season, what was the maximum distance you hunted from a paved road in the Sproul?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1	.2	.2	.2
.1	1	.2	.2	.3
.2	3	.5	.5	.8
.3	2	.3	.3	1.1
.5	18	2.8	2.9	4.0
.7	4	.6	.6	4.7
.8	5	.8	.8	5.5
1.0	48	7.6	7.7	13.2
1.1	1	.2	.2	13.4
1.2	6	.9	1.0	14.3
1.3	1	.2	.2	14.5
1.5	30	4.7	4.8	19.3
1.6	1	.2	.2	19.5
1.8	2	.3	.3	19.8
1.9	1	.2	.2	20.0
2.0	86	13.6	13.8	33.8
2.2	2	.3	.3	34.1
2.3	1	.2	.2	34.3
2.4	2	.3	.3	34.6
2.5	25	4.0	4.0	38.6
2.7	3	.5	.5	39.1
2.8	2	.3	.3	39.5
3.0	64	10.1	10.3	49.8
3.2	2	.3	.3	50.1
3.5	23	3.6	3.7	53.8
3.8	2	.3	.3	54.1
3.9	1	.2	.2	54.3
4.0	46	7.3	7.4	61.7
4.1	1	.2	.2	61.8
4.5	14	2.2	2.3	64.1
4.6	1	.2	.2	64.3

	4.8	1	.2	.2	64.4
	5.0	79	12.5	12.7	77.1
	5.2	1	.2	.2	77.3
	5.3	2	.3	.3	77.6
	5.5	5	.8	.8	78.4
	5.6	1	.2	.2	78.6
	5.8	2	.3	.3	78.9
	6.0	24	3.8	3.9	82.8
	6.2	2	.3	.3	83.1
	6.5	2	.3	.3	83.4
	6.9	1	.2	.2	83.6
	7.0	17	2.7	2.7	86.3
	7.1	1	.2	.2	86.5
	7.5	4	.6	.6	87.1
	7.7	1	.2	.2	87.3
	8.0	9	1.4	1.4	88.7
	8.5	1	.2	.2	88.9
	9.0	9	1.4	1.4	90.3
	10.0	34	5.4	5.5	95.8
	10.2	1	.2	.2	96.0
	10.3	1	.2	.2	96.1
	10.5	2	.3	.3	96.5
	10.8	1	.2	.2	96.6
	11.0	2	.3	.3	96.9
	12.0	3	.5	.5	97.4
	12.2	1	.2	.2	97.6
	12.6	1	.2	.2	97.7
	13.5	2	.3	.3	98.1
	14.0	2	.3	.3	98.4
	14.5	1	.2	.2	98.6
	15.0	6	.9	1.0	99.5
	25.0	3	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	621	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	1.7		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 42: In the 2001 hunting season, what was the maximum distance you hunted from an open dirt road or non gated dirt road in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.0	5	.8	.8	.8
	.1	10	1.6	1.6	2.4
	.2	9	1.4	1.5	3.9
	.3	3	.5	.5	4.4
	.3	15	2.4	2.4	6.8
	.4	4	.6	.6	7.5

	.5	78	12.3	12.7	20.1
	.6	7	1.1	1.1	21.3
	.7	6	.9	1.0	22.2
	.8	12	1.9	1.9	24.2
	.9	1	.2	.2	24.4
	1.0	189	29.9	30.7	55.0
	1.1	3	.5	.5	55.5
	1.2	9	1.4	1.5	57.0
	1.3	5	.8	.8	57.8
	1.4	1	.2	.2	58.0
	1.5	57	9.0	9.3	67.2
	1.6	2	.3	.3	67.5
	1.7	1	.2	.2	67.7
	1.8	1	.2	.2	67.9
	2.0	83	13.1	13.5	81.3
	2.2	1	.2	.2	81.5
	2.3	3	.5	.5	82.0
	2.4	1	.2	.2	82.1
	2.5	17	2.7	2.8	84.9
	3.0	37	5.9	6.0	90.9
	3.1	1	.2	.2	91.1
	3.5	3	.5	.5	91.6
	3.6	1	.2	.2	91.7
	3.9	1	.2	.2	91.9
	4.0	11	1.7	1.8	93.7
	4.2	1	.2	.2	93.8
	4.5	3	.5	.5	94.3
	4.8	1	.2	.2	94.5
	5.0	15	2.4	2.4	96.9
	5.1	1	.2	.2	97.1
	5.7	1	.2	.2	97.2
	6.0	3	.5	.5	97.7
	7.0	2	.3	.3	98.1
	7.5	2	.3	.3	98.4
	8.5	1	.2	.2	98.5
	10.0	2	.3	.3	98.9
	11.0	1	.2	.2	99.0
	12.0	1	.2	.2	99.2
	12.6	1	.2	.2	99.4
	15.0	2	.3	.3	99.7
	16.0	1	.2	.2	99.8
	200.0	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	616	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	16	2.5		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 43: Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 no	285	45.1	45.7	45.7
	2 yes	339	53.6	54.3	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 44: For each of the following statements, please indicate whether or not you agree

44A Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	13	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2 disagree	62	9.8	9.9	12.0
	3 neither agree nor disagree	83	13.1	13.3	25.3
	4 agree	250	39.6	40.1	65.4
	5 strongly agree	216	34.2	34.6	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

44B Public lands have higher deer densities than private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	222	35.1	35.6	35.6
	2 disagree	268	42.4	42.9	78.5
	3 neither agree nor disagree	94	14.9	15.1	93.6
	4 agree	24	3.8	3.8	97.4
	5 strongly agree	16	2.5	2.6	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

44C Public lands have higher hunter success rates than private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	133	21.0	21.3	21.3
	2 disagree	272	43.0	43.7	65.0
	3 neither agree nor disagree	130	20.6	20.9	85.9
	4 agree	63	10.0	10.1	96.0
	5 strongly agree	25	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

44D I hunt with the goal of harvesting and antlered deer only		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	81	12.8	12.9	12.9
	2 disagree	155	24.5	24.7	37.6
	3 neither agree nor disagree	106	16.8	16.9	54.5
	4 agree	147	23.3	23.4	77.9
	5 strongly agree	139	22.0	22.1	100.0
	Total	628	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.6		
Total		632	100.0		

44E The number of deer has no effect on plant and animal communities		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	244	38.6	39.2	39.2
	2 disagree	241	38.1	38.7	77.8
	3 neither agree nor disagree	85	13.4	13.6	91.5
	4 agree	38	6.0	6.1	97.6
	5 strongly agree	15	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

44F There is enough public hunting in PA to provide access to anyone who wants to hunt		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	38	6.0	6.1	6.1
	2 disagree	99	15.7	15.8	21.9
	3 neither agree nor disagree	117	18.5	18.7	40.6
	4 agree	275	43.5	43.9	84.5
	5 strongly agree	97	15.3	15.5	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

44G The quality of the hunting experience is higher on private lands than it is on public lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	47	7.4	7.5	7.5
	2 disagree	122	19.3	19.6	27.1
	3 neither agree nor disagree	210	33.2	33.7	60.7
	4 agree	157	24.8	25.2	85.9
	5 strongly agree	88	13.9	14.1	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

44H Posting of private land has made it more difficult for me to find a place to hunt		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	46	7.3	7.3	7.3
	2 disagree	128	20.3	20.4	27.8
	3 neither agree nor disagree	103	16.3	16.5	44.2
	4 agree	204	32.3	32.6	76.8
	5 strongly agree	145	22.9	23.2	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

44I Over time, deer hunting pressure has decreased in the places in hunt		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	100	15.8	16.0	16.0
	2 disagree	162	25.6	25.9	41.9
	3 neither agree nor disagree	104	16.5	16.6	58.6
	4 agree	178	28.2	28.5	87.0
	5 strongly agree	81	12.8	13.0	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

44J It has become increasingly difficult for me to find a good place to hunt deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	49	7.8	7.9	7.9
	2 disagree	195	30.9	31.3	39.2
	3 neither agree nor disagree	139	22.0	22.3	61.5
	4 agree	162	25.6	26.0	87.5
	5 strongly agree	78	12.3	12.5	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

44K Deer damage to forests in Pennsylvania is a problem		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	77	12.2	12.3	12.3
	2 disagree	160	25.3	25.5	37.8
	3 neither agree nor disagree	190	30.1	30.3	68.1
	4 agree	137	21.7	21.9	90.0
	5 strongly agree	63	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

44L Keeping deer populations in balance with natural food supplies is necessary		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	9	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2 disagree	31	4.9	4.9	6.4
	3 neither agree nor disagree	76	12.0	12.1	18.5
	4 agree	359	56.8	57.3	75.8
	5 strongly agree	152	24.1	24.2	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

44M I don't really care if I shoot and antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	136	21.5	21.7	21.7
	2 disagree	187	29.6	29.9	51.6
	3 neither agree nor disagree	126	19.9	20.1	71.7
	4 agree	135	21.4	21.6	93.3
	5 strongly agree	42	6.6	6.7	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

44N Posting has restricted my access to hunting on private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	24	3.8	3.8	3.8
	2 disagree	87	13.8	13.9	17.8
	3 neither agree nor disagree	129	20.4	20.6	38.4
	4 agree	244	38.6	39.0	77.4
	5 strongly agree	141	22.3	22.6	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

44O Deer cause serious conflicts with other land uses, such as forestry, farming, highways, and other development		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	39	6.2	6.2	6.2
	2 disagree	129	20.4	20.6	26.8
	3 neither agree nor disagree	161	25.5	25.7	52.5
	4 agree	235	37.2	37.5	90.0
	5 strongly agree	63	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

44P I would rather harvest a doe than no deer at all		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	114	18.0	18.2	18.2
	2 disagree	113	17.9	18.0	36.2
	3 neither agree nor disagree	84	13.3	13.4	49.6
	4 agree	227	35.9	36.2	85.8
	5 strongly agree	89	14.1	14.2	100.0
	Total	627	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.8		
Total		632	100.0		

44QThe higher the deer population, the better my hunting experience		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	19	3.0	3.0	3.0
	2 disagree	100	15.8	16.1	19.1
	3 neither agree nor disagree	95	15.0	15.2	34.3
	4 agree	281	44.5	45.1	79.5
	5 strongly agree	128	20.3	20.5	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

44R I hunt to harvest a trophy antlered deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	77	12.2	12.3	12.3
	2 disagree	168	26.6	26.9	39.2
	3 neither agree nor disagree	133	21.0	21.3	60.5
	4 agree	155	24.5	24.8	85.3
	5 strongly agree	92	14.6	14.7	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

44S I can have a satisfying day of hunting without harvesting a deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	1	.2	.2	.2
	2 disagree	11	1.7	1.8	1.9
	3 neither agree nor disagree	29	4.6	4.6	6.5
	4 agree	317	50.2	50.6	57.2
	5 strongly agree	268	42.4	42.8	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

44T I can have a satisfying season of hunting without harvesting a deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	16	2.5	2.6	2.6
	2 disagree	91	14.4	14.5	17.1
	3 neither agree nor disagree	52	8.2	8.3	25.4
	4 agree	293	46.4	46.8	72.2
	5 strongly agree	174	27.5	27.8	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

44U The number of deer has no effect on forest regeneration		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 strongly disagree	150	23.7	24.0	24.0
	2 disagree	284	44.9	45.4	69.4
	3 neither agree nor disagree	122	19.3	19.5	89.0
	4 agree	56	8.9	9.0	97.9
	5 strongly agree	13	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 45: How important would you say hunting is to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	2	.3	.3	.3
	2 unimportant	20	3.2	3.2	3.6
	3 slightly unimportant	57	9.0	9.2	12.8
	4 neither	215	34.0	34.8	47.6
	5 slightly important	314	49.7	50.8	98.4
	6 important	2	.3	.3	98.7
	7 very unimportant	8	1.3	1.3	100.0
	Total	618	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.2		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 46: How crowded do you feel in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 not at all crowded	179	28.3	28.6	28.6
	2	118	18.7	18.8	47.4
	3 slightly crowded	109	17.2	17.4	64.9
	4	46	7.3	7.3	72.2
	5	33	5.2	5.3	77.5
	6 moderately crowded	68	10.8	10.9	88.3
	7	41	6.5	6.5	94.9
	8	22	3.5	3.5	98.4
	9 extremely crowded	10	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 47: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting

47A To get outdoors		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	9	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2 unimportant	209	33.1	33.4	34.9
	3 neither	16	2.5	2.6	37.4
	4 important	8	1.3	1.3	38.7
	5 very important	383	60.6	61.3	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

47B To get away from my everyday routine		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	16	2.5	2.6	2.6
	2 unimportant	193	30.5	31.0	33.6
	3 neither	45	7.1	7.2	40.8
	4 important	13	2.1	2.1	42.9
	5 very important	355	56.2	57.1	100.0
	Total	622	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.6		
Total		632	100.0		

47C To obtain venison		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	58	9.2	9.4	9.4
	2 unimportant	185	29.3	29.9	39.3
	3 neither	229	36.2	37.1	76.4
	4 important	93	14.7	15.0	91.4
	5 very important	53	8.4	8.6	100.0
	Total	618	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.2		
Total		632	100.0		

47D To get a large antlered deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	46	7.3	7.4	7.4
	2 unimportant	186	29.4	29.9	37.3
	3 neither	209	33.1	33.6	70.9
	4 important	98	15.5	15.8	86.7
	5 very important	83	13.1	13.3	100.0
	Total	622	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.6		
Total		632	100.0		

47E The challenge of hunting deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	18	2.8	2.9	2.9
	2 unimportant	296	46.8	47.4	50.2
	3 neither	57	9.0	9.1	59.4
	4 important	21	3.3	3.4	62.7
	5 very important	233	36.9	37.3	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

47F To test my outdoor skills		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	13	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2 unimportant	292	46.2	46.6	48.7
	3 neither	131	20.7	20.9	69.6
	4 important	32	5.1	5.1	74.8
	5 very important	158	25.0	25.2	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

47G To be with my friends		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	35	5.5	5.6	5.6
	2 unimportant	266	42.1	42.6	48.2
	3 neither	57	9.0	9.1	57.3
	4 important	25	4.0	4.0	61.3
	5 very important	242	38.3	38.7	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

47H To be with my family		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	29	4.6	4.7	4.7
	2 unimportant	222	35.1	36.2	40.9
	3 neither	95	15.0	15.5	56.4
	4 important	29	4.6	4.7	61.1
	5 very important	239	37.8	38.9	100.0
	Total	614	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	18	2.8		
Total		632	100.0		

47I To return to traditional hunting spots		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	24	3.8	3.8	3.8
	2 unimportant	264	41.8	42.2	46.1
	3 neither	101	16.0	16.2	62.2
	4 important	37	5.9	5.9	68.2
	5 very important	199	31.5	31.8	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

47J To help manage the deer population		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 very unimportant	23	3.6	3.7	3.7
	2 unimportant	251	39.7	40.2	43.9
	3 neither	183	29.0	29.3	73.2
	4 important	63	10.0	10.1	83.3
	5 very important	104	16.5	16.7	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 48: Who was primarily responsible for teaching you how to hunt deer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 parent	383	60.6	61.2	61.2
	2 other relative	82	13.0	13.1	74.3
	3 peers	9	1.4	1.4	75.7
	4 PGC hunting education course	1	.2	.2	75.9
	5 hunting camp companion	28	4.4	4.5	80.4
	6 friend	44	7.0	7.0	87.4
	7 learned on my own	79	12.5	12.6	100.0
	Total	626	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 49: Which sources do you most often rely upon to get your news/information about Pennsylvania hunting-related issues?

49A Television		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	195	30.9	31.2	31.2
	2 No	430	68.0	68.8	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49B Radio		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	71	11.2	11.4	11.4
	2 No	554	87.7	88.6	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49C Newspapers		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	395	62.5	63.2	63.2
	2 No	230	36.4	36.8	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49D Organization newsletters		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	125	19.8	20.0	20.0
	2 No	500	79.1	80.0	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49E Hunting magazines		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	265	41.9	42.4	42.4
	2 No	360	57.0	57.6	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49F Internet		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	75	11.9	12.0	12.0
	2 No	550	87.0	88.0	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49G Talking to others		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	374	59.2	59.8	59.8
	2 No	251	39.7	40.2	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49H PGC Website		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	106	16.8	17.0	17.0
	2 No	519	82.1	83.0	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49I The hunting regulation booklet		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	418	66.1	66.9	66.9
	2 No	207	32.8	33.1	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

49J Other		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	75	11.9	12.0	12.0
	2 No	550	87.0	88.0	100.0
	Total	625	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.1		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 50: Of those identified above as relied upon most often, which is the most important source?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 television	17	2.7	2.8	2.8
	2 radio	4	.6	.7	3.5
	3 newspapers	128	20.3	21.1	24.5
	4 organization newsletters	18	2.8	3.0	27.5
	5 hunting magazines	48	7.6	7.9	35.4
	6 internet	4	.6	.7	36.0
	7 talking to others	106	16.8	17.4	53.5
	8 PGC website	31	4.9	5.1	58.6
	9 hunting regulation booklet	210	33.2	34.5	93.1
	10 other	42	6.6	6.9	100.0
	Total	608	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	24	3.8		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 51: Who uses most of the venison from the deer you harvest?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 your household	505	79.9	81.1	81.1
	2 other family members	49	7.8	7.9	88.9
	3 other hunters	17	2.7	2.7	91.7
	4 friends	42	6.6	6.7	98.4
	5 charities	4	.6	.6	99.0
	6 whoever will take it	6	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 52: If you purchase additional antlerless permits, how many antlerless deer would you seek to harvest in a year?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	159	25.2	26.9	26.9
	1	184	29.1	31.2	58.1
	2	200	31.6	33.9	92.0
	3	1	.2	.2	92.2
	3	32	5.1	5.4	97.6
	4	11	1.7	1.9	99.5
	5	1	.2	.2	99.7
	10	2	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	590	93.4	100.0	
Missing	System	42	6.6		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 53: What is the highest level of formal education that you completed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 did not complete high school	49	7.8	7.9	7.9
	2 completed high school	241	38.1	39.1	47.0
	3 some college or vocational training	200	31.6	32.4	79.4
	4 completed college degree	88	13.9	14.3	93.7
	5 graduate or prof training beyond college	39	6.2	6.3	100.0
	Total	617	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	15	2.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 54: How many people, including yourself, live in your household?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1	60	9.5	9.6	9.6
	2	215	34.0	34.5	44.1
	3	130	20.6	20.9	65.0
	4	152	24.1	24.4	89.4
	5	49	7.8	7.9	97.3
	6	15	2.4	2.4	99.7
	7	1	.2	.2	99.8
	20	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 55: How many are under 18 years of age?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	366	57.9	58.7	58.7
	1	108	17.1	17.3	76.1
	2	114	18.0	18.3	94.4
	3	30	4.7	4.8	99.2
	4	5	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 56: How many are over 65 years of age?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	515	81.5	82.7	82.7
	1	52	8.2	8.3	91.0
	2	55	8.7	8.8	99.8
	3	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 57: Would you say your health is…

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 excellent	233	36.9	37.4	37.4
	2 good	324	51.3	52.0	89.4
	3 fair	59	9.3	9.5	98.9
	4 poor	7	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 58: How much difficulty do you have doing the following?

58A Going up and down stairs		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	11	1.7	1.8	1.8
	2 some difficulty	56	8.9	9.0	10.8
	3 no difficulty	556	88.0	89.2	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

58B Kneeling or stooping		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	11	1.7	1.8	1.8
	2 some difficulty	105	16.6	16.9	18.6
	3 no difficulty	507	80.2	81.4	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

58C Lifting or carrying objects		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	4	.6	.6	.6
	2 some difficulty	18	2.8	2.9	3.5
	3 no difficulty	602	95.3	96.5	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

58D Using hands or fingers		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	5	.8	.8	.8
	2 some difficulty	26	4.1	4.2	5.0
	3 no difficulty	592	93.7	95.0	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

58E Seeing, even with glasses		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	1	.2	.2	.2
	2 some difficulty	47	7.4	7.5	7.7
	3 no difficulty	575	91.0	92.3	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

58F Hearing		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	17	2.7	2.7	2.7
	2 some difficulty	164	25.9	26.3	29.0
	3 no difficulty	443	70.1	71.0	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

58G Walking		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 great deal of difficulty	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2 some difficulty	67	10.6	10.7	12.0
	3 no difficulty	549	86.9	88.0	100.0
	Total	624	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 59: Do you use any of the following while you hunt in the Sproul?

