

U.S. Consumer's Intake of Food At Home and Food Away from Home as A Complex Economic System

Faith Parum Senarath Dharmasena

Department of Agricultural Economics Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-2124

Copyright 2020 by Faith Parum and Senarath Dharmasena. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for noncommercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Background Information and Justification

- Americans spend 9.7% of their disposable income on food each year, and food expenditures are the third largest expenditure in the U.S. economy
- In 2009 Food Away From Home expenditures surpassed Food At Home for the first time
- As of 2018, less than 50% of food expenditures were used to purchase FAH.
- Rise of FAFH expenditures
 - Industrialization of the 19th century
 - Urbanization and creation of automobiles
- Literature suggests that factors such as income, time constraints, relative price of food and non-food items, and household demographic composition are important factors in determining the U.S. consumer's food expenditures.

Important Definitions

- Food at Home- FAH
 - All food purchased from supermarkets, retailers, smaller grocery stores, or supercenters
 - $\circ~$ It can include prepared or semi-prepared items that are consumed off-premise or at home
- Food Away From Home- FAFH
 - Food obtained from restaurants, school lunches, and an 'other' category.
 - Restaurants encompass both full service and fast-food establishments.
 - The other category holds expenditures such as vending machines, someone else, etcetera

Consumer Expenditure Patterns

Constant-dollar food expenditures, 1987-2017 (1988 = 100)



Source: USDA, Economic Research Service Food Expenditure Series.

Objectives

- Discover factors that influence consumers consumption of FAH and FAFH
 - Identify factors that influence consumer expenditure
 - Determine correlations between expenditures and other factors
 - Find causality structures determining FAH and FAFH intake/consumption patterns using cutting-edge machine learning algorithms (Directed Acyclic Graphs)

Data

- United States Department of Agriculture- Economic Research Service
 - FoodAPS National Household Food Acquisition and Purchase Survey
- Week-long survey of households from April 2012 and January 2013.
- Instructed to record all FAH and FAFH expenditures
 - Other factors were collected such as income, program participation, food security, health status, and distance to local supermarkets
- This study focuses on 10 variables- FAH, FAFH, Age, Sex, Race, Ethnicity, Employment, Education, Marital Status, and BMI.
 - The original data contains many more variables, and further research can begin to include these for a more inclusive view.
 - We excluded everyone under 21 due to missing BMI, Education, Marital Status, and Employment.

Variables



Variables



Summary Statistics

	FAH (\$/person/week)	FAFH (\$/person/week)	Age (in years)	BMI (kg/m²)
Mean	52.06	17.87	45.16	28.18
Median	13.73	2.17	47.50	27.12
Standard Deviation	84.67	35.42	16.90	6.93

Methodology

- Causality structures are identified through Greedy Equivalence Search (GES) machine-learning algorithm
- GES is operationalized through TETRAD statistical package
 - Searches causal models with artificial intelligence and Directed Acyclic Graphs
- GES finds the optimal causal structures through a search of equivalence classes (Chickering, 2000) in order to minimize a Bayesian Information Criteria
- We imposed knowledge to that FAH and FAFH are weakly-exogenous and other variables to be exogenous

Results-

Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) of Consumer Expenditure



Conclusions and Next Steps

- Conclusions
 - \circ Age and ethnicity are exogenous
 - Food away from home expenditure is determined by the individual education status, body mass index, and employment status.
 - Food at home expenditure is determined by the individual education status, employment status, marital status, gender and race.
 - Also, there is a contemporaneous causality relationship between food at home and food away from home expenditures.
- Future Research
 - Expand the model to include more explanatory variables
 - Break the model up into smaller groups to discover patterns within subgroups (age, participation in food assistance programs, etc.) to help policymakers create effective policy

Thank you! Questions or Comments?



CHARACTERIZING WHERE CONSUMERS PURCHASE FRESH FRUITS: AN ATTITUDINAL FACTOR STUDY

JULIANO M. R. MARQUES

PURDUE UNIVERSITY/UFLA

ARIANA P TORRES

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

BRIDGET K. BEHE

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

PETRUS LANGENHOVEN

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

LUIZ HENRIQUE DE BARROS VILAS BOAS

PURDUE UNIVERSITY/UFLA



PURPOSE











Investigate **attitudinal factors** and market attributes **guiding** consumers to purchase fresh fruit at their **selected markets**

CONTEXT

Fresh fruits consumption has increased in the U.S.