59A Maps		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	257	40.7	41.3	41.3
	2 no	366	57.9	58.7	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

59B Compass		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	280	44.3	44.9	44.9
	2 no	343	54.3	55.1	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

59C Walkie-talkie		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	387	61.2	62.1	62.1
	2 no	236	37.3	37.9	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

59D GPS unit		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 yes	46	7.3	7.4	7.4
	2 no	577	91.3	92.6	100.0
	Total	623	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.4		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 60: Could you please tell me if your total household income from all sources before taxes in 2000…

60A Was more or less than $30,000?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 less than	57	9.0	19.1	19.1
	2 more than	242	38.3	80.9	100.0
	Total	299	47.3	100.0	
Missing	System	333	52.7		
Total		632	100.0		

60B Is it more or less than $15,000		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 less than	39	6.2	10.7	10.7
	2 more than	325	51.4	89.3	100.0
	Total	364	57.6	100.0	
Missing	System	268	42.4		
Total		632	100.0		

60C Is it more or less than $45,000		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 less than	190	30.1	35.4	35.4
	2 more than	346	54.7	64.6	100.0
	Total	536	84.8	100.0	
Missing	System	96	15.2		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 61: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 male	598	94.6	98.4	98.4
	2 female	10	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	608	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	24	3.8		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 62: Had GPS unit in the field

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 GPS Respondent	182	28.8	28.8	28.8
2 Non-GPS Respondent	450	71.2	71.2	100.0
Total	632	100.0	100.0	

Table 63: Income recoded into categories

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 less than15k	38	6.0	8.2	8.2
	2 15-29,999 k	26	4.1	5.6	13.7
	3 30k-44,999k	56	8.9	12.0	25.8
	4 45k or more	346	54.7	74.2	100.0
	Total	466	73.7	100.0	
Missing	System	166	26.3		
Total		632	100.0		

Table 64: Use hunting camps categories

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Uses camp	475	75.2	76.6	76.6
	2 Does not use camp	145	22.9	23.4	100.0
	Total	620	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	12	1.9		
Total		632	100.0		

Bivariate Analysis Time 1

Table 65: Years hunting categories * Use of GPS unit

Years hunting categories	Use of GPS unit		Total
	Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
≤ 9	6	41	47
	12.8%	87.2%	100.0%
10 -19	18	61	79
	22.8%	77.2%	100.0%
20 -29	46	102	148
	31.1%	68.9%	100.0%
30 -39	60	98	158
	38.0%	62.0%	100.0%
≥ 40	52	145	197
	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
Total	182	447	629
	28.9%	71.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.657(a)	4	.005
Likelihood Ratio	15.428	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.921	1	.087
N of Valid Cases	629		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 13.60.

Table 66: Years hunting categories * Income

	Income				Total
Years hunting categories	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
≤ 9	2	2	3	20	27
	7.4%	7.4%	11.1%	74.1%	100.0%
10 -19	5	1	7	43	56
	8.9%	1.8%	12.5%	76.8%	100.0%
20 -29	4	3	14	98	119
	3.4%	2.5%	11.8%	82.4%	100.0%
30 -39	6	5	11	110	132
	4.5%	3.8%	8.3%	83.3%	100.0%
≥ 40	21	15	21	75	132
	15.9%	11.4%	15.9%	56.8%	100.0%
Total	38	26	56	346	466
	8.2%	5.6%	12.0%	74.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.691(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.618	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.800	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	466		

a 5 cells (25.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.51.

Table 67: Years hunting categories * Highest level of education completed

Years hunting categories	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
≤ 9	17	12	7	5	1	42
	40.5%	28.6%	16.7%	11.9%	2.4%	100.0%
10 -19	2	29	17	22	8	78
	2.6%	37.2%	21.8%	28.2%	10.3%	100.0%
20 -29	2	51	58	28	7	146
	1.4%	34.9%	39.7%	19.2%	4.8%	100.0%
30 -39	9	63	47	25	13	157
	5.7%	40.1%	29.9%	15.9%	8.3%	100.0%
≥ 40	19	86	71	8	10	194
	9.8%	44.3%	36.6%	4.1%	5.2%	100.0%
Total	49	241	200	88	39	617
	7.9%	39.1%	32.4%	14.3%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	113.964(a)	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	95.161	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.792	1	.181
N of Valid Cases	617		

a 3 cells (12.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.65.

Table 68: Years hunting categories * Age Categories

Years hunting categories	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
≤ 9	26	16	3	1		1	47
	55.3%	34.0%	6.4%	2.1%		2.1%	100.0%
10 -19		35	32	7	2	2	78
		44.9%	41.0%	9.0%	2.6%	2.6%	100.0%
20 -29			64	65	14	3	146
			43.8%	44.5%	9.6%	2.1%	100.0%
30 -39				86	65	7	158
				54.4%	41.1%	4.4%	100.0%
≥ 40					63	132	195
					32.3%	67.7%	100.0%
Total	26	51	99	159	144	145	624
	4.2%	8.2%	15.9%	25.5%	23.1%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1137.159(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	983.374	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	478.104	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	624		

a 3 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.96.

Table 69: Years hunting in PA categories * Use of GPS unit

Years hunting in PA categories	Use of GPS unit		Total
	Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
≤ 9	6	48	54
	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
10 -19	21	65	86
	24.4%	75.6%	100.0%
20 -29	46	103	149
	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
30 -39	59	95	154
	38.3%	61.7%	100.0%
≥ 40	50	136	186
	26.9%	73.1%	100.0%
Total	182	447	629
	28.9%	71.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.434(a)	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	17.774	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.246	1	.039
N of Valid Cases	629		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 15.62.

Table70: Years hunting in PA categories * Income

Years hunting in PA categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
≤ 9	2	2	4	23	31
	6.5%	6.5%	12.9%	74.2%	100.0%
10 -19	5	1	7	49	62
	8.1%	1.6%	11.3%	79.0%	100.0%
20 -29	4	3	15	99	121
	3.3%	2.5%	12.4%	81.8%	100.0%
30 -39	6	5	10	108	129
	4.7%	3.9%	7.8%	83.7%	100.0%
≥ 40	21	15	20	67	123
	17.1%	12.2%	16.3%	54.5%	100.0%
Total	38	26	56	346	466
	8.2%	5.6%	12.0%	74.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.754(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	42.764	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.922	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	466		

a 4 cells (20.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.73.

Table 71: Years hunting in PA categories * Highest level of education completed

Years hunting in PA categories	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
≤ 9	17	13	10	8	1	49
	34.7%	26.5%	20.4%	16.3%	2.0%	100.0%
10 -19	2	30	20	21	12	85
	2.4%	35.3%	23.5%	24.7%	14.1%	100.0%
20 -29	3	52	58	27	7	147
	2.0%	35.4%	39.5%	18.4%	4.8%	100.0%
30 -39	8	66	45	24	10	153
	5.2%	43.1%	29.4%	15.7%	6.5%	100.0%
≥ 40	19	80	67	8	9	183
	10.4%	43.7%	36.6%	4.4%	4.9%	100.0%
Total	49	241	200	88	39	617
	7.9%	39.1%	32.4%	14.3%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	101.004(a)	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	87.338	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.159	1	.041
N of Valid Cases	617		

a 2 cells (8.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 3.10.

Table 72: Years hunting in PA categories * Age Categories

Years hunting in PA categories	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
≤ 9	26	19	4	3	1	1	54
	48.1%	35.2%	7.4%	5.6%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0%
10 -19		32	34	10	5	4	85
		37.6%	40.0%	11.8%	5.9%	4.7%	100.0%
20 -29			61	64	18	4	147
			41.5%	43.5%	12.2%	2.7%	100.0%
30 -39				82	62	10	154
				53.2%	40.3%	6.5%	100.0%
≥ 40					58	126	184
					31.5%	68.5%	100.0%
Total	26	51	99	159	144	145	624
	4.2%	8.2%	15.9%	25.5%	23.1%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1012.514(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	894.926	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	441.852	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	624		

a 3 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.25.

Table 73: Years hunting in Sproul categories * Income

Years hunting in Sproul categories		Income				Total
		less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
	≤ 9	8	5	10	89	112
		7.1%	4.5%	8.9%	79.5%	100.0%
	10 -19	1	2	10	66	79
		1.3%	2.5%	12.7%	83.5%	100.0%
	20 -29	8	5	15	98	126
		6.3%	4.0%	11.9%	77.8%	100.0%
	30 -39	7	5	9	66	87
		8.0%	5.7%	10.3%	75.9%	100.0%
	≥ 40	14	9	12	25	60
		23.3%	15.0%	20.0%	41.7%	100.0%
Total		38	26	56	344	464
		8.2%	5.6%	12.1%	74.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	48.194(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.746	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.889	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	464		

a 4 cells (20.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 3.36.

Table 74: Years hunting in Sproul categories * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Years hunting in Sproul categories	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
≤ 9	23	51	41	26	8	149
	15.4%	34.2%	27.5%	17.4%	5.4%	100.0%
10 -19	6	37	31	26	8	108
	5.6%	34.3%	28.7%	24.1%	7.4%	100.0%
20 -29	5	62	61	19	12	159
	3.1%	39.0%	38.4%	11.9%	7.5%	100.0%
30 -39	5	46	35	14	8	108
	4.6%	42.6%	32.4%	13.0%	7.4%	100.0%
≥ 40	10	43	32	3	3	91
	11.0%	47.3%	35.2%	3.3%	3.3%	100.0%
Total	49	239	200	88	39	615
	8.0%	38.9%	32.5%	14.3%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.356(a)	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	46.185	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.044	1	.153
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 5.77.

Table 75: Years hunting in Sproul categories * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Years hunting in Sproul categories	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
≤ 9	26	36	26	33	18	14	153
	17.0%	23.5%	17.0%	21.6%	11.8%	9.2%	100.0%
10 -19		15	32	30	19	13	109
		13.8%	29.4%	27.5%	17.4%	11.9%	100.0%
20 -29			40	55	47	18	160
			25.0%	34.4%	29.4%	11.3%	100.0%
30 -39				40	39	29	108
				37.0%	36.1%	26.9%	100.0%
≥ 40					21	71	92
					22.8%	77.2%	100.0%
Total	26	51	98	158	144	145	622
	4.2%	8.2%	15.8%	25.4%	23.2%	23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	410.503(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	432.180	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	231.685	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	622		

a 3 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 3.85.

Table 76: Years hunting antlerless deer categories * Income

Years hunting antlerless deer categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
≤ 9	22	15	41	254	332
	6.6%	4.5%	12.3%	76.5%	100.0%
10 -19	4	4	6	41	55
	7.3%	7.3%	10.9%	74.5%	100.0%
20 -29	3	4	6	33	46
	6.5%	8.7%	13.0%	71.7%	100.0%
30 -39	3	2	1	11	17
	17.6%	11.8%	5.9%	64.7%	100.0%
≥ 40	5			3	8
	62.5%			37.5%	100.0%
Total	37	25	54	342	458
	8.1%	5.5%	11.8%	74.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.273(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.666	12	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.759	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	458		

a 10 cells (50.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .44.

Table 77: Years hunting antlerless deer categories * Age Categories

Years hunting antlerless deer categories	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
≤ 9	26	43	70	103	97	99	438
	5.9%	9.8%	16.0%	23.5%	22.1%	22.6%	100.0%
10 -19		7	14	23	18	17	79
		8.9%	17.7%	29.1%	22.8%	21.5%	100.0%
20 -29			14	24	15	11	64
			21.9%	37.5%	23.4%	17.2%	100.0%
30 -39				8	7	8	23
				34.8%	30.4%	34.8%	100.0%
≥ 40					4	6	10
					40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total	26	50	98	158	141	141	614
	4.2%	8.1%	16.0%	25.7%	23.0%	23.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.020(a)	20	.001
Likelihood Ratio	64.897	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.336	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 11 cells (36.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .42.

Table 78: Years hunting antlerless deer categories * Use of GPS unit

	Years hunting antlerless deer categories					Total
Use of GPS unit	≤ 9	10 -19	20 -29	30 -39	≥ 40	
Use of GPS unit Respondent	115	33	24	7	2	181
	26.0%	41.8%	36.9%	30.4%	20.0%	29.2%
Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	327	46	41	16	8	438
	74.0%	58.2%	63.1%	69.6%	80.0%	70.8%
Total	442	79	65	23	10	619
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.497(a)	4	.033
Likelihood Ratio	10.111	4	.039
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.574	1	.109
N of Valid Cases	619		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.92.

Table 79: Years hunting antlerless deer categories * Use hunting camps

Years hunting antlerless deer categories		Use hunting camps: uses camp	Use hunting camps: does not use camp	Total
	≤ 9	354	81	435
		81.4%	18.6%	100.0%
	10 -19	52	25	77
		67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
	20 -29	38	27	65
		58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
	30 -39	19	4	23
		82.6%	17.4%	100.0%
	≥ 40	4	6	10
		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total		467	143	610
		76.6%	23.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.906(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	26.161	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.241	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	610		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.34.

Table 80: Archery days afield categories * Age Categories

Archery days afield categories		Age Categories						Total
		20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
	0	19	25	55	92	98	119	408
		4.7%	6.1%	13.5%	22.5%	24.0%	29.2%	100.0%
	1 – 10	1	9	10	23	20	8	71
		1.4%	12.7%	14.1%	32.4%	28.2%	11.3%	100.0%
	11 - 25	2	7	17	24	10	6	66
		3.0%	10.6%	25.8%	36.4%	15.2%	9.1%	100.0%
	26 - 50	3	9	17	18	14	9	70
		4.3%	12.9%	24.3%	25.7%	20.0%	12.9%	100.0%
Total		25	50	99	157	142	142	615
		4.1%	8.1%	16.1%	25.5%	23.1%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.064(a)	15	.000
Likelihood Ratio	46.806	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.847	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 3 cells (12.5%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.68.

Table 81: Flintlock days afield categories * Use of GPS unit

Flintlock days afield categories	Use of GPS unit		Total
	Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
0	145	378	523
	27.7%	72.3%	100.0%
1 - 10	32	60	92
	34.8%	65.2%	100.0%
11 - 25	4	2	6
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total	181	440	621
	29.1%	70.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.017(a)	2	.049
Likelihood Ratio	5.487	2	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.602	1	.032
N of Valid Cases	621		

a 2 cells (33.3%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.75.

Table 82: Flintlock days afield categories * Income

Flintlock days afield categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
0	31	22	44	295	392
	7.9%	5.6%	11.2%	75.3%	100.0%
1 - 10	4	3	12	45	64
	6.3%	4.7%	18.8%	70.3%	100.0%
11 -25	2			2	4
	50.0%			50.0%	100.0%
Total	37	25	56	342	460
	8.0%	5.4%	12.2%	74.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.878(a)	6	.045
Likelihood Ratio	8.532	6	.202
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.115	1	.291
N of Valid Cases	460		

a 5 cells (41.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .22.

Table 83: Flintlock days afield categories * Highest level of education completed

Flintlock days afield categories	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
0	39	199	160	82	34	514
	7.6%	38.7%	31.1%	16.0%	6.6%	100.0%
1 - 10	9	35	37	6	3	90
	10.0%	38.9%	41.1%	6.7%	3.3%	100.0%
11 - 25		6				6
		100.0%				100.0%
Total	48	240	197	88	37	610
	7.9%	39.3%	32.3%	14.4%	6.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.211(a)	8	.020
Likelihood Ratio	21.074	8	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.805	1	.016
N of Valid Cases	610		

a 5 cells (33.3%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .36.

Table 84: October antlerless days afield categories * Age Categories

		Age Categories						Total
October antlerless days afield categories		20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
	0	17	45	92	147	130	124	555
		3.1%	8.1%	16.6%	26.5%	23.4%	22.3%	100.0%
	1 - 10	8	5	6	11	12	18	60
		13.3%	8.3%	10.0%	18.3%	20.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	11 - 25			1				1
				100.0%				100.0%
Total		25	50	99	158	142	142	616
		4.1%	8.1%	16.1%	25.6%	23.1%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.820(a)	10	.008
Likelihood Ratio	17.820	10	.058
Linear-by-Linear Association	.769	1	.380
N of Valid Cases	616		

a 8 cells (44.4%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .04.

Table 85: Firearm days afield categories * Age Categories

Firearm days afield categories	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
0		1	1		4	9	15
		6.7%	6.7%		26.7%	60.0%	100.0%
1 - 10	20	29	56	81	71	67	324
	6.2%	9.0%	17.3%	25.0%	21.9%	20.7%	100.0%
11 - 25	5	16	32	65	53	51	222
	2.3%	7.2%	14.4%	29.3%	23.9%	23.0%	100.0%
26 -50		3	9	11	14	15	52
		5.8%	17.3%	21.2%	26.9%	28.8%	100.0%
Total	25	49	98	157	142	142	613
	4.1%	8.0%	16.0%	25.6%	23.2%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.987(a)	15	.029
Likelihood Ratio	30.932	15	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.368	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	613		

a 8 cells (33.3%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .61.

Table 86: Firearm days afield categories * Income

Firearm days afield categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
0	4	1		5	10
	40.0%	10.0%		50.0%	100.0%
1 - 10	12	12	29	193	246
	4.9%	4.9%	11.8%	78.5%	100.0%
11 - 25	14	10	21	125	170
	8.2%	5.9%	12.4%	73.5%	100.0%
26 - 50	6	2	6	19	33
	18.2%	6.1%	18.2%	57.6%	100.0%
Total	36	25	56	342	459
	7.8%	5.4%	12.2%	74.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.919(a)	9	.002
Likelihood Ratio	19.764	9	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.313	1	.128
N of Valid Cases	459		

a 6 cells (37.5%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .54.

Table 87: Firearm days afield categories * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Firearm days afield categories	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
0	2	9	4			15
	13.3%	60.0%	26.7%			100.0%
1 - 10	25	121	91	56	25	318
	7.9%	38.1%	28.6%	17.6%	7.9%	100.0%
11 -25	16	88	76	30	12	222
	7.2%	39.6%	34.2%	13.5%	5.4%	100.0%
26 -50	4	20	26	2		52
	7.7%	38.5%	50.0%	3.8%		100.0%
Total	47	238	197	88	37	607
	7.7%	39.2%	32.5%	14.5%	6.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.623(a)	12	.023
Likelihood Ratio	30.340	12	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.106	1	.293
N of Valid Cases	607		

a 6 cells (30.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .91.

Table 88: Late flintlock days afield categories * Use of GPS unit

Late flintlock days afield categories	Use of GPS unit		Total
	Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
0	121	333	454
	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%
1 -10	45	73	118
	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
11 -25	8	29	37
	21.6%	78.4%	100.0%
26 - 50	5	4	9
	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
Total	179	439	618
	29.0%	71.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.066(a)	3	.018
Likelihood Ratio	9.563	3	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.845	1	.092
N of Valid Cases	618		

a 1 cells (12.5%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.61.

Table 89: Late flintlock days afield categories * Income

Late flintlock days afield categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
0	29	21	37	246	333
	8.7%	6.3%	11.1%	73.9%	100.0%
1 - 10	2	4	14	74	94
	2.1%	4.3%	14.9%	78.7%	100.0%
11 -25	3		5	20	28
	10.7%		17.9%	71.4%	100.0%
26 - 50	3			1	4
	75.0%			25.0%	100.0%
Total	37	25	56	341	459
	8.1%	5.4%	12.2%	74.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.898(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.946	9	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	.264	1	.608
N of Valid Cases	459		

a 7 cells (43.8%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .22.

Table 90: Days afield not hunting categories * Use hunting camps

Days afield not hunting categories	Use hunting camps: uses camp	Use hunting camps: does not use camp	Total
0	20	12	32
	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
1 - 10	209	77	286
	73.1%	26.9%	100.0%
11 -25	105	22	127
	82.7%	17.3%	100.0%
26 -50	128	25	153
	83.7%	16.3%	100.0%
Total	462	136	598
	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.504(a)	3	.006
Likelihood Ratio	12.368	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.014	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	598		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 7.28.

Table 91: Travel for antlered deer categories * Highest level of education completed

Travel for antlered deer categories	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
0	1			1		2
	50.0%			50.0%		100.0%
1 - 10	2	1	1			4
	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%			100.0%
11 - 25	7	20	14		2	43
	16.3%	46.5%	32.6%		4.7%	100.0%
26 - 50	12	59	29	10	7	117
	10.3%	50.4%	24.8%	8.5%	6.0%	100.0%
55 - 75	3	9	16	5	1	34
	8.8%	26.5%	47.1%	14.7%	2.9%	100.0%
76 - 100	2	37	22	11	5	77
	2.6%	48.1%	28.6%	14.3%	6.5%	100.0%
101 - 150	3	38	32	21	3	97
	3.1%	39.2%	33.0%	21.6%	3.1%	100.0%
151 or more	16	61	77	34	20	208
	7.7%	29.3%	37.0%	16.3%	9.6%	100.0%
Total	46	225	191	82	38	582
	7.9%	38.7%	32.8%	14.1%	6.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	65.833(a)	28	.000
Likelihood Ratio	67.064	28	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.405	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	582		

a 15 cells (37.5%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .13.

Table 92: Travel for antlerless deer categories * Age Categories

Travel for antlerless deer categories	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
0	2	4	7	22	25	30	90
	2.2%	4.4%	7.8%	24.4%	27.8%	33.3%	100.0%
1 - 10	2	4	6	7	6	16	41
	4.9%	9.8%	14.6%	17.1%	14.6%	39.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	1	7	8	17	20	15	68
	1.5%	10.3%	11.8%	25.0%	29.4%	22.1%	100.0%
26 - 50	8	17	29	44	32	14	144
	5.6%	11.8%	20.1%	30.6%	22.2%	9.7%	100.0%
55 - 75		5	4	3	6	3	21
		23.8%	19.0%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	100.0%
76 - 100	5	5	14	10	8	12	54
	9.3%	9.3%	25.9%	18.5%	14.8%	22.2%	100.0%
101 - 150	1	3	10	12	9	13	48
	2.1%	6.3%	20.8%	25.0%	18.8%	27.1%	100.0%
151 or more	5	5	15	33	30	23	111
	4.5%	4.5%	13.5%	29.7%	27.0%	20.7%	100.0%
Total	24	50	93	148	136	126	577
	4.2%	8.7%	16.1%	25.6%	23.6%	21.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	63.536(a)	35	.002
Likelihood Ratio	64.929	35	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.029	1	.082
N of Valid Cases	577		

a 14 cells (29.2%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .87.

Table 93: Travel for antlerless deer categories * Highest level of education completed

Travel for antlerless deer categories	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
0	7	37	20	16	9	89
	7.9%	41.6%	22.5%	18.0%	10.1%	100.0%
1 - 10	3	17	18	1	2	41
	7.3%	41.5%	43.9%	2.4%	4.9%	100.0%
11 - 25	7	32	22	5	2	68
	10.3%	47.1%	32.4%	7.4%	2.9%	100.0%
26 - 50	13	58	40	19	12	142
	9.2%	40.8%	28.2%	13.4%	8.5%	100.0%
55 - 75		4	11	4	1	20
		20.0%	55.0%	20.0%	5.0%	100.0%
76 - 100	2	25	19	5	1	52
	3.8%	48.1%	36.5%	9.6%	1.9%	100.0%
101 - 150	2	16	16	13	1	48
	4.2%	33.3%	33.3%	27.1%	2.1%	100.0%
151 or more	10	30	43	20	8	111
	9.0%	27.0%	38.7%	18.0%	7.2%	100.0%
Total	44	219	189	83	36	571
	7.7%	38.4%	33.1%	14.5%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.605(a)	28	.019
Likelihood Ratio	50.455	28	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.369	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	571		

a 10 cells (25.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.26.

Table 94: How far traveled to Sproul categories * Income

	Income				Total
How far traveled to Sproul	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
1 - 10	5	3	2	10	20
	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%	50.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	9	4	3	37	53
	17.0%	7.5%	5.7%	69.8%	100.0%
26 - 50	7	2	14	60	83
	8.4%	2.4%	16.9%	72.3%	100.0%
55 - 75	3	2	4	13	22
	13.6%	9.1%	18.2%	59.1%	100.0%
76 - 100	3	4	6	31	44
	6.8%	9.1%	13.6%	70.5%	100.0%
101 - 150	5	4	15	82	106
	4.7%	3.8%	14.2%	77.4%	100.0%
151 or more	4	6	12	107	129
	3.1%	4.7%	9.3%	82.9%	100.0%
Total	36	25	56	340	457
	7.9%	5.5%	12.3%	74.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.888(a)	18	.007
Likelihood Ratio	32.535	18	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.749	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	457		

a 11 cells (39.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.09.

Table 95: How far traveled to Sproul categories * Highest level of education completed

How far traveled to Sproul	Highest level of education completed: did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	Total
1 - 10	5	9	8		3	25
	20.0%	36.0%	32.0%		12.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	6	35	29	5	2	77
	7.8%	45.5%	37.7%	6.5%	2.6%	100.0%
26 - 50	13	49	32	18	10	122
	10.7%	40.2%	26.2%	14.8%	8.2%	100.0%
55 - 75	3	13	14	2	1	33
	9.1%	39.4%	42.4%	6.1%	3.0%	100.0%
76 - 100	1	29	14	9	1	54
	1.9%	53.7%	25.9%	16.7%	1.9%	100.0%
101 - 150	7	47	42	28	7	131
	5.3%	35.9%	32.1%	21.4%	5.3%	100.0%
151 or more	11	56	56	25	14	162
	6.8%	34.6%	34.6%	15.4%	8.6%	100.0%
Total	46	238	195	87	38	604
	7.6%	39.4%	32.3%	14.4%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.861(a)	24	.022
Likelihood Ratio	44.136	24	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.602	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 9 cells (25.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.57.

Table 96: How far traveled to Sproul categories * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
How far traveled to Sproul		uses camp	does not use camp	
	1 - 10	17	8	25
		68.0%	32.0%	100.0%
	11 - 25	41	37	78
		52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
	26 - 50	98	29	127
		77.2%	22.8%	100.0%
	55 - 75	29	3	32
		90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
	76 - 100	49	5	54
		90.7%	9.3%	100.0%
	101 - 150	110	25	135
		81.5%	18.5%	100.0%
	151 or more	125	36	161
		77.6%	22.4%	100.0%
Total		469	143	612
		76.6%	23.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.660(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.981	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.137	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	612		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 5.84.

Table 97: Do you consider yourself primarily * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Type of hunter	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
archery hunter	6	14	26	24	13	5	88
	6.8%	15.9%	29.5%	27.3%	14.8%	5.7%	100.0%
firearm hunter	18	36	72	133	125	133	517
	3.5%	7.0%	13.9%	25.7%	24.2%	25.7%	100.0%
flintlock/muzzleloader hunter	2	1	1	1	5	4	14
	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	35.7%	28.6%	100.0%
Total	26	51	99	158	143	142	619
	4.2%	8.2%	16.0%	25.5%	23.1%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.159(a)	10	.000
Likelihood Ratio	45.457	10	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.341	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	619		

a 7 cells (38.9%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .59.

Table 98: Did you kill antlered deer in 2001 * Use of GPS unit

	Use of GPS unit		Total
Did you kill antlered deer in 2001	Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
yes	36	124	160
	22.5%	77.5%	100.0%
no	145	321	466
	31.1%	68.9%	100.0%
Total	181	445	626
	28.9%	71.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.302(b)	1	.038		
Continuity Correction(a)	3.893	1	.048		
Likelihood Ratio	4.449	1	.035		
Fisher's Exact Test				.043	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.295	1	.038		
N of Valid Cases	626				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 46.26.

Table 99: Did you kill antlered deer in 2001 * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Did you kill antlered deer in 2001	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	8	18	32	44	36	22	160
	5.0%	11.3%	20.0%	27.5%	22.5%	13.8%	100.0%
no	18	33	66	114	108	122	461
	3.9%	7.2%	14.3%	24.7%	23.4%	26.5%	100.0%
Total	26	51	98	158	144	144	621
	4.2%	8.2%	15.8%	25.4%	23.2%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.875(a)	5	.016
Likelihood Ratio	14.543	5	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.447	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	621		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 6.70.

Table 100: Did you kill antlered deer in 2000 * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Did you kill antlered deer in 2000	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	6	18	37	60	43	20	184
	3.3%	9.8%	20.1%	32.6%	23.4%	10.9%	100.0%
no	20	32	61	98	99	121	431
	4.6%	7.4%	14.2%	22.7%	23.0%	28.1%	100.0%
Total	26	50	98	158	142	141	615
	4.2%	8.1%	15.9%	25.7%	23.1%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.880(a)	5	.000
Likelihood Ratio	28.060	5	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.824	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 7.78.

Table 101: Did you kill antlered deer in 1999 * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Did you kill antlered deer in 1999	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	2	19	42	67	45	25	200
	1.0%	9.5%	21.0%	33.5%	22.5%	12.5%	100.0%
no	23	31	55	91	97	117	414
	5.6%	7.5%	13.3%	22.0%	23.4%	28.3%	100.0%
Total	25	50	97	158	142	142	614
	4.1%	8.1%	15.8%	25.7%	23.1%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.113(a)	5	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.043	5	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.454	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 8.14.

Table 102: Did you kill antlered deer in 1999 * Use of GPS unit

	Use of GPS unit		Total
Did you kill antlered deer in 1999	Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
yes	70	130	200
	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
no	111	308	419
	26.5%	73.5%	100.0%
Total	181	438	619
	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.737(b)	1	.030		
Continuity Correction(a)	4.334	1	.037		
Likelihood Ratio	4.657	1	.031		
Fisher's Exact Test				.037	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.729	1	.030		
N of Valid Cases	619				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 58.48.

Table 103: Did you kill antlered deer in 1999 * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Did you kill antlered deer in 1999	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
yes	6	71	79	31	11	198
	3.0%	35.9%	39.9%	15.7%	5.6%	100.0%
no	42	164	119	57	27	409
	10.3%	40.1%	29.1%	13.9%	6.6%	100.0%
Total	48	235	198	88	38	607
	7.9%	38.7%	32.6%	14.5%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.739(a)	4	.005
Likelihood Ratio	16.189	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.381	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	607		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 12.40.

Table 104: Did you kill antlerless deer in 2001 * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Did you kill antlerless deer in 2001	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	5	12	39	41	35	24	156
	3.2%	7.7%	25.0%	26.3%	22.4%	15.4%	100.0%
no	21	38	59	114	109	117	458
	4.6%	8.3%	12.9%	24.9%	23.8%	25.5%	100.0%
Total	26	50	98	155	144	141	614
	4.2%	8.1%	16.0%	25.2%	23.5%	23.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.695(a)	5	.005
Likelihood Ratio	16.207	5	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.799	1	.028
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 6.61.

Table 105: Did you kill antlerless deer in 2000 * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Did you kill antlerless deer in 2000	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	14	20	34	51	37	18	174
	8.0%	11.5%	19.5%	29.3%	21.3%	10.3%	100.0%
no	12	30	64	104	106	122	438
	2.7%	6.8%	14.6%	23.7%	24.2%	27.9%	100.0%
Total	26	50	98	155	143	140	612
	4.2%	8.2%	16.0%	25.3%	23.4%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.102(a)	5	.000
Likelihood Ratio	33.666	5	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	29.406	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	612		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 7.39.

Table 106: Did you kill antlerless deer in 1999 * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Did you kill antlerless deer in 1999	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	6	17	28	58	34	30	173
	3.5%	9.8%	16.2%	33.5%	19.7%	17.3%	100.0%
no	18	33	70	97	106	110	434
	4.1%	7.6%	16.1%	22.4%	24.4%	25.3%	100.0%
Total	24	50	98	155	140	140	607
	4.0%	8.2%	16.1%	25.5%	23.1%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.594(a)	5	.041
Likelihood Ratio	11.499	5	.042
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.441	1	.064
N of Valid Cases	607		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 6.84.

Table 107: Did you kill antlerless deer in 2000 * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Did you kill antlerless deer in 2000	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
yes	14	74	49	30	4	171
	8.2%	43.3%	28.7%	17.5%	2.3%	100.0%
no	35	156	150	58	35	434
	8.1%	35.9%	34.6%	13.4%	8.1%	100.0%
Total	49	230	199	88	39	605
	8.1%	38.0%	32.9%	14.5%	6.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.748(a)	4	.030
Likelihood Ratio	12.017	4	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.606	1	.106
N of Valid Cases	605		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 11.02.

Table 108: Use hunting camps * When hunting in Sproul, describe topography

	When hunting deer in the Sproul, how would you best describe the topography where you most often hunt?				Total
Do you own, belong to, or use a camp in the Sproul?	Upper plateau fields	Side hills	Valley bottoms	Mixed topography	
Own camp	16	13	3	84	116
	13.8%	11.2%	2.6%	72.4%	100.0%
Belong to camp	43	60	5	159	267
	16.1%	22.5%	1.9%	59.6%	100.0%
Use camp	15	15	3	58	91
	16.5%	16.5%	3.3%	63.7%	100.0%
None of the above	34	12	6	93	145
	23.4%	8.3%	4.1%	64.1%	100.0%
Total	108	100	17	394	619
	17.4%	16.2%	2.7%	63.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.122(a)	9	.009
Likelihood Ratio	22.525	9	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.117	1	.291
N of Valid Cases	619		

a 3 cells (18.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.50.

Table 109: **On an average hunt in the Sproul, how crowded do you usually feel * Highest level of education completed**

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Crowded	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
not at all crowded	15	78	56	21	6	176
	8.5%	44.3%	31.8%	11.9%	3.4%	100.0%
2	8	32	41	28	7	116
	6.9%	27.6%	35.3%	24.1%	6.0%	100.0%
slightly crowded	6	46	30	15	11	108
	5.6%	42.6%	27.8%	13.9%	10.2%	100.0%
4	4	15	19	4	3	45
	8.9%	33.3%	42.2%	8.9%	6.7%	100.0%
5	4	13	11	4	1	33
	12.1%	39.4%	33.3%	12.1%	3.0%	100.0%
moderately crowded	9	25	19	7	5	65
	13.8%	38.5%	29.2%	10.8%	7.7%	100.0%
7	3	21	11	1	5	41
	7.3%	51.2%	26.8%	2.4%	12.2%	100.0%
8		3	11	6	1	21
		14.3%	52.4%	28.6%	4.8%	100.0%
extremely crowded		6	2	2		10
		60.0%	20.0%	20.0%		100.0%
Total	49	239	200	88	39	615
	8.0%	38.9%	32.5%	14.3%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	51.042(a)	32	.018
Likelihood Ratio	54.480	32	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	.107	1	.743
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 16 cells (35.6%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .63.

Table 110: How important is the next for your participation in hunting: To get outdoors* Income

	Income				Total
Outdoors	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
very important	21	15	36	223	295
	7.1%	5.1%	12.2%	75.6%	100.0%
unimportant			1	5	6
			16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
neither	5		2	2	9
	55.6%		22.2%	22.2%	100.0%
important	11	9	15	109	144
	7.6%	6.3%	10.4%	75.7%	100.0%
very unimportant		1	1	7	9
		11.1%	11.1%	77.8%	100.0%
Total	37	25	55	346	463
	8.0%	5.4%	11.9%	74.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.236(a)	12	.001
Likelihood Ratio	21.578	12	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	.298	1	.585
N of Valid Cases	463		

a 10 cells (50.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .32.

Table 111: How important is the next for your participation in hunting: To get outdoors * Highest level of education completed

		Highest level of education completed					Total
Outdoors		did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
	very important	19	144	128	55	30	376
		5.1%	38.3%	34.0%	14.6%	8.0%	100.0%
	unimportant	1	2	1	3		7
		14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	42.9%		100.0%
	neither	4	5	7			16
		25.0%	31.3%	43.8%			100.0%
	important	23	87	58	29	9	206
		11.2%	42.2%	28.2%	14.1%	4.4%	100.0%
	very unimportant		3	5	1		9
			33.3%	55.6%	11.1%		100.0%
Total		47	241	199	88	39	614
		7.7%	39.3%	32.4%	14.3%	6.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.649(a)	16	.015
Likelihood Ratio	31.848	16	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.951	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 13 cells (52.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .44.

Table 112: How important is the next for your participation in hunting: To obtain venison * Age Categories

		Age Categories						Total
To obtain venison		20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
	very important	6	8	11	13	8	6	52
		11.5%	15.4%	21.2%	25.0%	15.4%	11.5%	100.0%
	unimportant	1	3	12	17	28	32	93
		1.1%	3.2%	12.9%	18.3%	30.1%	34.4%	100.0%
	neither	8	20	39	61	48	51	227
		3.5%	8.8%	17.2%	26.9%	21.1%	22.5%	100.0%
	important	10	18	34	57	34	32	185
		5.4%	9.7%	18.4%	30.8%	18.4%	17.3%	100.0%
	very unimportant	1	2	3	11	21	20	58
		1.7%	3.4%	5.2%	19.0%	36.2%	34.5%	100.0%
Total		26	51	99	159	139	141	615
		4.2%	8.3%	16.1%	25.9%	22.6%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	54.358(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	54.830	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.196	1	.138
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 5 cells (16.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.20.

Table 113: How important is the next for your participation in hunting: To be with my friends * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
To be with my friends		uses camp	does not use camp	
	very important	198	40	238
		83.2%	16.8%	100.0%
	unimportant	13	12	25
		52.0%	48.0%	100.0%
	neither	37	20	57
		64.9%	35.1%	100.0%
	important	198	63	261
		75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
	very unimportant	25	10	35
		71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Total		471	145	616
		76.5%	23.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.073(a)	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	17.917	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.009	1	.045
N of Valid Cases	616		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 5.88.

Table 114: How important is the next for your participation in hunting: To help manage deer population * Income

		Income				Total
To help manage deer population		less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
	very important	9	2	7	59	77
		11.7%	2.6%	9.1%	76.6%	100.0%
	unimportant	5	2	4	41	52
		9.6%	3.8%	7.7%	78.8%	100.0%
	neither	10	10	11	102	133
		7.5%	7.5%	8.3%	76.7%	100.0%
	important	9	12	33	131	185
		4.9%	6.5%	17.8%	70.8%	100.0%
	very unimportant	4		1	11	16
		25.0%		6.3%	68.8%	100.0%
Total		37	26	56	344	463
		8.0%	5.6%	12.1%	74.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.311(a)	12	.034
Likelihood Ratio	21.382	12	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	.065	1	.798
N of Valid Cases	463		

a 6 cells (30.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .90.

Table 115: Primarily responsible for teaching you how to hunt * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Responsible for teaching to hunt	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
parent	24	147	118	62	25	376
	6.4%	39.1%	31.4%	16.5%	6.6%	100.0%
other relative	5	29	29	13	6	82
	6.1%	35.4%	35.4%	15.9%	7.3%	100.0%
peers		4	5			9
		44.4%	55.6%			100.0%
PGC hunting education course	1					1
	100.0%					100.0%
hunting camp companion	2	12	10	2	2	28
	7.1%	42.9%	35.7%	7.1%	7.1%	100.0%
friend	8	16	9	6	5	44
	18.2%	36.4%	20.5%	13.6%	11.4%	100.0%
learned on my own	9	33	29	5	1	77
	11.7%	42.9%	37.7%	6.5%	1.3%	100.0%
Total	49	241	200	88	39	617
	7.9%	39.1%	32.4%	14.3%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.981(a)	24	.027
Likelihood Ratio	35.523	24	.061
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.982	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	617		

a 16 cells (45.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .06.

Table 116: Who uses the most venison from the deer you harvest * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Uses venison	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
your household	24	48	85	142	109	95	503
	4.8%	9.5%	16.9%	28.2%	21.7%	18.9%	100.0%
other family members	1		8	5	12	23	49
	2.0%		16.3%	10.2%	24.5%	46.9%	100.0%
other hunters		1	1		8	7	17
		5.9%	5.9%		47.1%	41.2%	100.0%
friends		2	4	11	10	15	42
		4.8%	9.5%	26.2%	23.8%	35.7%	100.0%
charities					2	2	4
					50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
whoever will take it			1		3	2	6
			16.7%		50.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Total	25	51	99	158	144	144	621
	4.0%	8.2%	15.9%	25.4%	23.2%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.062(a)	25	.000
Likelihood Ratio	68.707	25	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.802	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	621		

a 22 cells (61.1%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .16.

Table 117: Who uses the most venison from the deer you harvest * Use hunting camps

		Uses hunting camps		Total
Uses venison		uses camp	does not use camp	
	your household	374	123	497
		75.3%	24.7%	100.0%
	other family members	35	13	48
		72.9%	27.1%	100.0%
	other hunters	15	2	17
		88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
	friends	38	4	42
		90.5%	9.5%	100.0%
	charities	1	3	4
		25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	whoever will take it	6		6
		100.0%		100.0%
Total		469	145	614
		76.4%	23.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.331(a)	5	.014
Likelihood Ratio	15.734	5	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.308	1	.069
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 5 cells (41.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .94.

Table 118: How supportive are you of a statewide antler restriction that requires bucks to have at least 3 points on one side * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
Support		uses camp	does not use camp	
	strongly support	94	37	131
		71.8%	28.2%	100.0%
	support	126	30	156
		80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
	slightly support	50	15	65
		76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
	neither support nor oppose	32	23	55
		58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
	slightly oppose	47	8	55
		85.5%	14.5%	100.0%
	oppose	54	13	67
		80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
	strongly oppose	69	19	88
		78.4%	21.6%	100.0%
Total		472	145	617
		76.5%	23.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.751(a)	6	.010
Likelihood Ratio	15.792	6	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	.828	1	.363
N of Valid Cases	617		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 12.93.

Table 119: How supportive are you of a antler restriction in the Sproul that requires bucks to have at least 3 points on one side * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
Support		uses camp	does not use camp	
	strongly support	102	40	142
		71.8%	28.2%	100.0%
	support	116	31	147
		78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
	slightly support	55	19	74
		74.3%	25.7%	100.0%
	neither support nor oppose	20	17	37
		54.1%	45.9%	100.0%
	slightly oppose	37	6	43
		86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	oppose	69	14	83
		83.1%	16.9%	100.0%
	strongly oppose	72	18	90
		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		471	145	616
		76.5%	23.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.565(a)	6	.007
Likelihood Ratio	16.504	6	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.825	1	.093
N of Valid Cases	616		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 8.71.

Table 120: Do you hunt alone * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Hunt alone	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
yes	7	22	43	94	83	92	341
	2.1%	6.5%	12.6%	27.6%	24.3%	27.0%	100.0%
no	19	29	56	65	60	50	279
	6.8%	10.4%	20.1%	23.3%	21.5%	17.9%	100.0%
Total	26	51	99	159	143	142	620
	4.2%	8.2%	16.0%	25.6%	23.1%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.654(a)	5	.000
Likelihood Ratio	23.864	5	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.031	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	620		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 11.70.