• Higher sales and production

Yet, consumers are less predictable

- Proliferation of labels
- Abundance of information on product preferences



Literature review

Fresh fruits

consumer preferences and willingness to pay for fruits

health benefits of fresh fruits



Marketplace

Specific market characteristics Factors influencing buying produce at a marketplace

Limited studies examining how attitudes drive choice of marketplace among fresh fruit buyers What guides fresh fruits buyers to choose their marketplace?

RESEARCH QUESTION?

- How attitudes influence this decision?
- What market characteristics influence this decision?



DATA AND METHODS



DATA

- Online questionnaire distributed in Fall 2018 ٠
- ٠





FACTORS DRIVING THE LIKELIHOOD TO CHOOSE CHAIN STORES



FACTORS DRIVING THE LIKELIHOOD TO CHOOSE CLUB STORES OR WAREHOUSE



FACTORS DRIVING THE LIKELIHOOD TO CHOOSE INDEPENDENT GROCERY STORES



FACTORS DRIVING THE LIKELIHOOD TO CHOOSE DTC MARKETS



From a robust U.S. sample, our findings provide useful information for academics, marketplaces managers and policy makers

- Support on strategic and direct messages to fresh fruits customers:
 - ✓ Chain stores should highlight fresh fruits price
 - ✓ Club stores may downplay fresh fruits variety

CONCLUSION

- ✓ Independent stores may focus on taste of fruits to attract female shoppers
- DTC markets should emphasize sweetness messages about local food and focus on small households

Support smaller retail vendors to have a better access to their customers.



Thanks for your attention!

Juliano Marques

Doctorate Student – Federal University of Lavras – Brazil

Visiting Student at Purdue University

marquesj@purdue.edu

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE CONSUMPTION AMONG A SELECTED GROUP OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

Patricia E. McLean-Meyinsse Southern University and A&M College

INTRODUCTION

- The *Dietary Guidelines for Americans* were first introduced in 1980 to help Americans to make healthier food choices.
- These *Guidelines* contain recommendations aimed at fostering healthier eating habits so as to mitigate rising overweight and obesity rates, incidences of chronic diseases, and healthcare costs, among others.

INTRODUCTION

• In essence, the recommendations encourage Americans to eat a wide variety of fruits, vegetables, protein foods, grains, and fat-free or low fat dairy and to curtail their daily intake of sugars, saturated fats, trans fats, sodium, and alcohol.

INTRODUCTION

- With respect to fruits and vegetables, the *Guidelines* indicate that to maintain good health, adults should eat at least 1¹/₂ 2 cups of fruits and 2-3 cups of vegetables daily.
- However, many Americans, including college students, do not meet the recommended daily guidelines for these or for any other food groups.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

- College students are notorious for their unhealthy eating habits and a lack of physical activity, which put them at increased risks for chronic diseases in adulthood.
- Thus, it is imperative for researchers to continue to study students' eating habits and to help them to make healthier food choices when deficiencies are uncovered.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

- Our study is based on that premise.
- It examines college students' daily consumption of fruits and vegetables and factors associated with consumption.

OBJECTIVES

The study's objectives are as follows.

- To describe daily consumption of fruits and vegetables by a randomly selected group of students.
- To determine whether selected sociodemographic characteristics: academic classifications (CLASS), household size (HSIZE), income levels (INCOME), area of residence (LIVE), martial status (MARITAL), employment status (WORK), race (RACE), and gender (GENDER) affect consumption levels.

METHODS & PROCEDURES

- The study's data were compiled from a random sample of **132 college** students in **Spring 2020**.
- The questions were designed to ascertain **nutritional knowledge**, fruit **and vegetable consumption**, and **sociodemographic characteristics**.
METHODS & PROCEDURES

Questions on Fruit and Vegetable Consumption:

- In general, how many cups of fresh or processed fruit do you eat per day? **FRUIT**
 - A. None
 - B. 1 ¹/₂ to 2 Cups
 - C. Greater than 2 Cups
- In general, how many cups of fresh or processed vegetables do you eat per day? **VEGETAB**
 - A. None
 - B. 2 to 3 Cups
 - C. Greater than 3 Cups

- How are you classified?
- Where do you live?
- How many people live at your permanent address?
- Which of the following best describes you?
- Which category do you think best describes your family's total annual household income?
- Are you working while attending school?
- Gender

Empirical Analyzes

• Descriptive Statistics are used to address the first objective.

• The chi-square tests for independence are used to analyze Objective 2.

• The data were analyzed with *Excel* and *SPSS*.

- DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS:
- Academic Classification
 - -Freshman11%-Sophomores47%-Juniors19%
 - -Seniors
 - -Graduate Students

47% 19% 4% 19%

- Median Household Size
- Median Income

• Live –On Campus

Marital Status

-Single

\$35,000-\$49,999

3

39%

86%

- Employment Status –Work
- Race —African Americans
- Gender –Female



89%

77%

- DAILY CONSUMPTION PATTERNS:
- FRUITS
 - 1½ 2 Cups
 - Greater than 2 Cups
 - None
- VEGETABLES
 - 2 3 Cups
 - Greater than 3 Cups
 - None

54% 7% 39% 48% 6% 46%

Table 1: Factors Associated with Daily Fruit Consumption

Variables	None	1 ¹ /2 -2 Cups	<2 Cups	χ2	p-Value
	39%	54%	7%		
CLASS					
Freshman	71.4	21.4	7.1		
Sophomore	45.2	48.4	6.5		
Junior	16.0.0	76.0	8.0		
Senior	66.7	33.3	0.0		
Graduate	24	68.0	8.0	17.567**	0.025
HSIZE					
3 ≤	39.6	54.7	5.7		
< 3	39.7	52.6	7.7	0.217	0.897

Table 1: Factors Associated with Daily Fruit Consumption

Variables	None	1 ¹ / ₂ -2 Cups	< 2 Cups	χ2	p- Value
	39%	54%	7%		
INCOME					
> \$15,000	47.4	42.1	10.5		
\$15,000-\$34,999	63	33.3	3.7		
\$35,000-\$49,999	42.1	50.0	7.9		
\leq \$50,000	20.8	72.9	6.2	15.186**	0.019
LIVE					
Off Campus	43.8	51.2	5.0		
On Campus	32.7	57.7	9.6	2.206	0.332
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	43.0	50.0	7.0		
Other	16.7	77.8	5.6	5.012*	0.082

Table 1: Factors Associated with Daily Fruit Consumption

Variables	None	1 ¹ /2-2 Cups	< 2 Cups	χ2	p-Value
	39%	54%	7%		
WORK STATUS					
No	33.3	53.3	13.3		
Yes	42.5	54.0	3.4	4.890*	0.087
RACE					
African Americans	39.8	53.4	57.1		
Other	35.7	57.1	7.1	0.089	0.956
GENDER					
Female	38.2	52.9	8.8		
Male	43.3	56.7	0.0	2.860	0.239

Note: (**) implies statistical significance at the at the 5% level of probability.

Table 2: Factors Associated with Daily VegetableConsumption

Variables	None	2-3 Cups	< 3 Cups	χ2	P-Value
	46%	48%	6%		
CLASS					
Freshman	57.1	35.7	7.1		
Sophomore	54.8	38.7	6.5		
Junior	36.0	60.0	4.0		
Senior	66.7	33.3	0.0		
Graduate	24.0	68.0	8.0	10.555	0.228
HSIZE					
3 ≤	52.8	39.6	7.5		
< 3	41.0	53.8	5.1	2.590	0.274

Table 2: Factors Associated with Daily VegetableConsumption

Variables	None	2-3 Cups	< 3 Cups	χ2	p-Value
	46%	48%	6%		
INCOME					
> \$15,000	42.1	57.9	0.0		
\$15,000-\$34,999	66.7	25.9	7.4		
\$35,000-\$49,999	50.0	44.7	5.3		
\leq \$50,000	33.3	58.3	8.3	10.339	0.111
LIVE					
Off Campus	41.2	51.2	7.5		
On Campus	53.8	42.3	3.8	2.304	0.316
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	48.2	45.6	6.1		
Other	33.3	61.1	5.6	1.539	0.463