Table 121: Compared to other years, how much time did you spend driving deer on the Sproul in the 2001 riffle season * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Time driving deer	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
more time	4	7	6	12	9	2	40
	10.0%	17.5%	15.0%	30.0%	22.5%	5.0%	100.0%
about the same amount of time	8	13	35	47	40	31	174
	4.6%	7.5%	20.1%	27.0%	23.0%	17.8%	100.0%
less time	8	15	14	21	27	17	102
	7.8%	14.7%	13.7%	20.6%	26.5%	16.7%	100.0%
did not drive deer	5	15	44	76	68	93	301
	1.7%	5.0%	14.6%	25.2%	22.6%	30.9%	100.0%
Total	25	50	99	156	144	143	617
	4.1%	8.1%	16.0%	25.3%	23.3%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.014(a)	15	.000
Likelihood Ratio	47.111	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.635	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	617		

a 3 cells (12.5%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.62.

Table 122: Compared to other years, how much time did you spend driving deer on the Sproul in the 2001 riffle * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
Time driving deer		uses camp	does not use camp	
	more time	34	6	40
		85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	about the same amount of time	148	25	173
		85.5%	14.5%	100.0%
	less time	85	17	102
		83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	did not drive deer	204	95	299
		68.2%	31.8%	100.0%
Total		471	143	614
		76.7%	23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.651(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.017	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.880	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 9.32.

Table 123: Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area * Use hunting camps

	Use hunting camps		Total
Walk gated roads	uses camp	does not use camp	
yes	237	96	333
	71.2%	28.8%	100.0%
no	233	49	282
	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%
Total	470	145	615
	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.116(b)	1	.001		
Continuity Correction(a)	10.489	1	.001		
Likelihood Ratio	11.313	1	.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.001	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.098	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	615				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 66.49.

Table 124: Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands * Highest level of education completed

Public vs. Private	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
strongly disagree	4	5	1	2	1	13
	30.8%	38.5%	7.7%	15.4%	7.7%	100.0%
disagree	7	25	20	4	4	60
	11.7%	41.7%	33.3%	6.7%	6.7%	100.0%
neither agree nor disagree	3	35	29	13	3	83
	3.6%	42.2%	34.9%	15.7%	3.6%	100.0%
agree	27	96	72	39	12	246
	11.0%	39.0%	29.3%	15.9%	4.9%	100.0%
strongly agree	7	79	77	30	18	211
	3.3%	37.4%	36.5%	14.2%	8.5%	100.0%
Total	48	240	199	88	38	613
	7.8%	39.2%	32.5%	14.4%	6.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.723(a)	16	.011
Likelihood Ratio	31.181	16	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.843	1	.009
N of Valid Cases	613		

a 6 cells (24.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .81.

Table 125: Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands		uses camp	does not use camp	
	strongly disagree	9	3	12
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	disagree	47	14	61
		77.0%	23.0%	100.0%
	neither agree nor disagree	72	11	83
		86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
	agree	193	53	246
		78.5%	21.5%	100.0%
	strongly agree	149	64	213
		70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Total		470	145	615
		76.4%	23.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.449(a)	4	.034
Likelihood Ratio	10.854	4	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.377	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.83.

Table 126: Posting of private lands has made it more difficult for me to find a place to hunt * Income

		Income				Total
Posting of private lands		less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
	strongly disagree	7	2		22	31
		22.6%	6.5%		71.0%	100.0%
	disagree	9	4	17	68	98
		9.2%	4.1%	17.3%	69.4%	100.0%
	neither agree nor disagree	3	5	4	68	80
		3.8%	6.3%	5.0%	85.0%	100.0%
	agree	11	11	18	107	147
		7.5%	7.5%	12.2%	72.8%	100.0%
	strongly agree	8	4	17	79	108
		7.4%	3.7%	15.7%	73.1%	100.0%
Total		38	26	56	344	464
		8.2%	5.6%	12.1%	74.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.370(a)	12	.018
Likelihood Ratio	26.605	12	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.299	1	.254
N of Valid Cases	464		

a 4 cells (20.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.74.

Table 127: It has become increasingly difficult for me to find a good place to hunt deer * Income

		Income				Total
Difficult to find place to hunt deer		less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
	strongly disagree	5	6	2	26	39
		12.8%	15.4%	5.1%	66.7%	100.0%
	disagree	13	6	20	108	147
		8.8%	4.1%	13.6%	73.5%	100.0%
	neither agree nor disagree	8	10	12	72	102
		7.8%	9.8%	11.8%	70.6%	100.0%
	agree	5	4	17	86	112
		4.5%	3.6%	15.2%	76.8%	100.0%
	strongly agree	6		5	51	62
		9.7%		8.1%	82.3%	100.0%
Total		37	26	56	343	462
		8.0%	5.6%	12.1%	74.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.632(a)	12	.031
Likelihood Ratio	24.215	12	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.155	1	.042
N of Valid Cases	462		

a 5 cells (25.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.19.

Table 128: Keeping deer populations in balance with natural food supplies is necessary * Income

		Income				Total
Deer populations in balance		less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
	strongly disagree	5			3	8
		62.5%			37.5%	100.0%
	disagree	3		3	14	20
		15.0%		15.0%	70.0%	100.0%
	neither agree nor disagree	4	2	7	43	56
		7.1%	3.6%	12.5%	76.8%	100.0%
	agree	15	23	33	189	260
		5.8%	8.8%	12.7%	72.7%	100.0%
	strongly agree	11	1	13	96	121
		9.1%	.8%	10.7%	79.3%	100.0%
Total		38	26	56	345	465
		8.2%	5.6%	12.0%	74.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.323(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.010	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.045	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	465		

a 8 cells (40.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .45.

Table 129: I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer * Use of GPS unit

		Use of GPS unit		Total
Don't care Antlered /Antlerless		Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
	strongly disagree	39	97	136
		28.7%	71.3%	100.0%
	disagree	63	124	187
		33.7%	66.3%	100.0%
	neither agree nor disagree	45	81	126
		35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
	agree	29	106	135
		21.5%	78.5%	100.0%
	strongly agree	6	36	42
		14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
Total		182	444	626
		29.1%	70.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.865(a)	4	.012
Likelihood Ratio	13.591	4	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.695	1	.030
N of Valid Cases	626		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 12.21.

Table 130: I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Don't care Antlered /Antlerless	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
strongly disagree	4	7	14	28	36	46	135
	3.0%	5.2%	10.4%	20.7%	26.7%	34.1%	100.0%
disagree	4	16	26	53	48	36	183
	2.2%	8.7%	14.2%	29.0%	26.2%	19.7%	100.0%
neither agree nor disagree	3	10	28	42	23	20	126
	2.4%	7.9%	22.2%	33.3%	18.3%	15.9%	100.0%
agree	11	10	27	28	28	31	135
	8.1%	7.4%	20.0%	20.7%	20.7%	23.0%	100.0%
strongly agree	4	8	4	7	9	10	42
	9.5%	19.0%	9.5%	16.7%	21.4%	23.8%	100.0%
Total	26	51	99	158	144	143	621
	4.2%	8.2%	15.9%	25.4%	23.2%	23.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.009(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	46.001	20	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.816	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	621		

a 2 cells (6.7%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.76.

Table 131: I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Don't care Antlered /Antlerless	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
strongly disagree	8	54	42	17	15	136
	5.9%	39.7%	30.9%	12.5%	11.0%	100.0%
disagree	8	68	64	29	12	181
	4.4%	37.6%	35.4%	16.0%	6.6%	100.0%
neither agree nor disagree	6	54	40	21	5	126
	4.8%	42.9%	31.7%	16.7%	4.0%	100.0%
agree	22	51	37	18	4	132
	16.7%	38.6%	28.0%	13.6%	3.0%	100.0%
strongly agree	5	14	15	3	3	40
	12.5%	35.0%	37.5%	7.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Total	49	241	198	88	39	615
	8.0%	39.2%	32.2%	14.3%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.984(a)	16	.010
Likelihood Ratio	29.812	16	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.486	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	615		

a 2 cells (8.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.54.

Table 132: The higher the deer population, the better my hunting experience * Use of GPS unit

Higher deer, higher hunting experience		Use of GPS unit		Total
		Use of GPS unit Respondent	Non-Use of GPS unit Respondent	
	strongly disagree	7	12	19
		36.8%	63.2%	100.0%
	disagree	34	66	100
		34.0%	66.0%	100.0%
	neither agree nor disagree	34	61	95
		35.8%	64.2%	100.0%
	agree	83	198	281
		29.5%	70.5%	100.0%
	strongly agree	24	104	128
		18.8%	81.3%	100.0%
Total		182	441	623
		29.2%	70.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.420(a)	4	.034
Likelihood Ratio	10.902	4	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.622	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	623		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 5.55.

Table 133: The higher the deer population, the better my hunting experience * Income

The higher the deer population, the better my hunting experience	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
strongly disagree	6			9	15
	40.0%			60.0%	100.0%
disagree	5	4	14	51	74
	6.8%	5.4%	18.9%	68.9%	100.0%
neither agree nor disagree	2	5	12	54	73
	2.7%	6.8%	16.4%	74.0%	100.0%
agree	15	10	22	160	207
	7.2%	4.8%	10.6%	77.3%	100.0%
strongly agree	9	6	8	71	94
	9.6%	6.4%	8.5%	75.5%	100.0%
Total	37	25	56	345	463
	8.0%	5.4%	12.1%	74.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.851(a)	12	.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.431	12	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.800	1	.180
N of Valid Cases	463		

a 5 cells (25.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .81.

Table 134: The number of deer has no effect on forest regeneration * Highest level of education completed

Number of deer on forest regeneration	Highest level of education completed					Total
	did not complete high school	completed high school	some college or vocational training	completed college degree	graduate or prof training beyond college	
strongly disagree	8	46	53	22	19	148
	5.4%	31.1%	35.8%	14.9%	12.8%	100.0%
disagree	19	109	96	45	13	282
	6.7%	38.7%	34.0%	16.0%	4.6%	100.0%
neither agree nor disagree	11	59	30	15	5	120
	9.2%	49.2%	25.0%	12.5%	4.2%	100.0%
agree	9	20	17	4	2	52
	17.3%	38.5%	32.7%	7.7%	3.8%	100.0%
strongly agree	2	6	3	1		12
	16.7%	50.0%	25.0%	8.3%		100.0%
Total	49	240	199	87	39	614
	8.0%	39.1%	32.4%	14.2%	6.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.797(a)	16	.006
Likelihood Ratio	31.557	16	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.671	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	614		

a 7 cells (28.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .76.

Table 135: How many years have you been hunting deer?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	1	.3	.3	.3
2	5	1.4	1.4	1.6
3	1	.3	.3	1.9
4	3	.8	.8	2.7
5	2	.5	.5	3.3
6	1	.3	.3	3.6
7	3	.8	.8	4.4
8	4	1.1	1.1	5.5
9	2	.5	.5	6.0
10	5	1.4	1.4	7.4
11	3	.8	.8	8.2
12	5	1.4	1.4	9.6
13	4	1.1	1.1	10.7
14	1	.3	.3	11.0
15	7	1.9	1.9	12.9
16	4	1.1	1.1	14.0
17	2	.5	.5	14.5
18	4	1.1	1.1	15.6
19	1	.3	.3	15.9
20	21	5.7	5.8	21.6
21	2	.5	.5	22.2
22	3	.8	.8	23.0
23	4	1.1	1.1	24.1
24	10	2.7	2.7	26.8
25	22	6.0	6.0	32.9
26	7	1.9	1.9	34.8
27	9	2.5	2.5	37.3
28	8	2.2	2.2	39.5
29	4	1.1	1.1	40.5
30	33	9.0	9.0	49.6
31	4	1.1	1.1	50.7
32	2	.5	.5	51.2
33	10	2.7	2.7	54.0
34	5	1.4	1.4	55.3
35	20	5.5	5.5	60.8
36	10	2.7	2.7	63.6
37	2	.5	.5	64.1
38	8	2.2	2.2	66.3
39	2	.5	.5	66.8
40	30	8.2	8.2	75.1
41	5	1.4	1.4	76.4
42	4	1.1	1.1	77.5

	43	4	1.1	1.1	78.6
	44	8	2.2	2.2	80.8
	45	11	3.0	3.0	83.8
	46	2	.5	.5	84.4
	47	3	.8	.8	85.2
	48	4	1.1	1.1	86.3
	49	1	.3	.3	86.6
	50	14	3.8	3.8	90.4
	51	3	.8	.8	91.2
	52	6	1.6	1.6	92.9
	53	6	1.6	1.6	94.5
	54	2	.5	.5	95.1
	55	2	.5	.5	95.6
	56	1	.3	.3	95.9
	57	1	.3	.3	96.2
	58	1	.3	.3	96.4
	60	9	2.5	2.5	98.9
	61	1	.3	.3	99.2
	62	1	.3	.3	99.5
	63	2	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	365	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 136: How many years have you hunted deer in Pennsylvania?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	2	.5	.5	.5
2	6	1.6	1.6	2.2
3	1	.3	.3	2.5
4	3	.8	.8	3.3
5	2	.5	.5	3.8
6	1	.3	.3	4.1
7	4	1.1	1.1	5.2
8	4	1.1	1.1	6.3
9	2	.5	.5	6.9
10	7	1.9	1.9	8.8
11	2	.5	.5	9.3
12	6	1.6	1.6	11.0
13	4	1.1	1.1	12.1
14	1	.3	.3	12.4
15	8	2.2	2.2	14.6
16	3	.8	.8	15.4
17	2	.5	.5	15.9
18	6	1.6	1.6	17.6

	19	1	.3	.3	17.9
	20	19	5.2	5.2	23.1
	21	3	.8	.8	23.9
	22	5	1.4	1.4	25.3
	23	3	.8	.8	26.1
	24	11	3.0	3.0	29.1
	25	20	5.5	5.5	34.6
	26	7	1.9	1.9	36.5
	27	9	2.5	2.5	39.0
	28	10	2.7	2.7	41.8
	29	4	1.1	1.1	42.9
	30	32	8.7	8.8	51.6
	31	4	1.1	1.1	52.7
	32	1	.3	.3	53.0
	33	12	3.3	3.3	56.3
	34	8	2.2	2.2	58.5
	35	18	4.9	4.9	63.5
	36	9	2.5	2.5	65.9
	37	2	.5	.5	66.5
	38	9	2.5	2.5	69.0
	39	2	.5	.5	69.5
	40	27	7.4	7.4	76.9
	41	3	.8	.8	77.7
	42	5	1.4	1.4	79.1
	43	4	1.1	1.1	80.2
	44	9	2.5	2.5	82.7
	45	10	2.7	2.7	85.4
	46	1	.3	.3	85.7
	47	2	.5	.5	86.3
	48	3	.8	.8	87.1
	50	12	3.3	3.3	90.4
	51	3	.8	.8	91.2
	52	5	1.4	1.4	92.6
	53	6	1.6	1.6	94.2
	54	2	.5	.5	94.8
	55	2	.5	.5	95.3
	56	1	.3	.3	95.6
	57	1	.3	.3	95.9
	58	1	.3	.3	96.2
	60	10	2.7	2.7	98.9
	61	1	.3	.3	99.2
	62	1	.3	.3	99.5
	63	2	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 137: How many years have you hunted deer in the Sproul State Forest?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1	.3	.3	.3
1	10	2.7	2.7	3.0
2	19	5.2	5.2	8.2
3	11	3.0	3.0	11.3
4	9	2.5	2.5	13.7
5	15	4.1	4.1	17.9
6	3	.8	.8	18.7
7	7	1.9	1.9	20.6
8	5	1.4	1.4	22.0
9	5	1.4	1.4	23.4
10	17	4.6	4.7	28.0
11	1	.3	.3	28.3
12	10	2.7	2.7	31.0
13	4	1.1	1.1	32.1
14	1	.3	.3	32.4
15	15	4.1	4.1	36.5
17	2	.5	.5	37.1
18	5	1.4	1.4	38.5
19	2	.5	.5	39.0
20	28	7.7	7.7	46.7
21	3	.8	.8	47.5
22	6	1.6	1.6	49.2
23	3	.8	.8	50.0
24	8	2.2	2.2	52.2
25	18	4.9	4.9	57.1
26	5	1.4	1.4	58.5
27	8	2.2	2.2	60.7
28	4	1.1	1.1	61.8
29	4	1.1	1.1	62.9
30	35	9.6	9.6	72.5
31	6	1.6	1.6	74.2
32	2	.5	.5	74.7
33	9	2.5	2.5	77.2
34	5	1.4	1.4	78.6
35	15	4.1	4.1	82.7
36	4	1.1	1.1	83.8
37	3	.8	.8	84.6
38	4	1.1	1.1	85.7
39	2	.5	.5	86.3
40	12	3.3	3.3	89.6
41	1	.3	.3	89.8
42	2	.5	.5	90.4

	43	1	.3	.3	90.7
	44	2	.5	.5	91.2
	45	6	1.6	1.6	92.9
	47	2	.5	.5	93.4
	48	2	.5	.5	94.0
	50	9	2.5	2.5	96.4
	52	3	.8	.8	97.3
	53	3	.8	.8	98.1
	54	1	.3	.3	98.4
	55	1	.3	.3	98.6
	57	1	.3	.3	98.9
	58	2	.5	.5	99.5
	60	1	.3	.3	99.7
	63	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 138: How many years have you hunted antlerless deer in the Sproul?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	116	31.7	32.0	32.0
1	29	7.9	8.0	39.9
2	31	8.5	8.5	48.5
3	16	4.4	4.4	52.9
4	20	5.5	5.5	58.4
5	17	4.6	4.7	63.1
6	5	1.4	1.4	64.5
7	1	.3	.3	64.7
8	4	1.1	1.1	65.8
9	2	.5	.6	66.4
10	20	5.5	5.5	71.9
11	2	.5	.6	72.5
12	5	1.4	1.4	73.8
13	4	1.1	1.1	74.9
15	13	3.6	3.6	78.5
16	1	.3	.3	78.8
17	1	.3	.3	79.1
18	2	.5	.6	79.6
20	19	5.2	5.2	84.8
21	1	.3	.3	85.1
22	4	1.1	1.1	86.2
23	4	1.1	1.1	87.3
24	1	.3	.3	87.6
25	9	2.5	2.5	90.1
26	2	.5	.6	90.6

	28	1	.3	.3	90.9
	29	1	.3	.3	91.2
	30	10	2.7	2.8	93.9
	31	2	.5	.6	94.5
	32	1	.3	.3	94.8
	33	5	1.4	1.4	96.1
	34	1	.3	.3	96.4
	35	2	.5	.6	97.0
	37	1	.3	.3	97.2
	40	8	2.2	2.2	99.4
	50	2	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 139: Compared to other years, how much time did you spend hunting deer on the Sproul in the 2002 season

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 More time	82	22.4	22.6	22.6
	2 About the same amount of time	204	55.7	56.2	78.8
	3 Less time	77	21.0	21.2	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 140: In addition to the general hunting license, which other licenses or stamps did you have for the 2002 season for hunting deer in Pennsylvania?

140A Archery License		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Archery License	131	35.8	36.2	36.2
	2 Antlerless License	166	45.4	45.9	82.0
	3 None of the above	65	17.8	18.0	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

140B Antlerless License		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Archery License	137	37.4	60.4	60.4
	2 Antlerless License	90	24.6	39.6	100.0
	Total	227	62.0	100.0	
Missing	System	139	38.0		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 141: Did you kill an antlered deer in 2002?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	93	25.4	25.5	25.5
	2 No	272	74.3	74.5	100.0
	Total	365	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 142: In what season did you kill this antlered deer? (2002)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Early	11	3.0	12.0	12.0
	2 Firearm	78	21.3	84.8	96.7
	3 Late	3	.8	3.3	100.0
	Total	92	25.1	100.0	
Missing	System	274	74.9		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 143: Did you kill an antlerless deer in 2002?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	116	31.7	31.8	31.8
	2 No	249	68.0	68.2	100.0
	Total	365	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 144: In what season did you kill this antlerless deer? (2002)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Early	22	6.0	19.0	19.0
	2 Early Junior/Senior	1	.3	.9	19.8
	3 Firearm	79	21.6	68.1	87.9
	4 Late	14	3.8	12.1	100.0
	Total	116	31.7	100.0	
Missing	System	250	68.3		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 145: What is the furthest you are willing to travel from your home to hunt antlered deer in a concurrent season?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	2	.5	.6	.6
1	1	.3	.3	.8
10	7	1.9	1.9	2.8
15	1	.3	.3	3.0
17	1	.3	.3	3.3
18	1	.3	.3	3.6
20	12	3.3	3.3	6.9
25	6	1.6	1.7	8.6
30	16	4.4	4.4	13.0
32	1	.3	.3	13.3
35	3	.8	.8	14.1
40	16	4.4	4.4	18.5
45	2	.5	.6	19.1
50	26	7.1	7.2	26.2
60	18	4.9	5.0	31.2
65	1	.3	.3	31.5
70	2	.5	.6	32.0
72	1	.3	.3	32.3
75	2	.5	.6	32.9
80	7	1.9	1.9	34.8
85	2	.5	.6	35.4
90	5	1.4	1.4	36.7
99	23	6.3	6.4	43.1
100	92	25.1	25.4	68.5
110	1	.3	.3	68.8
120	4	1.1	1.1	69.9
123	1	.3	.3	70.2
130	3	.8	.8	71.0
140	1	.3	.3	71.3
150	27	7.4	7.5	78.7
160	3	.8	.8	79.6
165	1	.3	.3	79.8
170	3	.8	.8	80.7
175	2	.5	.6	81.2
180	6	1.6	1.7	82.9
190	1	.3	.3	83.1
200	27	7.4	7.5	90.6
225	2	.5	.6	91.2
240	1	.3	.3	91.4
250	7	1.9	1.9	93.4
260	1	.3	.3	93.6
300	6	1.6	1.7	95.3

	350	2	.5	.6	95.9
	380	1	.3	.3	96.1
	400	1	.3	.3	96.4
	450	1	.3	.3	96.7
	600	1	.3	.3	97.0
	999	9	2.5	2.5	99.4
	3000	2	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 146: What is the furthest you are willing to travel from your home to hunt antlerless deer in a concurrent season?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
\	0	51	13.9	14.3	14.3
	1	5	1.4	1.4	15.7
	6	1	.3	.3	16.0
	8	1	.3	.3	16.3
	10	14	3.8	3.9	20.2
	12	1	.3	.3	20.5
	14	1	.3	.3	20.8
	15	3	.8	.8	21.6
	17	1	.3	.3	21.9
	18	1	.3	.3	22.2
	20	18	4.9	5.1	27.2
	25	6	1.6	1.7	28.9
	30	20	5.5	5.6	34.6
	32	1	.3	.3	34.8
	35	4	1.1	1.1	36.0
	40	18	4.9	5.1	41.0
	45	1	.3	.3	41.3
	50	31	8.5	8.7	50.0
	60	13	3.6	3.7	53.7
	65	1	.3	.3	53.9
	70	2	.5	.6	54.5
	75	2	.5	.6	55.1
	80	9	2.5	2.5	57.6
	85	1	.3	.3	57.9
	90	1	.3	.3	58.1
	99	2	.5	.6	58.7
	100	30	8.2	8.4	67.1
	110	1	.3	.3	67.4
	120	6	1.6	1.7	69.1
	123	1	.3	.3	69.4
	124	1	.3	.3	69.7

	125	1	.3	.3	69.9
	130	4	1.1	1.1	71.1
	150	20	5.5	5.6	76.7
	160	5	1.4	1.4	78.1
	165	2	.5	.6	78.7
	170	3	.8	.8	79.5
	175	1	.3	.3	79.8
	180	7	1.9	2.0	81.7
	190	1	.3	.3	82.0
	200	25	6.8	7.0	89.0
	225	2	.5	.6	89.6
	250	9	2.5	2.5	92.1
	260	1	.3	.3	92.4
	290	1	.3	.3	92.7
	300	7	1.9	2.0	94.7
	350	2	.5	.6	95.2
	380	1	.3	.3	95.5
	400	2	.5	.6	96.1
	450	1	.3	.3	96.3
	500	1	.3	.3	96.6
	600	2	.5	.6	97.2
	999	7	1.9	2.0	99.2
	1000	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	356	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.7		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 147: How many days did you spend afield in each of the following 2002 hunting seasons:

147A Early (Archery, Flintlock/Muzzleloader)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	112	30.6	31.1	31.1
1	104	28.4	28.9	60.0
2	15	4.1	4.2	64.2
3	10	2.7	2.8	66.9
4	14	3.8	3.9	70.8
5	20	5.5	5.6	76.4
6	10	2.7	2.8	79.2
7	11	3.0	3.1	82.2
8	8	2.2	2.2	84.4
9	2	.5	.6	85.0
10	14	3.8	3.9	88.9
12	5	1.4	1.4	90.3
13	1	.3	.3	90.6
14	3	.8	.8	91.4
15	12	3.3	3.3	94.7

	20	11	3.0	3.1	97.8
	22	1	.3	.3	98.1
	25	2	.5	.6	98.6
	30	4	1.1	1.1	99.7
	42	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

147B Early Junior/Senior (Archery, October Firearm, Flintlock/Muzzleloader)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	163	44.5	45.3	45.3
1	144	39.3	40.0	85.3
2	25	6.8	6.9	92.2
3	16	4.4	4.4	96.7
4	1	.3	.3	96.9
5	3	.8	.8	97.8
6	2	.5	.6	98.3
7	1	.3	.3	98.6
10	1	.3	.3	98.9
12	1	.3	.3	99.2
14	1	.3	.3	99.4
15	1	.3	.3	99.7
40	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing System	6	1.6		
Total	366	100.0		

147C Firearm (Rifle/Pistol/Shotgun)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1	.3	.3	.3
1	18	4.9	5.0	5.3
2	15	4.1	4.2	9.4
3	40	10.9	11.1	20.6
4	40	10.9	11.1	31.7
5	72	19.7	20.0	51.7
6	40	10.9	11.1	62.8
7	42	11.5	11.7	74.4
8	24	6.6	6.7	81.1
9	1	.3	.3	81.4
9	5	1.4	1.4	82.8
10	30	8.2	8.3	91.1
11	2	.5	.6	91.7

	12	14	3.8	3.9	95.6
	13	1	.3	.3	95.8
	14	14	3.8	3.9	99.7
	18	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

147D Late (Archery, Flintlock/Muzzleloader)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	128	35.0	35.6	35.6
	1	118	32.2	32.8	68.3
	2	24	6.6	6.7	75.0
	3	21	5.7	5.8	80.8
	4	24	6.6	6.7	87.5
	5	15	4.1	4.2	91.7
	6	11	3.0	3.1	94.7
	7	3	.8	.8	95.6
	8	5	1.4	1.4	96.9
	9	1	.3	.3	97.2
	10	3	.8	.8	98.1
	11	1	.3	.3	98.3
	12	3	.8	.8	99.2
	14	2	.5	.6	99.7
	21	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 148: How many days, in total, did you spend visiting your hunting areas, in the 2002 hunting season, when you were not hunting deer?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	11	3.0	3.2	3.2
1	39	10.7	11.2	14.3
2	32	8.7	9.2	23.5
3	32	8.7	9.2	32.7
4	17	4.6	4.9	37.5
5	32	8.7	9.2	46.7
6	24	6.6	6.9	53.6
7	19	5.2	5.4	59.0
8	10	2.7	2.9	61.9
9	1	.3	.3	62.2
10	34	9.3	9.7	71.9
12	14	3.8	4.0	75.9

	14	15	4.1	4.3	80.2
	15	13	3.6	3.7	84.0
	17	1	.3	.3	84.2
	18	2	.5	.6	84.8
	19	1	.3	.3	85.1
	20	17	4.6	4.9	90.0
	21	6	1.6	1.7	91.7
	23	1	.3	.3	92.0
	25	5	1.4	1.4	93.4
	30	11	3.0	3.2	96.6
	35	2	.5	.6	97.1
	40	1	.3	.3	97.4
	45	1	.3	.3	97.7
	48	1	.3	.3	98.0
	50	1	.3	.3	98.3
	52	1	.3	.3	98.6
	60	3	.8	.9	99.4
	90	2	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	349	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	17	4.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 149: For each of the following 2002 hunting seasons, where did you primarily hunt:

149A Early (Archery, Flintlock/Muzzleloader)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Public Lands	118	32.2	46.6	46.6
	2 Private Lands	48	13.1	19.0	65.6
	3 Did not hunt in that season	87	23.8	34.4	100.0
	Total	253	69.1	100.0	
Missing	System	113	30.9		
Total		366	100.0		

149B October Antlerless Firearm		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Public Lands	71	19.4	33.8	33.8
	2 Private Lands	26	7.1	12.4	46.2
	3 Did not hunt in that season	113	30.9	53.8	100.0
	Total	210	57.4	100.0	
Missing	System	156	42.6		
Total		366	100.0		

149C Firearm		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Public Lands	321	87.7	89.9	89.9
	2 Private Lands	35	9.6	9.8	99.7
	3 Did not hunt in that season	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	357	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	2.5		
Total		366	100.0		

149 Late (Archery, Flintlock/Muzzleloader)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Public Lands	88	24.0	37.4	37.4
	2 Private Lands	45	12.3	19.1	56.6
	3 Did not hunt in that season	102	27.9	43.4	100.0
	Total	235	64.2	100.0	
Missing	System	131	35.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 150: How far do you travel from your home to hunt deer in the Sproul?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	1	.3	.3	.3
2	1	.3	.3	.6
3	1	.3	.3	.8
4	1	.3	.3	1.1
5	3	.8	.8	1.9
7	2	.5	.6	2.5
8	1	.3	.3	2.8
9	1	.3	.3	3.0
10	8	2.2	2.2	5.3
12	6	1.6	1.7	6.9
14	2	.5	.6	7.5
15	9	2.5	2.5	10.0
17	1	.3	.3	10.2
18	1	.3	.3	10.5
19	1	.3	.3	10.8
20	13	3.6	3.6	14.4
22	3	.8	.8	15.2
25	4	1.1	1.1	16.3
28	1	.3	.3	16.6
30	20	5.5	5.5	22.2
32	1	.3	.3	22.4
35	14	3.8	3.9	26.3
37	1	.3	.3	26.6

40	17	4.6	4.7	31.3
45	6	1.6	1.7	33.0
50	14	3.8	3.9	36.8
55	1	.3	.3	37.1
56	1	.3	.3	37.4
60	8	2.2	2.2	39.6
65	1	.3	.3	39.9
70	1	.3	.3	40.2
72	1	.3	.3	40.4
75	5	1.4	1.4	41.8
80	9	2.5	2.5	44.3
83	1	.3	.3	44.6
84	1	.3	.3	44.9
85	2	.5	.6	45.4
90	3	.8	.8	46.3
99	2	.5	.6	46.8
100	21	5.7	5.8	52.6
105	1	.3	.3	52.9
110	1	.3	.3	53.2
113	1	.3	.3	53.5
115	2	.5	.6	54.0
120	13	3.6	3.6	57.6
123	1	.3	.3	57.9
124	1	.3	.3	58.2
125	3	.8	.8	59.0
130	10	2.7	2.8	61.8
135	2	.5	.6	62.3
136	2	.5	.6	62.9
140	5	1.4	1.4	64.3
148	1	.3	.3	64.5
150	37	10.1	10.2	74.8
156	1	.3	.3	75.1
160	11	3.0	3.0	78.1
161	1	.3	.3	78.4
163	1	.3	.3	78.7
165	4	1.1	1.1	79.8
170	4	1.1	1.1	80.9
175	7	1.9	1.9	82.8
180	11	3.0	3.0	85.9
185	1	.3	.3	86.1
190	3	.8	.8	87.0
200	15	4.1	4.2	91.1
205	1	.3	.3	91.4
210	1	.3	.3	91.7
215	1	.3	.3	92.0
225	3	.8	.8	92.8
230	1	.3	.3	93.1

	240	2	.5	.6	93.6
	250	6	1.6	1.7	95.3
	260	1	.3	.3	95.6
	300	5	1.4	1.4	97.0
	375	1	.3	.3	97.2
	400	3	.8	.8	98.1
	450	1	.3	.3	98.3
	500	1	.3	.3	98.6
	600	2	.5	.6	99.2
	1000	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 151: When hunting deer in the Sproul, do you normally stay away from home?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	305	83.3	84.5	84.5
	2 No	56	15.3	15.5	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 152: Do you own, belong to, or use a camp in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Own camp	93	25.4	25.6	25.6
	2 Belong to camp	141	38.5	38.8	64.5
	3 Use camp	59	16.1	16.3	80.7
	4 None of the above	70	19.1	19.3	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 153: When hunting deer in the Sproul, how would you best describe the topography where you most often hunt?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Upper plateau fields	81	22.1	22.4	22.4
	2 Side hills	64	17.5	17.7	40.1
	3 Valley bottoms	3	.8	.8	40.9
	4 Mixed topography	214	58.5	59.1	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 154: Please rank the most frequently hunted habitat types.

154A Most frequently hunted habitat		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Oak dominated area, open woods	55	15.0	32.4	32.4
	2 Maple and other hardwood dominated area, open wooded	14	3.8	8.2	40.6
	3 Pine and hemlock dominated area, open wooded	8	2.2	4.7	45.3
	4 Wooded area with dense stands of Mt. Laurel or rhododendron	75	20.5	44.1	89.4
	5 Dense wooded area, limited visibility	7	1.9	4.1	93.5
	6 Large areas with no undergrowth and patchy trees	6	1.6	3.5	97.1
	7 Forest with mixed ages, open area	2	.5	1.2	98.2
	8 Mixed low vegetation, open area	3	.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	170	46.4	100.0	
Missing	System	196	53.6		
Total		366	100.0		

154B Second most frequently hunted habitat		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Oak dominated area, open woods	50	13.7	29.4	29.4
	2 Maple and other hardwood dominated area, open wooded	24	6.6	14.1	43.5

	3 Pine and hemlock dominated area, open wooded	21	5.7	12.4	55.9
	4 Wooded area with dense stands of Mt. Laurel or rhododendron	53	14.5	31.2	87.1
	5 Dense wooded area, limited visibility	7	1.9	4.1	91.2
	6 Large areas with no undergrowth and patchy trees	5	1.4	2.9	94.1
	7 Forest with mixed ages, open area	3	.8	1.8	95.9
	8 Mixed low vegetation, open area	7	1.9	4.1	100.0
	Total	170	46.4	100.0	
Missing	System	196	53.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 155: Approximately what percent of the time do you hunt in each habitat?

155A Most frequently hunted habitat		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	10	1	.3	.3	.3
	20	4	1.1	1.1	1.4
	25	3	.8	.8	2.3
	30	2	.5	.6	2.8
	40	15	4.1	4.2	7.1
	45	1	.3	.3	7.4
	50	138	37.7	39.1	46.5
	60	38	10.4	10.8	57.2
	65	3	.8	.8	58.1
	70	32	8.7	9.1	67.1
	75	47	12.8	13.3	80.5
	80	47	12.8	13.3	93.8
	85	4	1.1	1.1	94.9
	90	10	2.7	2.8	97.7
	95	2	.5	.6	98.3
	100	6	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	353	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	13	3.6		
Total		366	100.0		

155B Second most frequently hunted habitat		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	5	1.4	1.4	1.4
	5	3	.8	.9	2.3
	10	11	3.0	3.1	5.4
	15	4	1.1	1.1	6.6
	20	46	12.6	13.1	19.7
	25	46	12.6	13.1	32.9
	30	45	12.3	12.9	45.7
	35	5	1.4	1.4	47.1
	40	42	11.5	12.0	59.1
	50	128	35.0	36.6	95.7
	60	7	1.9	2.0	97.7
	70	2	.5	.6	98.3
	75	3	.8	.9	99.1
	80	3	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	350	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	16	4.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 156: How supportive would you be of a statewide antler restriction that requires bucks to have at least three points on one side?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly support	119	32.5	33.0	33.0
	2 Support	119	32.5	33.0	65.9
	3 Slightly support	27	7.4	7.5	73.4
	4 Neither support nor oppose	34	9.3	9.4	82.8
	5 Slightly oppose	22	6.0	6.1	88.9
	6 Oppose	21	5.7	5.8	94.7
	7 Strongly oppose	19	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 157: Group permits that allow parties to hunt together to harvest deer, regardless of who actually takes the animal, is one suggestion for managing deer in remote areas or where specific reductions are desired. How supportive would you be of a proposal that allow group permits?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly support	29	7.9	8.1	8.1
	2 Support	59	16.1	16.4	24.4
	3 Slightly support	35	9.6	9.7	34.2
	4 Neither support nor oppose	67	18.3	18.6	52.8
	5 Slightly oppose	20	5.5	5.6	58.3
	6 Oppose	67	18.3	18.6	76.9
	7 Strongly oppose	83	22.7	23.1	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 158: This spring the Game Commission established 22 deer management areas. How supportive are you of the proposed deer management area approach for allocating antlerless licenses?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly support	85	23.2	23.6	23.6
	2 Support	114	31.1	31.7	55.3
	3 Slightly support	27	7.4	7.5	62.8
	4 Neither support nor oppose	71	19.4	19.7	82.5
	5 Slightly oppose	18	4.9	5.0	87.5
	6 Oppose	28	7.7	7.8	95.3
	7 Strongly oppose	17	4.6	4.7	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 159: While in the field, do you typically hunt alone?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	195	53.3	53.6	53.6
	2 No	169	46.2	46.4	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 160: Do you use any of the following while you hunt the Sproul?

160A Maps		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	132	36.1	36.3	36.3
	2 No	232	63.4	63.7	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

160B Compass		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	177	48.4	48.6	48.6
	2 No	187	51.1	51.4	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

160C Walkie-talkie		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	216	59.0	59.3	59.3
	2 No	148	40.4	40.7	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

160D GPS Unit		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	64	17.5	17.6	17.6
	2 No	300	82.0	82.4	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 161: During the 2002 rifle season, how did you typically hunt?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 Drives with nine or less hunters	37	10.1	10.2	10.2
2 Drives with ten or more hunters	24	6.6	6.6	16.8
3 In ground stand	95	26.0	26.1	42.9
4 In tree stand	68	18.6	18.7	61.5
5 Stalking	90	24.6	24.7	86.3
6 Small, quiet, pushes	42	11.5	11.5	97.8
7 Other	8	2.2	2.2	100.0

	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 162: Compared to other years, how much time did you spend driving deer on the Sproul in the 2002 rifle season?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 More time	24	6.6	6.6	6.6
	2 About the same amount of time	103	28.1	28.4	35.0
	3 Less time	77	21.0	21.2	56.2
	4 Did not drive deer	159	43.4	43.8	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 163: With the change to concurrent seasons, are you now more likely to buy an antlerless license to hunt on the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	179	48.9	49.3	49.3
	2 No	184	50.3	50.7	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table164: Did the concurrent season change the way you hunted deer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	58	15.8	16.0	16.0
	2 No	305	83.3	84.0	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 165: Did the concurrent season change the way your group or camp hunted deer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	47	12.8	13.2	13.2
	2 No	308	84.2	86.8	100.0
	Total	355	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	11	3.0		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 166: In total, during the 2002 hunting season, how many people purchased hunting licenses in your household?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1	247	67.5	68.2	68.2
	2	80	21.9	22.1	90.3
	3	18	4.9	5.0	95.3
	4	14	3.8	3.9	99.2
	5	2	.5	.6	99.7
	6	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 167: How many were junior license holders?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	301	82.2	85.0	85.0
	1	38	10.4	10.7	95.8
	2	12	3.3	3.4	99.2
	3	2	.5	.6	99.7
	5	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	354	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	12	3.3		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 168: In the 2002 hunting season, what was the maximum distance you hunted from a paved road in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	.8	.9	.9
	0	2	.5	.6	1.5
	0	2	.5	.6	2.0
	1	3	.8	.9	2.9
	1	38	10.4	11.1	14.0
	1	2	.5	.6	14.6
	1	1	.3	.3	14.9
	2	12	3.3	3.5	18.4
	2	63	17.2	18.4	36.8
	2	1	.3	.3	37.1
	3	4	1.1	1.2	38.3
	3	42	11.5	12.3	50.6
	3	2	.5	.6	51.2
	3	1	.3	.3	51.5

	4	7	1.9	2.0	53.5
	4	1	.3	.3	53.8
	4	20	5.5	5.8	59.6
	4	1	.3	.3	59.9
	5	1	.3	.3	60.2
	5	1	.3	.3	60.5
	5	57	15.6	16.7	77.2
	5	1	.3	.3	77.5
	6	2	.5	.6	78.1
	6	10	2.7	2.9	81.0
	6	1	.3	.3	81.3
	7	1	.3	.3	81.6
	7	1	.3	.3	81.9
	7	10	2.7	2.9	84.8
	8	8	2.2	2.3	87.1
	9	3	.8	.9	88.0
	10	17	4.6	5.0	93.0
	11	3	.8	.9	93.9
	12	6	1.6	1.8	95.6
	13	1	.3	.3	95.9
	13	1	.3	.3	96.2
	14	1	.3	.3	96.5
	15	5	1.4	1.5	98.0
	18	2	.5	.6	98.5
	20	3	.8	.9	99.4
	25	1	.3	.3	99.7
	50	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	342	93.4	100.0	
Missing	System	24	6.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 169: In the 2002 hunting season, what was the maximum distance you hunted from an open or non-gated dirt road in the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
\	0	5	1.4	1.5	1.5
	0	1	.3	.3	1.8
	0	1	.3	.3	2.1
	0	2	.5	.6	2.7
	0	5	1.4	1.5	4.3
	0	1	.3	.3	4.6
	1	27	7.4	8.2	12.8
	1	1	.3	.3	13.1
	1	2	.5	.6	13.7
	1	1	.3	.3	14.0
	1	1	.3	.3	14.3

	1	131	35.8	39.9	54.3
	1	1	.3	.3	54.6
	1	2	.5	.6	55.2
	1	2	.5	.6	55.8
	2	18	4.9	5.5	61.3
	2	1	.3	.3	61.6
	2	2	.5	.6	62.2
	2	61	16.7	18.6	80.8
	3	6	1.6	1.8	82.6
	3	27	7.4	8.2	90.9
	4	1	.3	.3	91.2
	4	6	1.6	1.8	93.0
	4	1	.3	.3	93.3
	5	12	3.3	3.7	97.0
	6	2	.5	.6	97.6
	8	2	.5	.6	98.2
	10	4	1.1	1.2	99.4
	15	1	.3	.3	99.7
	50	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	328	89.6	100.0	
Missing	System	38	10.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 170: Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Yes	248	67.8	68.7	68.7
	2 No	113	30.9	31.3	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 171: For each of the following statements, please indicate whether or not you agree:

171A Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	4	1.1	1.1	1.1
	2 Disagree	50	13.7	13.8	14.9
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	49	13.4	13.5	28.5
	4 Agree	162	44.3	44.8	73.2
	5 Strongly Agree	97	26.5	26.8	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171B Public lands have higher densities		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	74	20.2	20.5	20.5
	2 Disagree	190	51.9	52.6	73.1
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	61	16.7	16.9	90.0
	4 Agree	27	7.4	7.5	97.5
	5 Strongly Agree	9	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

171C Public lands have higher hunter success rates than private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	43	11.7	11.9	11.9
	2 Disagree	186	50.8	51.5	63.4
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	80	21.9	22.2	85.6
	4 Agree	44	12.0	12.2	97.8
	5 Strongly Agree	8	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

171D I hunt with the goal of harvesting an antlerless deer only		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	49	13.4	13.5	13.5
	2 Disagree	126	34.4	34.8	48.3
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	38	10.4	10.5	58.8
	4 Agree	100	27.3	27.6	86.5
	5 Strongly Agree	49	13.4	13.5	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171E The number of deer has no effect on plant and animal communities		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	117	32.0	32.3	32.3
	2 Disagree	175	47.8	48.3	80.7
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	27	7.4	7.5	88.1
	4 Agree	33	9.0	9.1	97.2
	5 Strongly Agree	10	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171F There is enough hunting land in PA to provide access to anyone who wants to hunt		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	10	2.7	2.8	2.8
	2 Disagree	61	16.7	16.9	19.6
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	47	12.8	13.0	32.6
	4 Agree	196	53.6	54.1	86.7
	5 Strongly Agree	48	13.1	13.3	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171G The quality of the hunting experience is higher on private lands than it is on public lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	15	4.1	4.2	4.2
	2 Disagree	115	31.4	32.0	36.2
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	93	25.4	25.9	62.1
	4 Agree	109	29.8	30.4	92.5
	5 Strongly Agree	27	7.4	7.5	100.0
	Total	359	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.9		
Total		366	100.0		

171H Posting of private land has made it more difficult for me to find a place to hunt		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	25	6.8	6.9	6.9
	2 Disagree	90	24.6	24.9	31.9
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	42	11.5	11.6	43.5
	4 Agree	140	38.3	38.8	82.3
	5 Strongly Agree	64	17.5	17.7	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

171I Over time, deer hunting pressure has decreased in the places I hunt		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	42	11.5	11.7	11.7
	2 Disagree	117	32.0	32.6	44.3
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	53	14.5	14.8	59.1
	4 Agree	122	33.3	34.0	93.0
	5 Strongly Agree	25	6.8	7.0	100.0
	Total	359	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.9		
Total		366	100.0		

171J It has been increasingly difficult for me to find a good place to hunt deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	23	6.3	6.4	6.4
	2 Disagree	154	42.1	42.7	49.0
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	55	15.0	15.2	64.3
	4 Agree	105	28.7	29.1	93.4
	5 Strongly Agree	24	6.6	6.6	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

171K Deer damage to forests in Pennsylvania is a problem		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	21	5.7	5.8	5.8
	2 Disagree	115	31.4	31.9	37.7
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	66	18.0	18.3	56.0
	4 Agree	112	30.6	31.0	87.0
	5 Strongly Agree	47	12.8	13.0	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

171L Keeping deer population in balance with natural food supplies is necessary		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	4	1.1	1.1	1.1
	2 Disagree	13	3.6	3.6	4.7
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	28	7.7	7.7	12.4
	4 Agree	219	59.8	60.5	72.9
	5 Strongly Agree	98	26.8	27.1	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171M I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	56	15.3	15.6	15.6
	2 Disagree	119	32.5	33.1	48.6
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	65	17.8	18.1	66.7
	4 Agree	94	25.7	26.1	92.8
	5 Strongly Agree	26	7.1	7.2	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

171N Posting has restricted my access to hunting on private lands		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	10	2.7	2.8	2.8
	2 Disagree	69	18.9	19.2	21.9
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	54	14.8	15.0	36.9
	4 Agree	158	43.2	43.9	80.8
	5 Strongly Agree	69	18.9	19.2	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

1710 Deer cause serious conflicts with other land uses, such as forestry, farming, highways, and other developments		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	14	3.8	3.9	3.9
	2 Disagree	82	22.4	22.8	26.7
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	55	15.0	15.3	41.9
	4 Agree	169	46.2	46.9	88.9
	5 Strongly Agree	40	10.9	11.1	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

171P I would rather harvest a doe than no deer at all		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	53	14.5	14.7	14.7
	2 Disagree	87	23.8	24.2	38.9
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	43	11.7	11.9	50.8
	4 Agree	142	38.8	39.4	90.3
	5 Strongly Agree	35	9.6	9.7	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

171Q The higher the deer population, the better my harvest experience		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	13	3.6	3.6	3.6
	2 Disagree	90	24.6	24.9	28.5
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	53	14.5	14.6	43.1
	4 Agree	157	42.9	43.4	86.5
	5 Strongly Agree	49	13.4	13.5	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171R I hunt to harvest a trophy antlered deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	35	9.6	9.7	9.7
	2 Disagree	120	32.8	33.3	43.1
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	37	10.1	10.3	53.3
	4 Agree	126	34.4	35.0	88.3
	5 Strongly Agree	42	11.5	11.7	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

171S I can have a satisfying day of hunting without harvesting a deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	2	.5	.6	.6
	2 Disagree	5	1.4	1.4	1.9
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	6	1.6	1.7	3.6
	4 Agree	207	56.6	57.2	60.8
	5 Strongly Agree	142	38.8	39.2	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171T I can have a successful season of hunting without harvesting a deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	7	1.9	1.9	1.9
	2 Disagree	25	6.8	6.9	8.8
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	19	5.2	5.2	14.1
	4 Agree	213	58.2	58.8	72.9
	5 Strongly Agree	98	26.8	27.1	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

171U The number of deer has no effect on forest registration		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Strongly Disagree	77	21.0	21.3	21.3
	2 Disagree	192	52.5	53.0	74.3
	3 Neither agree nor disagree	54	14.8	14.9	89.2
	4 Agree	29	7.9	8.0	97.2
	5 Strongly Agree	10	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 172: How important, would you say hunting is to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	226	61.7	62.3	62.3
	2 Important	98	26.8	27.0	89.3
	3 Slightly Important	26	7.1	7.2	96.4
	4 Neither Important, nor Unimportant	9	2.5	2.5	98.9
	5 Slightly Unimportant	2	.5	.6	99.4
	7 Very Unimportant	2	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 173: How crowded do you usually feel?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Not at all crowded	71	19.4	19.7	19.7
	2	78	21.3	21.6	41.3
	Slightly crowded	67	18.3	18.6	59.8
	4	27	7.4	7.5	67.3
	5	44	12.0	12.2	79.5
	Moderately crowded	36	9.8	10.0	89.5
	7	21	5.7	5.8	95.3
	8	11	3.0	3.0	98.3
	Extremely crowded	6	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 174: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting:

174A To get outdoors		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	229	62.6	63.3	63.3
	2 Unimportant	3	.8	.8	64.1
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	9	2.5	2.5	66.6
	4 Important	117	32.0	32.3	98.9
	5 Very Unimportant	4	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

174B To get away from my everyday routine		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	204	55.7	56.5	56.5
	2 Unimportant	9	2.5	2.5	59.0
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	13	3.6	3.6	62.6
	4 Important	131	35.8	36.3	98.9
	5 Very Unimportant	4	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

174C To obtain venison		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	25	6.8	6.9	6.9
	2 Unimportant	99	27.0	27.4	34.3
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	110	30.1	30.5	64.8
	4 Important	115	31.4	31.9	96.7
	5 Very Unimportant	12	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

174D To get a large antlered deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	43	11.7	11.9	11.9
	2 Unimportant	112	30.6	30.9	42.8
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	77	21.0	21.3	64.1
	4 Important	109	29.8	30.1	94.2
	5 Very Unimportant	21	5.7	5.8	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

174E The challenge of hunting deer		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	133	36.3	36.7	36.7
	2 Unimportant	13	3.6	3.6	40.3
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	27	7.4	7.5	47.8
	4 Important	184	50.3	50.8	98.6
	5 Very Unimportant	5	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

174F To test my outdoor skills		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	100	27.3	27.7	27.7
	2 Unimportant	33	9.0	9.1	36.8
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	54	14.8	15.0	51.8
	4 Important	170	46.4	47.1	98.9
	5 Very Unimportant	4	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

174G To be with my friends		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	156	42.6	43.1	43.1
	2 Unimportant	17	4.6	4.7	47.8
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	25	6.8	6.9	54.7
	4 Important	157	42.9	43.4	98.1
	5 Very Unimportant	7	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

174H To be with my family		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	138	37.7	38.3	38.3
	2 Unimportant	29	7.9	8.1	46.4
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	42	11.5	11.7	58.1
	4 Important	143	39.1	39.7	97.8
	5 Very Unimportant	8	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

174I To return to traditional hunting spots		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	118	32.2	32.7	32.7
	2 Unimportant	23	6.3	6.4	39.1
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	51	13.9	14.1	53.2
	4 Important	168	45.9	46.5	99.7
	5 Very Unimportant	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

174J To help manage the deer population		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Very Important	76	20.8	21.0	21.0
	2 Unimportant	37	10.1	10.2	31.2
	3 Neither important nor unimportant	72	19.7	19.9	51.1
	4 Important	168	45.9	46.4	97.5
	5 Very Unimportant	9	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 175: Who was primarily responsible for teaching you how to hunt deer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Parent	236	64.5	65.0	65.0
	2 Other Relative	48	13.1	13.2	78.2
	3 Peers	8	2.2	2.2	80.4
	4 PGC hunting education course	1	.3	.3	80.7
	5 Hunting camp companion	11	3.0	3.0	83.7
	6 Friend	23	6.3	6.3	90.1
	7 Learned on my own	36	9.8	9.9	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 176: Which sources do you most often rely upon to get your news/information about Pennsylvania hunting-related issues

176A Television		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Television	21	5.7	12.4	12.4
	2 Radio	2	.5	1.2	13.5
	3 Newspapers	43	11.7	25.3	38.8
	4 Organization newsletters	10	2.7	5.9	44.7
	5 Hunting magazines	51	13.9	30.0	74.7
	6 Internet	8	2.2	4.7	79.4
	7 Talking to other	13	3.6	7.6	87.1
	8 PGC Websites	6	1.6	3.5	90.6
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	8	2.2	4.7	95.3
	10 Other	8	2.2	4.7	100.0
	Total	170	46.4	100.0	
Missing	System	196	53.6		
Total		366	100.0		

176B Radio		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Television	1	.3	2.1	2.1
	2 Radio	9	2.5	18.8	20.8
	3 Newspapers	13	3.6	27.1	47.9
	4 Organization newsletters	9	2.5	18.8	66.7
	5 Hunting magazines	7	1.9	14.6	81.2
	6 Internet	3	.8	6.3	87.5
	7 Talking to other	1	.3	2.1	89.6
	8 PGC Websites	1	.3	2.1	91.7
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	2	.5	4.2	95.8
	10 Other	2	.5	4.2	100.0
	Total	48	13.1	100.0	
Missing	System	318	86.9		
Total		366	100.0		

176C Newspaper		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	3 Newspapers	6	1.6	15.4	15.4
	4 Organization newsletters	10	2.7	25.6	41.0
	5 Hunting magazines	12	3.3	30.8	71.8
	6 Internet	4	1.1	10.3	82.1
	7 Talking to other	7	1.9	17.9	100.0
	Total	39	10.7	100.0	
Missing	System	327	89.3		
Total		366	100.0		

176D Organization newsletters		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	4 Organization newsletters	3	.8	7.7	7.7
	5 Hunting magazines	10	2.7	25.6	33.3
	6 Internet	4	1.1	10.3	43.6
	7 Talking to other	15	4.1	38.5	82.1
	8 PGC Websites	2	.5	5.1	87.2
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	5	1.4	12.8	100.0
	Total	39	10.7	100.0	
Missing	System	327	89.3		
Total		366	100.0		

176E Hunting magazines		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	5 Hunting magazines	3	.8	9.7	9.7
	6 Internet	3	.8	9.7	19.4
	7 Talking to other	10	2.7	32.3	51.6
	8 PGC Websites	4	1.1	12.9	64.5
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	11	3.0	35.5	100.0
	Total	31	8.5	100.0	
Missing	System	335	91.5		
Total		366	100.0		

176F Internet		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	7 Talking to other	6	1.6	31.6	31.6
	8 PGC Websites	2	.5	10.5	42.1
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	11	3.0	57.9	100.0
	Total	19	5.2	100.0	
Missing	System	347	94.8		
Total		366	100.0		

176G Talking to others		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	8 PGC Websites	4	1.1	50.0	50.0
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	4	1.1	50.0	100.0
	Total	8	2.2	100.0	
Missing	System	358	97.8		
Total		366	100.0		

176H PGC Website		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	4	1.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	362	98.9		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 177: Of those you identified above as relying upon most often, which is the most important source?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Television	7	1.9	2.0	2.0
	2 Radio	3	.8	.9	2.9
	3 Newspapers	50	13.7	14.3	17.1
	4 Organization newsletters	15	4.1	4.3	21.4
	5 Hunting magazines	69	18.9	19.7	41.1
	6 Internet	11	3.0	3.1	44.3
	7 Talking to other	56	15.3	16.0	60.3
	8 PGC Websites	25	6.8	7.1	67.4
	9 The hunting regulation booklet	88	24.0	25.1	92.6
	10 Other	26	7.1	7.4	100.0
	Total	350	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	16	4.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 178: Who uses most of the venison from the deer you harvest?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Your household	297	81.1	81.6	81.6
	2 Other family members	27	7.4	7.4	89.0
	3 Other hunters	17	4.6	4.7	93.7
	4 Friends	18	4.9	4.9	98.6
	5 Charities	4	1.1	1.1	99.7
	6 Whoever will take it	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 179: If you purchase additional antlerless permits, how many antlerless deer would you seek to harvest in a year

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	88	24.0	24.5	24.5
1	100	27.3	27.9	52.4
2	129	35.2	35.9	88.3
3	28	7.7	7.8	96.1
4	7	1.9	1.9	98.1
5	4	1.1	1.1	99.2
8	1	.3	.3	99.4
10	2	.5	.6	100.0
Total	359	98.1	100.0	

Missing	System	7	1.9		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 180: How many antlerless permits would you purchase to hunt on the Sproul?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	102	27.9	28.6	28.6
	1	140	38.3	39.2	67.8
	2	97	26.5	27.2	95.0
	3	10	2.7	2.8	97.8
	4	4	1.1	1.1	98.9
	5	2	.5	.6	99.4
	10	2	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	357	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	2.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 181: What is the highest level of formal education that you completed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Did not complete high school	26	7.1	7.2	7.2
	2 Completed high school or equivalent	145	39.6	40.2	47.4
	3 Some college or vocational training	91	24.9	25.2	72.6
	4 Completed college degree	68	18.6	18.8	91.4
	5 Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	31	8.5	8.6	100.0
	Total	361	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 182: How many people, including yourself, live in your household?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1	34	9.3	9.3	9.3
	2	134	36.6	36.8	46.2
	3	60	16.4	16.5	62.6
	4	96	26.2	26.4	89.0
	5	35	9.6	9.6	98.6
	6	3	.8	.8	99.5
	7	2	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 183: How many are under 18 years of age?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	218	59.6	59.9	59.9
	1	52	14.2	14.3	74.2
	2	72	19.7	19.8	94.0
	3	19	5.2	5.2	99.2
	4	2	.5	.5	99.7
	5	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 184: How many are over 65 years of age?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	297	81.1	81.6	81.6
	1	34	9.3	9.3	90.9
	2	31	8.5	8.5	99.5
	3	1	.3	.3	99.7
	4	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 185: Would you say your health is…

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Excellent	139	38.0	38.2	38.2
	2 Good	197	53.8	54.1	92.3
	3 Fair	23	6.3	6.3	98.6
	4 Poor	5	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	364	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 186: How much difficulty do you have doing the following?

186A Going up and down stairs		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	3	.8	.8	.8
	2 Some difficulty	25	6.8	6.9	7.7
	3 No difficulty	335	91.5	92.3	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

186B Kneeling or stooping		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	7	1.9	1.9	1.9
	2 Some difficulty	61	16.7	16.9	18.8
	3 No difficulty	294	80.3	81.2	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

186C Lifting or carrying objects less than 10 pounds, like a bag of groceries		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	1	.3	.3	.3
	2 Some difficulty	11	3.0	3.0	3.3
	3 No difficulty	351	95.9	96.7	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

186D Using your hands or fingers		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	2	.5	.6	.6
	2 Some difficulty	5	1.4	1.4	1.9
	3 No difficulty	356	97.3	98.1	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

186E Seeing, even with glasses		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	1	.3	.3	.3
	2 Some difficulty	23	6.3	6.3	6.6
	3 No difficulty	339	92.6	93.4	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

186FHearing		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	6	1.6	1.7	1.7
	2 Some difficulty	82	22.4	22.6	24.2
	3 No difficulty	275	75.1	75.8	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

186G Walking		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Great deal of difficulty	7	1.9	1.9	1.9
	2 Some difficulty	26	7.1	7.2	9.1
	3 No difficulty	330	90.2	90.9	100.0
	Total	363	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 187: How would you describe your current place of residence?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Large city	4	1.1	1.1	1.1
	2 Medium sized city	20	5.5	5.5	6.6
	3 Small city	47	12.8	13.0	19.6
	4 Suburban	71	19.4	19.6	39.2
	5 Rural town or village	126	34.4	34.8	74.0
	6 In the country	94	25.7	26.0	100.0
	Total	362	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 188: Could you please tell me if your total household income from all sources before taxes in 2000 was…

188A More or less than $30,000		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Less	40	10.9	13.5	13.5
	2 More	234	63.9	78.8	92.3
	3 Refused	23	6.3	7.7	100.0
	Total	297	81.1	100.0	
Missing	System	69	18.9		
Total		366	100.0		

188B Is it more or less than $15,000		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Less	14	3.8	6.8	6.8
	2 More	192	52.5	92.8	99.5
	3 Refused	1	.3	.5	100.0
	Total	207	56.6	100.0	
Missing	System	159	43.4		
Total		366	100.0		

188C Is it more or less than $45,000		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Less	102	27.9	34.5	34.5
	2 More	194	53.0	65.5	100.0
	Total	296	80.9	100.0	
Missing	System	70	19.1		
Total		366	100.0		

Table189: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1 Male	356	97.3	98.9	98.9
	2 Female	4	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	360	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		366	100.0		

Table 190: Survey type method

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 Mail	196	53.6	53.6	53.6
2 Phone	170	46.4	46.4	100.0
Total	366	100.0	100.0	

Table 191: Had GPS unit in the field

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 Yes	165	45.1	45.1	45.1
2 No	201	54.9	54.9	100.0
Total	366	100.0	100.0	

Table 192: Years hunting categories * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Years hunting categories	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
≤ 9	10	7	2	0	0	2	21
	47.6%	33.3%	9.5%	.0%	.0%	9.5%	100.0%
10 - 19	0	19	12	2	3	0	36
	.0%	52.8%	33.3%	5.6%	8.3%	.0%	100.0%
20 - 29	0	0	46	36	4	4	90
	.0%	.0%	51.1%	40.0%	4.4%	4.4%	100.0%
30 - 39	0	0	1	61	31	3	96
	.0%	.0%	1.0%	63.5%	32.3%	3.1%	100.0%
≥ 40	0	0	0	1	43	77	121
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	35.5%	63.6%	100.0%
Total	10	26	61	100	81	86	364
	2.7%	7.1%	16.8%	27.5%	22.3%	23.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	666.619(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	549.855	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	253.996	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	364		

a 10 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .58.

Table 193: Years hunting categories * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Years hunting categories	Did not complete high school	Completed high school or equivalent	Some college or vocational training	Completed college degree	Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	
≤ 9	10	6	1	2	1	20
	50.0%	30.0%	5.0%	10.0%	5.0%	100.0%
10 - 19	1	14	6	15	0	36
	2.8%	38.9%	16.7%	41.7%	.0%	100.0%
20 - 29	2	35	27	18	8	90
	2.2%	38.9%	30.0%	20.0%	8.9%	100.0%
30 - 39	5	32	28	19	12	96
	5.2%	33.3%	29.2%	19.8%	12.5%	100.0%
≥ 40	8	58	29	14	10	119
	6.7%	48.7%	24.4%	11.8%	8.4%	100.0%
Total	26	145	91	68	31	361
	7.2%	40.2%	25.2%	18.8%	8.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	84.278(a)	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	59.235	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.322	1	.571
N of Valid Cases	361		

a 5 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.44.

Table 194: Years hunting categories * Use of GPS unit

	Use of GPS unit		Total
Years hunting categories	yes	no	
≤ 9	8	14	22
	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
10 - 19	15	21	36
	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
20 - 29	36	54	90
	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
30 - 39	60	36	96
	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
≥ 40	45	76	121
	37.2%	62.8%	100.0%
Total	164	201	365
	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.598(a)	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	16.625	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	.073	1	.787
N of Valid Cases	365		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.88.