Table 2: Factors Associated with Daily VegetableConsumption

Variables	None	2-3 Cups	< 3 Cups	χ2	p-Value
	46%	48%	6%		
WORK STATUS					
No	51.1	35.6	13.3		
Yes	43.7	54.0	2.3	8.433**	0.015
RACE					
African Americans	45.8	48.3	5.9		
Other	50.0	42.9	7.1	0.157	0.925
GENDER					
Female	48.0	46.1	5.9		
Male	40.0	53.3	6.7	0.603	0.740

Note: (**) implies statistical significance at the at the 5% level of probability.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Students who consumed between 1½-2 cups of fresh fruits per day were more likely to be

- juniors,
- married or divorced,
- to live in households with income levels above \$50,000,
- or to have jobs.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

- 46% of respondents did not eat vegetables regularly;
- 48% reported eating between 2-3 cups daily; and 6% reported eating more than three cups daily.
- Students who worked were more likely to eat
- **2-3** cups of fresh vegetables daily.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

- A majority of the participants appeared to have met the minimum daily recommendations for fruits but not for vegetables.
- Given the state's high obesity rate among young adults, students should be encouraged to include more vegetables in their diets.

SPECIAL THANKS TO

 The United States Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (Evans-Allen Project # 1020359) and the Southern University Agricultural Research and Extension Center for funding the research project



The National Institute of Food and Agriculture



Predicting obesity among American adults using FoodAPS data: A Discriminant Analysis Approach

Daniel Berlin & Sanjib Bhuyan Dept. of Agric. Food & Resource Economics Rutgers University, New Jersey

Paper presented at the 2020 FDRS Virtual Conference, October 13, 2020

Introduction

- Obesity has long been a pressing issue in the United States; however, only in that past 20 years has it become an epidemic (Ogden 2010).
- The CDC has recognized that obesity is a health epidemic, and the American Medical Association (AMA) has officially recognized obesity as a chronic disease (AMA 2013).
- Clearly there have been changes in food consumption behavior of American consumers, and not necessarily in a good way.
- When we look at the changes in American diets, we see that there has been an increase in calories consumed, but no real increase in activity levels (Bentley 2017).
- Consumers went from eating 2,016 calories on average in 1970 to 2,390 average calories per day in 2014 (Bentley 2017).

Introduction (contd.)

- Eating large amounts of processed or fast food, eating out more often, and consuming larger portions are all associated with weight gain and in turn obesity (NHS 2019).
- Americans' obesity problem may be related to their food consumption behavior, particularly consumption of food away from home (FAFH).
- Americans now consume more FAFH than FAH. In 2017, American consumers spent \$900 billion on FAFH consumption compared to \$750 billion on food-athome (FAH).
- Fast food (QSR) fat content specifically has changed very little over the decades (down to 39 from 41 percent) showing that this may be a large contributor to the negative overall health status of American consumers (USDA, ERS 2014) and the share of calories that fats and oils occupies in our diets has gone up over the years, seemingly due to high consumption of these foods



Graph 1. FAFH and FAH Expenditures



RUTGERS

Graph 2. Caloric Share of Various Outlet Sources in the American Adults Diet (1977-2014)

Percent of total daily calories (kcals)



RUTGERS Table 1. Top 30 fast-food and casual dining restaurants

Top 30 Fast-Food Restaurants		Top 30 Casual-Dining Restaurants			
Arby's	McDonald's	Applebee's Neighborhood Grill & Macaroni Grill Bar			
Boston Market	Panda Express	Bennigan's Grill & Tavern Olive Garden			
Burger King	Panera Bread	Bob Evans Outback Steakhouse			
Carl's Jr.	Papa John's Pizza	Buffalo Wild Wings Grill & Bar P.F. Chang's China Bistro			
Checkers Drive-In/Rally's	Pizza Hut	California Pizza Kitchen Perkins Restaurant & Bakery			
Chick-fil-A	Popeyes	Carrabba's Italian Grill Red Lobster			
Chipotle	Quiznos Subs	Chili's Bar & Grill Red Robin Gourmet Burgers			
Church's Chicken	Sonic Drive-In	Cracker Barrel Old Country Store Ruby Tuesday			
Dairy Queen	Starbucks	Denny's Ryan's Grill Buffet Bakery			
Domino's Pizza	Steak 'n Shake	Friendly's Sbarro			
Dunkin' Donuts	Subway	Golden Corral Buffet & Grill T.G.I. Friday's			
Hardee's	Taco Bell	HomeTown Buffet/Old Country Texas Roadhouse Buffet			
Jack in the Box	Wendy's	Hooters The Cheesecake Factory			
KFC	Whataburger	IHOP Tim Hortons			
Little Caesars Pizza		LongHorn Steakhouse Waffle House			