Table 195: Years hunted in PA categories * Income

Years hunted in PA	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
≤ 9	1	1	3	11	16
	6.3%	6.3%	18.8%	68.8%	100.0%
10 - 19	1	1	5	23	30
	3.3%	3.3%	16.7%	76.7%	100.0%
20 - 29	3	6	8	52	69
	4.3%	8.7%	11.6%	75.4%	100.0%
30 - 39	3	4	8	67	82
	3.7%	4.9%	9.8%	81.7%	100.0%
≥ 40	6	16	15	40	77
	7.8%	20.8%	19.5%	51.9%	100.0%
Total	14	28	39	193	274
	5.1%	10.2%	14.2%	70.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.175(a)	12	.026
Likelihood Ratio	22.515	12	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.184	1	.013
N of Valid Cases	274		

a 9 cells (45.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

Table 196: Years hunted in PA categories * Use of GPS unit

	Use of GPS unit		Total
Years hunted in PA	yes	no	
≤ 9	10	15	25
	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
10 - 19	17	23	40
	42.5%	57.5%	100.0%
20 - 29	39	52	91
	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
30 - 39	59	38	97
	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
≥ 40	38	73	111
	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%
Total	163	201	364
	44.8%	55.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.542(a)	4	.004
Likelihood Ratio	15.609	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	.155	1	.694
N of Valid Cases	364		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.20.

Table 197: Years hunted in PA categories * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Years hunted in PA	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
≤ 9	10	8	4	0	0	2	24
	41.7%	33.3%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	100.0%
10 - 19	0	18	12	5	4	1	40
	.0%	45.0%	30.0%	12.5%	10.0%	2.5%	100.0%
20 - 29	0	0	44	36	7	4	91
	.0%	.0%	48.4%	39.6%	7.7%	4.4%	100.0%
30 - 39	0	0	1	59	31	6	97
	.0%	.0%	1.0%	60.8%	32.0%	6.2%	100.0%
≥ 40	0	0	0	0	38	73	111
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%
Total	10	26	61	100	80	86	363
	2.8%	7.2%	16.8%	27.5%	22.0%	23.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	588.858(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	504.226	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	238.090	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	363		

a 8 cells (26.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .66.

Table 198: Years hunted in PA categories * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Years hunted in PA	Did not complete high school	Completed high school or equivalent	Some college or vocational training	Completed college degree	Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	
≤ 9	10	6	2	3	2	23
	43.5%	26.1%	8.7%	13.0%	8.7%	100.0%
10 - 19	1	16	9	14	0	40
	2.5%	40.0%	22.5%	35.0%	.0%	100.0%
20 - 29	4	34	25	20	8	91
	4.4%	37.4%	27.5%	22.0%	8.8%	100.0%
30 - 39	3	36	29	18	11	97
	3.1%	37.1%	29.9%	18.6%	11.3%	100.0%
≥ 40	8	53	26	13	9	109
	7.3%	48.6%	23.9%	11.9%	8.3%	100.0%
Total	26	145	91	68	30	360
	7.2%	40.3%	25.3%	18.9%	8.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	67.157(a)	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	49.173	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.102	1	.750
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 5 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.66.

Table 199: Years hunted in Sproul categories * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Years hunted in the Sproul	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
≤ 9	10	17	18	18	14	7	84
	11.9%	20.2%	21.4%	21.4%	16.7%	8.3%	100.0%
10 - 19	0	9	18	15	11	4	57
	.0%	15.8%	31.6%	26.3%	19.3%	7.0%	100.0%
20 - 29	0	0	24	33	17	13	87
	.0%	.0%	27.6%	37.9%	19.5%	14.9%	100.0%
30 - 39	0	0	1	34	26	24	85
	.0%	.0%	1.2%	40.0%	30.6%	28.2%	100.0%
≥ 40	0	0	0	0	12	38	50
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	24.0%	76.0%	100.0%
Total	10	26	61	100	80	86	363
	2.8%	7.2%	16.8%	27.5%	22.0%	23.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	214.269(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	229.726	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	123.907	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	363		

a 7 cells (23.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.38.

Table 200: Years hunted in Sproul categories * Income

Years hunted in the Sproul	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
≤ 9	5	4	7	47	63
	7.9%	6.3%	11.1%	74.6%	100.0%
10 - 19	0	2	8	35	45
	.0%	4.4%	17.8%	77.8%	100.0%
20 - 29	2	6	9	48	65
	3.1%	9.2%	13.8%	73.8%	100.0%
30 - 39	4	6	6	50	66
	6.1%	9.1%	9.1%	75.8%	100.0%
≥ 40	3	10	9	13	35
	8.6%	28.6%	25.7%	37.1%	100.0%
Total	14	28	39	193	274
	5.1%	10.2%	14.2%	70.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.503(a)	12	.002
Likelihood Ratio	30.023	12	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.966	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	274		

a 8 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.79.

Table 201: Years hunting antlerless deer categories * Age Categories

Years hunting antlerless deer	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
≤ 9	10	21	43	51	63	52	240
	4.2%	8.8%	17.9%	21.3%	26.3%	21.7%	100.0%
10 - 19	0	5	9	18	4	12	48
	.0%	10.4%	18.8%	37.5%	8.3%	25.0%	100.0%
20 - 29	0	0	8	16	8	10	42
	.0%	.0%	19.0%	38.1%	19.0%	23.8%	100.0%
30 - 39	0	0	1	15	4	2	22
	.0%	.0%	4.5%	68.2%	18.2%	9.1%	100.0%
≥ 40	0	0	0	0	1	9	10
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
Total	10	26	61	100	80	85	362
	2.8%	7.2%	16.9%	27.6%	22.1%	23.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.869(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	70.571	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.691	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	362		

a 14 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

Table 202: Years hunting antlerless deer categories * Income

	Income				Total
Years hunting antlerless deer	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
≤ 9	9	11	26	134	180
	5.0%	6.1%	14.4%	74.4%	100.0%
10 - 19	1	5	7	25	38
	2.6%	13.2%	18.4%	65.8%	100.0%
20 - 29	0	8	3	19	30
	.0%	26.7%	10.0%	63.3%	100.0%
30 - 39	3	3	1	11	18
	16.7%	16.7%	5.6%	61.1%	100.0%
≥ 40	1	1	2	4	8
	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	14	28	39	193	274
	5.1%	10.2%	14.2%	70.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.457(a)	12	.024
Likelihood Ratio	21.202	12	.048
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.119	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	274		

a 11 cells (55.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .41.

Table 203: Early archery and flintlock days afield categories * Age Categories

		Age Categories						Total
Early archery and flintlock days afield categories		20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
	0	3	6	21	27	28	27	112
		2.7%	5.4%	18.8%	24.1%	25.0%	24.1%	100.0%
	1 – 10	5	12	13	45	41	47	163
		3.1%	7.4%	8.0%	27.6%	25.2%	28.8%	100.0%
	11 - 25	1	3	11	15	10	4	44
		2.3%	6.8%	25.0%	34.1%	22.7%	9.1%	100.0%
	26 - 50	1	4	16	12	2	5	40
		2.5%	10.0%	40.0%	30.0%	5.0%	12.5%	100.0%
Total		10	25	61	99	81	83	359
		2.8%	7.0%	17.0%	27.6%	22.6%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.759(a)	15	.001
Likelihood Ratio	40.827	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.231	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	359		

a 6 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.11.

Table204: Early archery and flintlock days afield categories * Income

Early archery and flintlock days afield categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
0	9	1	6	57	73
	12.3%	1.4%	8.2%	78.1%	100.0%
1 - 10	3	21	26	81	131
	2.3%	16.0%	19.8%	61.8%	100.0%
11 – 25	0	2	3	30	35
	.0%	5.7%	8.6%	85.7%	100.0%
26 - 50	1	4	4	24	33
	3.0%	12.1%	12.1%	72.7%	100.0%
Total	13	28	39	192	272
	4.8%	10.3%	14.3%	70.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.707(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	34.181	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.787	1	.375
N of Valid Cases	272		

a 6 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.58.

Table 205: Firearm days afield categories * Highest level of education completed

	Highest level of education completed					Total
Firearm days afield categories	Did not complete high school	Completed high school or equivalent	Some college or vocational training	Completed college degree	Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	
0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1 - 10	15	63	44	41	22	185
	8.1%	34.1%	23.8%	22.2%	11.9%	100.0%
11 - 25	8	61	42	21	7	139
	5.8%	43.9%	30.2%	15.1%	5.0%	100.0%
26 - 50	3	19	4	5	1	32
	9.4%	59.4%	12.5%	15.6%	3.1%	100.0%
Total	26	143	90	67	31	357
	7.3%	40.1%	25.2%	18.8%	8.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.820(a)	12	.006
Likelihood Ratio	22.828	12	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.897	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	357		

a 7 cells (35.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .07.

Table 206: Late archery days afield categories * Age Categories

Late archery days afield categories	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
0	4	7	29	29	31	28	128
	3.1%	5.5%	22.7%	22.7%	24.2%	21.9%	100.0%
1 - 10	6	16	23	58	48	50	201
	3.0%	8.0%	11.4%	28.9%	23.9%	24.9%	100.0%
11 - 25	0	1	9	10	2	1	23
	.0%	4.3%	39.1%	43.5%	8.7%	4.3%	100.0%
26 -50	0	1	0	2	0	4	7
	.0%	14.3%	.0%	28.6%	.0%	57.1%	100.0%
Total	10	25	61	99	81	83	359
	2.8%	7.0%	17.0%	27.6%	22.6%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.832(a)	15	.009
Likelihood Ratio	33.911	15	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.994
N of Valid Cases	359		

a 10 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.

Table 207: Late archery days afield categories * Income

Late archery days afield categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
0	7	2	6	67	82
	8.5%	2.4%	7.3%	81.7%	100.0%
1 - 10	4	23	28	109	164
	2.4%	14.0%	17.1%	66.5%	100.0%
11 - 25	1	1	4	14	20
	5.0%	5.0%	20.0%	70.0%	100.0%
26 - 50	1	2	1	2	6
	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total	13	28	39	192	272
	4.8%	10.3%	14.3%	70.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.005(a)	9	.004
Likelihood Ratio	24.954	9	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.988	1	.046
N of Valid Cases	272		

a 8 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.

Table 208: For each of the following 2002 hunting seasons, where did you primarily hunt: Early Season * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
Early Season	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
Public Lands	4	6	27	38	23	19	117
	3.4%	5.1%	23.1%	32.5%	19.7%	16.2%	100.0%
Private Lands	0	8	6	19	8	7	48
	.0%	16.7%	12.5%	39.6%	16.7%	14.6%	100.0%
Did not hunt in that season	3	6	8	16	24	30	87
	3.4%	6.9%	9.2%	18.4%	27.6%	34.5%	100.0%
Total	7	20	41	73	55	56	252
	2.8%	7.9%	16.3%	29.0%	21.8%	22.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.881(a)	10	.001
Likelihood Ratio	31.167	10	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.805	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	252		

a 4 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.33.

Table 209: For each of the following 2002 hunting seasons, where did you primarily hunt: October Antlerless Firearm * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
October Antlerless Firearm	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
Public Lands	5	7	10	26	11	12	71
	7.0%	9.9%	14.1%	36.6%	15.5%	16.9%	100.0%
Private Lands	1	1	5	10	2	7	26
	3.8%	3.8%	19.2%	38.5%	7.7%	26.9%	100.0%
Did not hunt in that season	1	9	16	23	30	34	113
	.9%	8.0%	14.2%	20.4%	26.5%	30.1%	100.0%
Total	7	17	31	59	43	53	210
	3.3%	8.1%	14.8%	28.1%	20.5%	25.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.490(a)	10	.034
Likelihood Ratio	20.464	10	.025
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.209	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	210		

a 5 cells (27.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .87.

Table 210: For each of the following 2002 hunting seasons, where did you primarily hunt: Late Archery/flintlock/muzzleloader Season* Use GPS unit

		Use of GPS unit		Total
Late Archery/flintlock/ muzzleloader Season		Yes	No	
	Public Lands	53	35	88
		60.2%	39.8%	100.0%
	Private Lands	19	26	45
		42.2%	57.8%	100.0%
	Did not hunt in that season	42	60	102
		41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
Total		114	121	235
		48.5%	51.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.746(a)	2	.021
Likelihood Ratio	7.786	2	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.671	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	235		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.83.

Table 211: Travel for antlered deer categories * Income

Travel for antlered deer categories	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
0	0	0	0	1	1
	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1 - 10	0	2	1	5	8
	.0%	25.0%	12.5%	62.5%	100.0%
11 - 25	0	1	0	12	13
	.0%	7.7%	.0%	92.3%	100.0%
26 - 50	3	12	8	23	46
	6.5%	26.1%	17.4%	50.0%	100.0%
55 - 75	1	1	1	15	18
	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	83.3%	100.0%
76 – 100	2	11	21	70	104
	1.9%	10.6%	20.2%	67.3%	100.0%
101 - 150	2	0	3	19	24
	8.3%	.0%	12.5%	79.2%	100.0%
151 or more	5	1	5	47	58
	8.6%	1.7%	8.6%	81.0%	100.0%
Total	13	28	39	192	272
	4.8%	10.3%	14.3%	70.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.296(a)	21	.012
Likelihood Ratio	42.809	21	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.738	1	.098
N of Valid Cases	272		

a 20 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

Table 212: Travel for antlered deer categories * How would you describe your current place of residence?

	How would you describe your current place of residence?						Total
Travel for antlered deer categories	Large city	Medium sized city	Small city	Suburban	Rural town or village	In the country	
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
1 - 10	0	0	1	0	5	2	8
	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	62.5%	25.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	0	0	2	2	13	4	21
	.0%	.0%	9.5%	9.5%	61.9%	19.0%	100.0%
26 - 50	0	1	11	8	29	15	64
	.0%	1.6%	17.2%	12.5%	45.3%	23.4%	100.0%
55 - 75	0	1	1	1	16	5	24
	.0%	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	66.7%	20.8%	100.0%
76 – 100	3	8	22	25	33	38	129
	2.3%	6.2%	17.1%	19.4%	25.6%	29.5%	100.0%
101 - 150	0	2	3	13	14	5	37
	.0%	5.4%	8.1%	35.1%	37.8%	13.5%	100.0%
151 or more	0	8	6	21	16	23	74
	.0%	10.8%	8.1%	28.4%	21.6%	31.1%	100.0%
Total	3	20	46	71	126	93	359
	.8%	5.6%	12.8%	19.8%	35.1%	25.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	62.226(a)	35	.003
Likelihood Ratio	66.879	35	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.851	1	.050
N of Valid Cases	359		

a 28 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Table 213: Travel for antlerless deer categories * Use hunting camps

Travel for antlerless deer categories	Use hunting camps: Use camp	Use hunting camps: do not use camps	Total
0	41	10	51
	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
1 - 10	17	4	21
	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	22	9	31
	71.0%	29.0%	100.0%
26 - 50	61	14	75
	81.3%	18.7%	100.0%
55 - 75	11	7	18
	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
76 – 100	40	3	43
	93.0%	7.0%	100.0%
101 - 150	31	2	33
	93.9%	6.1%	100.0%
151 or more	65	17	82
	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
Total	288	66	354
	81.4%	18.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.642(a)	7	.041
Likelihood Ratio	15.466	7	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	.886	1	.347
N of Valid Cases	354		

a 2 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.36.

Table 214: How far traveled to Sproul categories * Use hunting camps

	Use hunting camps		Total
How far traveled to Sproul categories	use camp	do not use camps	
0	10	9	19
	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
1 - 10	26	14	40
	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	60	14	74
	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
26 - 50	15	3	18
	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
55 - 75	36	3	39
	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%
76 – 100	69	11	80
	86.3%	13.8%	100.0%
101 - 150	77	14	91
	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
Total	293	68	361
	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.239(a)	6	.001
Likelihood Ratio	19.893	6	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.246	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	361		

a 2 cells (14.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.39.

Table 215: How far traveled to Sproul categories * How would you describe your current place of residence?

	How would you describe your current place of residence?						Total
How far traveled to Sproul categories	Large city	Medium sized city	Small city	Suburban	Rural town or village	In the country	
0	0	0	3	0	12	4	19
	.0%	.0%	15.8%	.0%	63.2%	21.1%	100.0%
1 - 10	0	1	3	3	21	12	40
	.0%	2.5%	7.5%	7.5%	52.5%	30.0%	100.0%
11 - 25	0	0	13	9	29	23	74
	.0%	.0%	17.6%	12.2%	39.2%	31.1%	100.0%
26 - 50	0	1	0	4	8	5	18
	.0%	5.6%	.0%	22.2%	44.4%	27.8%	100.0%
55 - 75	0	3	4	4	12	16	39
	.0%	7.7%	10.3%	10.3%	30.8%	41.0%	100.0%
76 – 100	1	4	12	26	23	14	80
	1.3%	5.0%	15.0%	32.5%	28.8%	17.5%	100.0%
101 - 150	2	11	11	24	21	19	88
	2.3%	12.5%	12.5%	27.3%	23.9%	21.6%	100.0%
Total	3	20	46	70	126	93	358
	.8%	5.6%	12.8%	19.6%	35.2%	26.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	63.104(a)	30	.000
Likelihood Ratio	72.497	30	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.101	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	358		

a 20 cells (47.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

Table 216: In addition to the general hunting license, which other licenses or stamps did you have for the 2002 season for hunting deer in Pennsylvania? * Age Categories

In addition to the general hunting license, which other licenses or stamps did you have for the 2002 season for hunting deer in Pennsylvania?		Age Categories						Total
		20 or more	20 - 29	30 - 39	40-49	50 -59	60 or more	
	Archery License	3	8	32	43	25	19	130
		2.3%	6.2%	24.6%	33.1%	19.2%	14.6%	100.0%
	Antlerless License	5	12	23	42	40	44	166
		3.0%	7.2%	13.9%	25.3%	24.1%	26.5%	100.0%
	None of the above	2	6	6	14	15	22	65
		3.1%	9.2%	9.2%	21.5%	23.1%	33.8%	100.0%
Total		10	26	61	99	80	85	361
		2.8%	7.2%	16.9%	27.4%	22.2%	23.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.848(a)	10	.031
Likelihood Ratio	20.082	10	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.113	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	361		

a 4 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.80.

Table 217: In addition to the general hunting license, which other licenses or stamps did you have for the 2002 season for hunting deer in Pennsylvania? * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
In addition to the general hunting license, which other licenses or stamps did you have for the 2002 season for hunting deer in Pennsylvania?		Yes	No	
	Archery License	101	28	129
		78.3%	21.7%	100.0%
	Antlerless License	129	37	166
		77.7%	22.3%	100.0%
	None of the above	60	5	65
		92.3%	7.7%	100.0%
Total		290	70	360
		80.6%	19.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.010(a)	2	.030
Likelihood Ratio	8.306	2	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.884	1	.049
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.64.

Table 218: Did you kill an antlerless deer in 2002? * Age categories

		Age Categories						Total
Did you kill an antlerless deer in 2002?		20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
	Yes	4	11	19	44	17	21	116
		3.4%	9.5%	16.4%	37.9%	14.7%	18.1%	100.0%
	No	6	15	42	56	64	65	248
		2.4%	6.0%	16.9%	22.6%	25.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Total		10	26	61	100	81	86	364
		2.7%	7.1%	16.8%	27.5%	22.3%	23.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.018(a)	5	.010
Likelihood Ratio	15.047	5	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.995	1	.014
N of Valid Cases	364		

a 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.19.

Table 219: When hunting deer in the Sproul, do you normally stay away from home? * Do you own, belong to, or use a camp in the Sproul?

	Do you own, belong to, or use a camp in the Sproul?				Total
When hunting deer in the Sproul, do you normally stay away from home?	Own camp	Belong to camp	Use camp	None of the above	
Yes	86	133	56	30	305
	28.2%	43.6%	18.4%	9.8%	100.0%
No	6	7	3	40	56
	10.7%	12.5%	5.4%	71.4%	100.0%
Total	92	140	59	70	361
	25.5%	38.8%	16.3%	19.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	114.939(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	92.270	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	69.524	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	361		

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

Table 220: On an average hunt in the Sproul, how crowded do you usually feel? * What is the highest level of formal education that you completed?

	Highest level of education completed					Total
How crowded do you usually feel?	Did not complete high school	Completed high school or equivalent	Some college or vocational training	Completed college degree	Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	
1 Not at all crowded	4	28	17	12	10	71
	5.6%	39.4%	23.9%	16.9%	14.1%	100.0%
2	4	31	16	16	10	77
	5.2%	40.3%	20.8%	20.8%	13.0%	100.0%
3 Slightly crowded	1	26	21	14	4	66
	1.5%	39.4%	31.8%	21.2%	6.1%	100.0%
4	0	10	9	7	1	27
	.0%	37.0%	33.3%	25.9%	3.7%	100.0%
5	9	17	8	8	2	44
	20.5%	38.6%	18.2%	18.2%	4.5%	100.0%
6 Moderately crowded	2	14	12	5	2	35
	5.7%	40.0%	34.3%	14.3%	5.7%	100.0%
7	2	11	4	3	1	21
	9.5%	52.4%	19.0%	14.3%	4.8%	100.0%
8	1	6	1	2	1	11
	9.1%	54.5%	9.1%	18.2%	9.1%	100.0%
9 Extremely crowded	3	1	2	0	0	6
	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	26	144	90	67	31	358
	7.3%	40.2%	25.1%	18.7%	8.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	50.474(a)	32	.020
Likelihood Ratio	43.707	32	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.015	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	358		

a 20 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .44.

Table 221: How important, would you say hunting is to you: * Age categories

	Age Categories						Total
How important, would you say hunting is to you	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
Very Important	5	15	39	73	44	46	222
	50.0%	57.7%	65.0%	73.0%	54.3%	57.5%	62.2%
Important	3	7	14	22	26	24	96
	30.0%	26.9%	23.3%	22.0%	32.1%	30.0%	26.9%
Slightly Important	1	4	6	5	6	4	26
	10.0%	15.4%	10.0%	5.0%	7.4%	5.0%	7.3%
Neither Important, nor Unimportant	0	0	1	0	3	5	9
	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	3.7%	6.3%	2.5%
Slightly Unimportant	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	1.3%	.6%
Very Unimportant	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.6%
Total	10	26	60	100	81	80	357
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.977(a)	25	.037
Likelihood Ratio	30.600	25	.203
Linear-by-Linear Association	.340	1	.560
N of Valid Cases	357		

a 22 cells (61.1%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .06.

Table 222: How important, would you say hunting is to you * Highest level of education completed

How important, would you say hunting is to you	Highest level of education completed					Total
	Did not complete high school	Completed high school or equivalent	Some college or vocational training	Completed college degree	Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	
Very Important	12	91	60	46	16	225
	48.0%	62.8%	65.9%	68.7%	51.6%	62.7%
Important	7	43	21	13	11	95
	28.0%	29.7%	23.1%	19.4%	35.5%	26.5%
Slightly Important	2	5	9	8	2	26
	8.0%	3.4%	9.9%	11.9%	6.5%	7.2%
Neither Important, nor Unimportant	2	5	1	0	1	9
	8.0%	3.4%	1.1%	.0%	3.2%	2.5%
Slightly Unimportant	1	1	0	0	0	2
	4.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Very Unimportant	1	0	0	0	1	2
	4.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.2%	.6%
Total	25	145	91	67	31	359
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.416(a)	20	.023
Likelihood Ratio	29.958	20	.071
Linear-by-Linear Association	.538	1	.463
N of Valid Cases	359		

a 18 cells (60.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .14.

Table 223: How important, would you say hunting is to you * Use of GPS unit

How important, would you say hunting is to you		Use of GPS unit		Total
		yes	no	
	Very Important	116	110	226
		51.3%	48.7%	100.0%
	Important	38	60	98
		38.8%	61.2%	100.0%
	Slightly Important	9	17	26
		34.6%	65.4%	100.0%
	Neither Important, nor Unimportant	0	9	9
		.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Slightly Unimportant	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Very Unimportant	0	2	2
		.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		164	199	363
		45.2%	54.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.327(a)	5	.009
Likelihood Ratio	19.512	5	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.092	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	363		

a 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .90.

Table 224: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To get outdoors * Income

	Income				Total
To get outdoors	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
Very Important	6	18	26	129	179
	3.4%	10.1%	14.5%	72.1%	100.0%
Unimportant	1	0	1	0	2
	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
Neither important nor unimportant	2	1	0	1	4
	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Important	3	9	12	62	86
	3.5%	10.5%	14.0%	72.1%	100.0%
Very Unimportant	1	0	0	1	2
	50.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	13	28	39	193	273
	4.8%	10.3%	14.3%	70.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.134(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.580	12	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	.452	1	.502
N of Valid Cases	273		

a 13 cells (65.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Table 225: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To get away from my everyday routine * Age Categories

To get away from my everyday routine	Income				Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
Very Important	5	14	21	120	160
	3.1%	8.8%	13.1%	75.0%	100.0%
Unimportant	2	0	1	2	5
	40.0%	.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Neither important nor unimportant	2	0	0	5	7
	28.6%	.0%	.0%	71.4%	100.0%
Important	4	14	16	65	99
	4.0%	14.1%	16.2%	65.7%	100.0%
Very Unimportant	0	0	0	1	1
	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	13	28	38	193	272
	4.8%	10.3%	14.0%	71.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.702(a)	12	.004
Likelihood Ratio	18.828	12	.093
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.219	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	272		

a 13 cells (65.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

Table 226: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To get away from my everyday routine * Age Categories

To get away from my everyday routine	Age Categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
Very Important	7	14	34	66	48	34	203
	3.4%	6.9%	16.7%	32.5%	23.6%	16.7%	100.0%
Unimportant	2	0	1	0	2	4	9
	22.2%	.0%	11.1%	.0%	22.2%	44.4%	100.0%
Neither important nor unimportant	0	1	2	2	3	5	13
	.0%	7.7%	15.4%	15.4%	23.1%	38.5%	100.0%
Important	0	11	23	30	28	39	131
	.0%	8.4%	17.6%	22.9%	21.4%	29.8%	100.0%
Very Unimportant	0	0	1	2	0	1	4
	.0%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Total	9	26	61	100	81	83	360
	2.5%	7.2%	16.9%	27.8%	22.5%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.022(a)	20	.012
Likelihood Ratio	35.692	20	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.375	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 19 cells (63.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Table 227: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To obtain venison * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
To obtain venison	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
Very Important	1	4	4	11	2	3	25
	4.0%	16.0%	16.0%	44.0%	8.0%	12.0%	100.0%
Unimportant	1	7	14	21	26	30	99
	1.0%	7.1%	14.1%	21.2%	26.3%	30.3%	100.0%
Neither important nor unimportant	2	5	23	31	30	19	110
	1.8%	4.5%	20.9%	28.2%	27.3%	17.3%	100.0%
Important	6	10	19	35	20	24	114
	5.3%	8.8%	16.7%	30.7%	17.5%	21.1%	100.0%
Very Unimportant	0	0	1	2	2	7	12
	.0%	.0%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	58.3%	100.0%
Total	10	26	61	100	80	83	360
	2.8%	7.2%	16.9%	27.8%	22.2%	23.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.714(a)	20	.028
Likelihood Ratio	33.180	20	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.901
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 12 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.

Table 228: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To be with my friends * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
To be with my friends		use camp	do not use camps	
	Very Important	132	24	156
		84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
	Unimportant	8	8	16
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Neither important nor unimportant	17	8	25
		68.0%	32.0%	100.0%
	Important	132	24	156
		84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
	Very Unimportant	2	5	7
		28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
Total		291	69	360
		80.8%	19.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.697(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.017	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.585	1	.444
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.34.

Table 229: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To be with my family * Age Categories

	Age Categories						Total
To be with my family	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
Very Important	4	8	31	46	34	15	138
	2.9%	5.8%	22.5%	33.3%	24.6%	10.9%	100.0%
Unimportant	0	1	3	3	9	13	29
	.0%	3.4%	10.3%	10.3%	31.0%	44.8%	100.0%
Neither important nor unimportant	1	1	5	14	8	12	41
	2.4%	2.4%	12.2%	34.1%	19.5%	29.3%	100.0%
Important	5	16	20	35	28	39	143
	3.5%	11.2%	14.0%	24.5%	19.6%	27.3%	100.0%
Very Unimportant	0	0	2	1	2	3	8
	.0%	.0%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
Total	10	26	61	99	81	82	359
	2.8%	7.2%	17.0%	27.6%	22.6%	22.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.093(a)	20	.009
Likelihood Ratio	41.283	20	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.229	1	.135
N of Valid Cases	359		

a 13 cells (43.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .22.

Table 230: How important are each of the following reasons for your participation in hunting: To be with my family * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
To be with my family		use camp	do not use camps	
	Very Important	116	22	138
		84.1%	15.9%	100.0%
	Unimportant	26	3	29
		89.7%	10.3%	100.0%
	Neither important nor unimportant	27	14	41
		65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
	Important	118	24	142
		83.1%	16.9%	100.0%
	Very Unimportant	3	5	8
		37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Total		290	68	358
		81.0%	19.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.609(a)	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	15.448	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.077	1	.149
N of Valid Cases	358		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.52.

Table 231: Which sources do you most often rely upon to get your news/information about Pennsylvania hunting-related issues * Age categories

	Age categories						Total
Sources to get your news/information about Pennsylvania hunting-related issues	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
Television	0	1	5	6	4	4	20
	.0%	7.1%	21.7%	13.6%	10.3%	9.8%	12.1%
Radio	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%	.6%
Newspapers	0	0	8	11	10	14	43
	.0%	.0%	34.8%	25.0%	25.6%	34.1%	26.1%
Organization newsletters	0	0	1	3	3	3	10
	.0%	.0%	4.3%	6.8%	7.7%	7.3%	6.1%
Hunting magazines	1	8	5	15	12	8	49
	25.0%	57.1%	21.7%	34.1%	30.8%	19.5%	29.7%
Internet	2	0	3	0	1	2	8
	50.0%	.0%	13.0%	.0%	2.6%	4.9%	4.8%
Talking to other	1	0	0	4	2	5	12
	25.0%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	5.1%	12.2%	7.3%
PGC Websites	0	0	1	1	3	1	6
	.0%	.0%	4.3%	2.3%	7.7%	2.4%	3.6%
The hunting regulation booklet	0	2	0	2	3	1	8
	.0%	14.3%	.0%	4.5%	7.7%	2.4%	4.8%
Other	0	3	0	2	1	2	8
	.0%	21.4%	.0%	4.5%	2.6%	4.9%	4.8%
Total	4	14	23	44	39	41	165
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.686(a)	45	.019
Likelihood Ratio	62.768	45	.041
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.422	1	.233
N of Valid Cases	165		

a 51 cells (85.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .02.

Table 232: Who uses most of the venison from the deer you harvest? * How would you describe your current place of residence?

	How would you describe your current place of residence?						Total
Who uses most of the venison from the deer you harvest?	Large city	Medium sized city	Small city	Suburban	Rural town or village	In the country	
Your household	2	14	41	53	103	82	295
	.7%	4.7%	13.9%	18.0%	34.9%	27.8%	100.0%
Other family members	0	0	3	10	10	4	27
	.0%	.0%	11.1%	37.0%	37.0%	14.8%	100.0%
Other hunters	0	1	1	5	5	5	17
	.0%	5.9%	5.9%	29.4%	29.4%	29.4%	100.0%
Friends	1	3	1	2	8	3	18
	5.6%	16.7%	5.6%	11.1%	44.4%	16.7%	100.0%
Charities	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Whoever will take it	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	3	20	47	71	126	94	361
	.8%	5.5%	13.0%	19.7%	34.9%	26.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.595(a)	25	.002
Likelihood Ratio	34.541	25	.097
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.782	1	.016
N of Valid Cases	361		

a 26 cells (72.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

Table 233: Group permits that allow parties to hunt together to harvest deer, regardless of who actually takes the animal * Use hunting camps

		Use hunting camps		Total
Group permits that allow parties to hunt together to harvest deer, regardless of who actually takes the animal		use camp	do not use camps	
	Strongly support	26	3	29
		89.7%	10.3%	100.0%
	Support	48	11	59
		81.4%	18.6%	100.0%
	Slightly support	27	8	35
		77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
	Neither support nor oppose	50	17	67
		74.6%	25.4%	100.0%
	Slightly oppose	11	9	20
		55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
	Oppose	61	6	67
		91.0%	9.0%	100.0%
	Strongly oppose	69	14	83
		83.1%	16.9%	100.0%
Total		292	68	360
		81.1%	18.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.019(a)	6	.009
Likelihood Ratio	16.088	6	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	.201	1	.654
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 1 cells (7.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.78.

Table 234: Distance hunted from open roads * Age Categories

Distance hunted from open roads		Age Categories						Total
		20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or higher	
	0 - 2	8	14	39	72	63	68	264
		3.0%	5.3%	14.8%	27.3%	23.9%	25.8%	100.0%
	2.1 - 5	2	7	13	16	9	6	53
		3.8%	13.2%	24.5%	30.2%	17.0%	11.3%	100.0%
	5.1 - 10	0	3	1	1	2	1	8
		.0%	37.5%	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%
	10.1 - 20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
		.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	20.1 or more	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
		.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		10	25	53	90	74	75	327
		3.1%	7.6%	16.2%	27.5%	22.6%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.238(a)	20	.011
Likelihood Ratio	26.466	20	.151
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.164	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	327		

a 20 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

Table 235: Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area? * Income

Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area?		Income			Total
	less than15k	15-29,999 k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
Yes	11	15	33	135	194
	5.7%	7.7%	17.0%	69.6%	100.0%
No	2	13	5	59	79
	2.5%	16.5%	6.3%	74.7%	100.0%
Total	13	28	38	194	273
	4.8%	10.3%	13.9%	71.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.133(a)	3	.017
Likelihood Ratio	10.686	3	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	.053	1	.818
N of Valid Cases	273		

a 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.76.

Table 236: Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area? * Use of GPS unit

	Use of GPS unit		Total
Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area?	yes	no	
Yes	122	126	248
	49.2%	50.8%	100.0%
No	40	73	113
	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
Total	162	199	361
	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.972(b)	1	.015		
Continuity Correction(a)	5.428	1	.020		
Likelihood Ratio	6.045	1	.014		
Fisher's Exact Test				.017	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.956	1	.015		
N of Valid Cases	361				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.71.

Table 237: Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area? * How would you describe your current place of residence?

	How would you describe your current place of residence?						Total
Do you walk gated roads to access your hunting area?	Large city	Medium sized city	Small city	Suburban	Rural town or village	In the country	
Yes	3	16	34	46	74	75	248
	1.2%	6.5%	13.7%	18.5%	29.8%	30.2%	100.0%
No	1	4	11	25	51	18	110
	.9%	3.6%	10.0%	22.7%	46.4%	16.4%	100.0%
Total	4	20	45	71	125	93	358
	1.1%	5.6%	12.6%	19.8%	34.9%	26.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.257(a)	5	.014
Likelihood Ratio	14.588	5	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.943
N of Valid Cases	358		

a 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.23.

Table 238: Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands * Use hunting camps

	Public lands are more heavily hunted than private lands					Total
Use hunting camps	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
use camps	3	39	41	141	67	291
	1.0%	13.4%	14.1%	48.5%	23.0%	100.0%
do not use camps	0	11	8	21	29	69
	.0%	15.9%	11.6%	30.4%	42.0%	100.0%
Total	3	50	49	162	96	360
	.8%	13.9%	13.6%	45.0%	26.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Test s

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.804(a)	4	.012
Likelihood Ratio	12.925	4	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.110	1	.146
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 2 cells (20.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .57.

Table 239: The quality of the hunting experience is higher on private lands than it is on public lands * Income

	Income				Total
The quality of the hunting experience is higher on private lands than it is on public lands	less than 15k	15k-29,999k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
Strongly Disagree	2	0	2	7	11
	15.4%	.0%	5.3%	3.6%	4.0%
Disagree	6	8	23	51	88
	46.2%	28.6%	60.5%	26.4%	32.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	8	8	55	72
	7.7%	28.6%	21.1%	28.5%	26.5%
Agree	2	10	3	65	80
	15.4%	35.7%	7.9%	33.7%	29.4%
Strongly Agree	2	2	2	15	21
	15.4%	7.1%	5.3%	7.8%	7.7%
Total	13	28	38	193	272
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.020(a)	12	.003
Likelihood Ratio	30.644	12	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.039	1	.081
N of Valid Cases	272		

a 9 cells (45.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .53.

Table 240: I can have a successful season of hunting without harvesting a deer * Income

I can have a successful season of hunting without harvesting a deer	Income				Total
	less than 15k	15k-29,999k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	4	5
	.0%	.0%	2.6%	2.1%	1.8%
Disagree	0	7	0	11	18
	.0%	25.0%	.0%	5.7%	6.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	0	1	13	15
	7.7%	.0%	2.6%	6.7%	5.5%
Agree	7	13	26	115	161
	53.8%	46.4%	66.7%	59.3%	58.8%
Strongly Agree	5	8	11	51	75
	38.5%	28.6%	28.2%	26.3%	27.4%
Total	13	28	39	194	274
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.738(a)	12	.022
Likelihood Ratio	23.418	12	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	.044	1	.834
N of Valid Cases	274		

a 11 cells (55.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .24.

Table 241: Public lands have higher hunter success rates than private lands * Income

Public lands have higher hunter success rates than private lands	Income				Total
	less than 15k	15k-29,999k	30k-44,999k	45k or more	
Strongly Disagree	3	0	3	27	33
	23.1%	.0%	7.7%	14.0%	12.1%
Disagree	5	13	24	104	146
	38.5%	46.4%	61.5%	53.9%	53.5%
Neither agree nor disagree	3	4	6	43	56
	23.1%	14.3%	15.4%	22.3%	20.5%
Agree	2	9	5	17	33
	15.4%	32.1%	12.8%	8.8%	12.1%
Strongly Agree	0	2	1	2	5
	.0%	7.1%	2.6%	1.0%	1.8%
Total	13	28	39	193	273
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.037(a)	12	.015
Likelihood Ratio	24.097	12	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.452	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	273		

a 11 cells (55.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .24.

Table 242: I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer * Age categories

I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer	Age categories						Total
	20 or less	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or more	
Strongly Disagree	1	3	8	12	13	19	56
	10.0%	11.5%	13.1%	12.0%	16.3%	24.7%	15.8%
Disagree	1	4	21	36	29	27	118
	10.0%	15.4%	34.4%	36.0%	36.3%	35.1%	33.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	3	12	25	13	9	64
	20.0%	11.5%	19.7%	25.0%	16.3%	11.7%	18.1%
Agree	5	10	13	20	21	21	90
	50.0%	38.5%	21.3%	20.0%	26.3%	27.3%	25.4%
Strongly Agree	1	6	7	7	4	1	26
	10.0%	23.1%	11.5%	7.0%	5.0%	1.3%	7.3%
Total	10	26	61	100	80	77	354
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.983(a)	20	.015
Likelihood Ratio	34.909	20	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.245	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	354		

a 9 cells (30.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .73.

Table 243: I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer * Use hunting camps

	I don't really care if I shoot an antlered or antlerless deer as long as I get a deer					Total
Use hunting camps	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
use camps	42	103	53	76	16	290
	14.5%	35.5%	18.3%	26.2%	5.5%	100.0%
do not use camps	13	15	12	18	10	68
	19.1%	22.1%	17.6%	26.5%	14.7%	100.0%
Total	55	118	65	94	26	358
	15.4%	33.0%	18.2%	26.3%	7.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.214(a)	4	.037
Likelihood Ratio	9.395	4	.052
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.982	1	.159
N of Valid Cases	358		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 4.94.

Table 244: Deer cause serious conflicts with other land uses, such as forestry, farming highways, and other developments * Use hunting camps

	Use hunting camps		Total
Deer cause serious conflicts with other land uses, such as forestry, farming, highways, and other developments	use camps	do not use camps	
Strongly Disagree	7	7	14
	2.4%	10.1%	3.9%
Disagree	70	11	81
	24.2%	15.9%	22.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	40	15	55
	13.8%	21.7%	15.4%
Agree	139	29	168
	48.1%	42.0%	46.9%
Strongly Agree	33	7	40
	11.4%	10.1%	11.2%
Total	289	69	358
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.962(a)	4	.011
Likelihood Ratio	11.077	4	.026
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.205	1	.272
N of Valid Cases	358		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 2.70.

Table 245: The number of deer has no effect on forest regeneration * Use hunting camps

	Use hunting camps		Total
The number of deer has no effect on forest regeneration	use camps	do not use camps	
Strongly Disagree	59	18	77
	20.3%	26.1%	21.4%
Disagree	165	26	191
	56.7%	37.7%	53.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	36	17	53
	12.4%	24.6%	14.7%
Agree	24	5	29
	8.2%	7.2%	8.1%
Strongly Agree	7	3	10
	2.4%	4.3%	2.8%
Total	291	69	360
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.211(a)	4	.024
Likelihood Ratio	10.698	4	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	.652	1	.419
N of Valid Cases	360		

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is 1.92.

Table 246: The number of deer has no effect on plant and animal communities * Highest level of education completed

The number of deer has no effect on plant and animal communities	Highest level of education completed					Total
	Did not complete high school	Completed high school or equivalent	Some college or vocational training	Completed college degree	Graduate or professional training beyond college degree	
Strongly Disagree	8	35	34	19	20	116
	30.8%	24.3%	37.8%	27.9%	64.5%	32.3%
Disagree	13	77	37	35	11	173
	50.0%	53.5%	41.1%	51.5%	35.5%	48.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	15	7	4	0	27
	3.8%	10.4%	7.8%	5.9%	.0%	7.5%
Agree	4	12	8	9	0	33
	15.4%	8.3%	8.9%	13.2%	.0%	9.2%
Strongly Agree	0	5	4	1	0	10
	.0%	3.5%	4.4%	1.5%	.0%	2.8%
Total	26	144	90	68	31	359
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.103(a)	16	.017
Likelihood Ratio	34.539	16	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.616	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	359		

a 9 cells (36.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected is .72.