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, November 2016.

Objectives

- As discussed earlier, what American consumers eat and where they eat have implications on their health. Our general objective, thus, is to examine the relationship between FAFH behavior and obesity among American adults.
- The specific objectives of this research are as follows:
 - to examine American adults' FAFH outlet choices (chain vs non chain), and
 - to analyze if consumers who frequent chain restaurants more often are more likely to be obese.

Analytical Framework

- To examine American adults' food and outlet choices (specific objective 1), we use simple frequency analysis.
 - This gives us an idea of the current levels of behavior across America and between various groups separated by individual characteristics.
- to analyze if consumers who frequent chain restaurants more often are more likely to be obese (specific objective 2), we use Discriminant Analysis.
 - We carry out several association tests to examine if there is any association between consumers' chain restaurant use (from low to very high) to their demographic characteristics, such as age, income, education, race, etc.
 - We use a DA model to predict which type of consumers among those who frequent chain restaurants are likely to become obese as opposed to not obese.

Discriminant Analysis model

- DA allows us to use known group memberships to create "discriminant functions", which in turn are used to estimate predictions and identifies which variables/predictors are most significant (Cramer 2003).
- We will use DA to predict an individual consumer's likelihood of being placed in the normal or overweight category, and normal or obese category. Discriminant function analysis was used previously by researchers to predict obesity from fitness scores (Hart 2019).
- As the focus is on individuals, discriminant analysis will provide more actionable information than a logit model even though the theory and functional form may be similar.
- Our D.A model is shown below:

 $Z = Logit Y (BMI) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 INCOME + + \beta_2 AGE + \beta_3 EDUCATION + \beta_4 CHAINVISIT + \varepsilon,$

RUTGERS

Data

- We are using the USDA's National Household Food Acquisition and Purchase Survey (FoodAPS) data on an individual level. FoodAPS tracked all food acquisitions made by consumers during a consecutive 7-day period during between April 2012 and January 2013.
- We use the CHAIN variable from the FoodAPS FAFH EVENT dataset to examine chain outlet consumption and the implications on health.
- We focus on the primary respondent (i.e the person who ate the acquired food). This will allow us to examine the link between food consumed and an individual's health implications.
- The sample size used in this report = 3,117 individuals who are primary respondents and who consumed the purchased food from one of the top 30 chain restaurants. Of those 3,117 respondents who acquired and ate FAFH, 1,017 did NOT acquire food from chain restaurants. Therefore, the effective N for our analysis is N=2,100.

Table 2. Variable definitions (N= 2,100)

Variable	Definition	Variable values	Mode	Мах	Min
OBESITY	Follows CDC definition of obesity: BMI of 30 or above	1 = BMI under 18.5 (underweight) 2 = BMI from 18.5-24.99 (Normal Weight) 3 = BMI from 25.0-29.99 (Overweight) 4 = BMI of 30.0+ (Obese)	4	4	1
CHAINVISIT	Frequency of purchasing food from one of the top 30 chain restaurants	1=low frequency2= moderate frequency3= high frequency4= very high frequency	1	4	1
AGE	Age of primary respondent	1=Teenager (18-19) 2= 20-35 3= 36-59 4= 60-65 5= 66+	3	5	1
INCOME	Income of the individual's household	0= No income reported 1= \$0.1-24,999 2= \$25,000-34,999 3= \$35,000-49,999 4= \$50,000-74,999 5= \$75,000-99,999 6= \$100,000-149,999 7= \$150,000-199,999 8= \$200,000+	1	8	0

Variable definitions (cont.)

Variable	Definition	Variable values	Mode	Max	Min
EDUCATION	Highest level of completed education by the primary respondent	1=Some H.S 2= H.S Diploma 3= Some College 4= Bachelors Degree 5= Masters Degree	3	5	1
GENDER	Gender of the primary respondent	1 = Male 2= Female	2	2	1
RACE	Race/Ethnicity of the primary respondent	1= White 2= Black 4= Asian 5= Other	1	5	1

RUTGERS

Results and Discussions Respondent characteristics (N=2,100)

- Most of the respondents were between the ages of 36-59 (42.4%) with the ages 20-35 making up the next largest category (35.3%).
- More of the respondents were female (71.7%) as opposed to Male (28.3%).
- When it came to race/ethnicity a majority of the respondents were white (69.1%). Blacks represented 15.4%, Asians represented 4.6% and the Other category represented 10.9%.
- Most of the respondents possessed some college education/an Associates degree (34%). The next largest category was represented by H.S Diplomas (28.3%). Respondents with Bachelors degrees represented 16.3% and those with only some H.S represented 14.9%.

RUTGERS

- A similar number of respondents reported not working (50%) and working (50%)
- When it came to their income a majority or respondents had an income of between \$0.1 and 24,999 (36.1%). The categories of \$25,000-34,999 had 15.2% of respondents, \$35,000-49,999 had 15.5% and \$50,000-74,999 had 16% of the sample.
- In terms of BMI the respondents were almost equally represented with not overweight representing 31.5%, overweight representing 31.6% and obese representing 36.5% (largest category).
- When it came to eating out at chain categories, having a low frequency of eating out accounted for the most respondents (44.9%), moderate frequency accounted for 25.3%, high frequency represented 13.6% and very high represented 16.3%. (N=2,100).

Relationship between frequency of chain use and obesity (N=2,100)

Table 3. Chain Use and Selected Variables Crosstabulation

	CHAIN USE					
	Null Hypothesis	Correlation values	Inference			
OBESITY	No relation between frequency of chain use and obesity	0.053 (p-value: 0.016*)	Weak correlation exists			
AGE	No relation between age and chain use	-0.711 (p-value: 0.001***)	Moderate correlation exists			
INCOME	No relation between income level and chain use	-0.031 (p-value: 0.157)	No relation exists			
EDUCATION	No relation between education level and chain use	0.069** (p-value: 0.002)	Weak Correlation Exists			
		Chi Square Values				
RACE	No relation between race/ethnicity and chain use	15.282 (p-value: 0.083)	No association exists			
GENDER	No relation between gender and chain use	-0.024 (p-value: 0.269)	No association exists			

RUTGERS Table 4. Discriminant Analysis Results

	Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Tests of Equality of Group Means		
Variables	β	Wilks Lambda'	F	Sig
CHAINVISIT S	0.262	0.999	2.596	0.107
EDUCATIO N	-0.705	0.987***	26.098	0.000
INCOME	-0.024	0.979***	43.488	0.000
AGE	0.680	0.997	5.471	0.019
	Wilks' Lambda Chi Square: 74	a: .964 4.246	Df: 4 Sig: .00	00

The estimated DA model:

 $Z = Logit Y (BMI) = -0.377+0.262CHAIN+ -0.705EDUCATION+ -0.024INCOME + 0.680AGE+ \varepsilon$,

D.A: Actual vs Predicted Obesity Outcomes

Graph 3. DA Results



• 68.7% of original cases were classified correctly by the DA.

RUTGERS

Conclusions and Implications

- It is evident that chain use is not equal among all individuals.
- Age, education and obesity were found to be correlated with chain use, while no such correlation was found for the other variables.
- The profile of those who were predicted to be obese category (yet were not obese due to their reported BMI) had the following characteristics: high chain use, lower education and lower income.
- Our D.A model was not able to successfully discriminate between obese and not obese for all the data. The DA model does not look at causality, it just shows us the characteristics and probability of someone belonging to a specific group. A logistic model is needed for this which my thesis will explore.



Thank you!

Q&A

Contact: daniel.berlin@rutgers.edu