

Fundamentals of Polling-Total Survey Error

[Introduction](#)

[Sampling](#)

[Total Survey Error](#)

[Reading Tables](#)

[Glossary of Terminology](#)



[What is meant by the margin of error?](#)

[What is sampling error?](#)

[What about my brother who's in the army stationed in Europe--can he be interviewed?](#)

[What is measurement error?](#)

[What happens when people can't be reached? What about screening calls?](#)

[What happens when the final sample doesn't look like the general public--For example, what if three quarters of your respondents are over fifty?](#)

What is meant by the margin of error?

Most surveys report margin of error in a manner such as: "the results of this survey are accurate at the 95% confidence level plus or minus 3 percentage points." That is the error that can result from the process of selecting the sample. It suggests what the upper and lower bounds of the results are. Sampling error is the only error that can be quantified, but there are many other errors to which surveys are susceptible. Emphasis on the sampling error does little to address the wide range of other opportunities for something to go wrong.

Total Survey Error includes [Sampling Error](#) and three other types of errors that you should be aware of when interpreting poll results: [Coverage Error](#), [Measurement Error](#), and [Non-Response Error](#).



[Top](#)

What is sampling error?

Sampling Error is the calculated statistical imprecision due to interviewing a random sample instead of the entire population. The margin of error provides an estimate of how much the results of the sample may differ due to chance when compared to what would have been found if the entire population was interviewed.

An annotated example:

There are close to 200 million adult U.S. residents. For comparison, lets say you have a giant jar of 200 million jelly beans. The president has commissioned you to find out how many jelly beans are red, how many are purple and how many are some other color. Since you have limited funds and time you opt against counting and sorting all 200 million jelly beans. Instead you randomly select 500 jelly beans of which 30% are red, 10% are purple and 60% are some other color.

Looking at the matrix below, you find that with a sample of 500 jelly beans you can report that 30 percent of the jelly beans in the jar are red, $\pm 4\%$. To further elaborate, you can say, with 95% confidence red jelly beans make up 30%, $\{\pm 4\%$ or the range of **26-34%** of the beans in the jar. Likewise you can report that purple jelly beans make up 10% $\{\pm 3\%$ or the range of **7-13%** of the beans in the jar.

Recommended allowance for sampling error of a percentage *
In Percentage Points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)**

Sample Size

	1,000	750	500	250	100
Percentage near 10	2%	2%	3%	4%	6%
Percentage near 20	3	3	4	5	9
Percentage near 30	3	4	4	6	10
Percentage near 40	3	4	5	7	10
Percentage near 50	3	4	5	7	11
Percentage near 60	3	4	5	7	10
Percentage near 70	3	4	4	6	10
Percentage near 80	3	3	4	5	9
Percentage near 90	2	2	3	4	6

An Important Observation

As the sample size increases, there are diminishing returns in percentage error. At percentages near 50%, the statistical error drops from 7 to 5% as the sample size is increased from 250 to 500. But, if the sample size is increased from 750 to 1,000, the statistical error drops from 4 to 3%. As the sample size rises above 1,000, the decrease in marginal returns is even more noticeable.

Notes:

* Table extracted from 'The Gallup Poll Monthly'.

** 95 in 100 confidence level: This means when a sample is drawn there are 95 chances in 100 that the sample will reflect the sampling frame at large within the sampling error (shown in chart).



What about my brother who's in the army stationed in Europe--can he be interviewed?

No, not in a typical survey of US adults. This is an example of **Coverage Error**. That's the error associated with the inability to contact portions of the population. Telephone surveys usually exclude people who do not have landline telephones in their household, the homeless, and institutionalized populations. This error includes people who are not home at the time of attempted contact because they are on vacation, in the military overseas, along with a variety of other reasons that they are unreachable--for the period the interviewing (with call backs) takes place.

Coverage Error affects those who only use a cell phone, since Random Digit Dialing (RDD) samples do not include cell phone exchanges. Recently this problem has grown particularly in trying to reach young people.

[Top](#)

What is measurement error?

Measurement Error is error or bias that occurs when surveys do not survey what they intended to measure. This type of error results from flaws in the instrument, question wording, question order, interviewer error, timing, question response options, etc. This is perhaps the most common and most problematic collection of errors faced by the polling industry.



What happens when people can't be reached? What about screening calls?

Non-response Error results from not being able to interview people who would be eligible to take the survey. Many households now have answering machines and caller ID that prevent easy contact; other people simply

do not want to respond to calls sometimes because the endless stream of telemarketing appeals make them wary of answering. Non-response bias is the difference in responses of those people who complete the survey vs. those who refuse to for any reason. While the error itself cannot be calculated, response rates can be calculated and there are countless ways to do so. The American Association for Public Opinion Research ([AAPOR web site](#)) provides recommended procedures for calculating response rates along with helpful tools and related definitions to assist interested researchers.



What happens when the final sample doesn't look like the general public--For example, what if three quarters of your respondents are over fifty?

Survey firms apply a technique called **weighting** to adjust the poll results to account for possible sample biases caused by specific groups of individuals not responding. The weighting uses known estimates of the total population provided by the Census to adjust the final results.

It's not uncommon to weight data by age, gender, education, race, etc. in order to achieve the correct demographic proportions.



**Youth Focus Group Interviews:
Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)**

Co-Authors:

Robert Burns
West Virginia University
Division of Forestry and Natural Resources
Recreation, Parks and Tourism Resources Program
Email: robert.burns@mail.wvu.edu

Cari Autry
Arizona State University
Department of Recreation and Tourism Management
Email: cari.autry@asu.edu

Alan Graefe
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Recreation, Parks and Tourism Management
Email: gyu@psu.edu

Supported provided by:

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Terry Bergerson
Outdoor Recreation Planner
Phone: 503.986.0747
Email: terry.bergerson@state.or.us

USDA Forest Service
Region 6 (Recreation, Land and Minerals)
Charles Frayer
Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Manager
Phone: 503-808-2446
Email: cfrayer@fs.fed.us

May 2007
Youth Focus Group Interviews:
Oregon SCORP

This research study was designed to explore the opinions and thoughts directly from youth of various age groups who lived in rural and urban areas in the state of Oregon. Activities, time, constraints and benefits experienced in the outdoors were the major focus of this exploration. The resulting findings will compliment a larger, quantitative study of youth and parents in the state of Oregon. Together, these findings will be folded into the Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).

Oregon Focus Groups

A series of nine focus group meetings occurred in three separate locations in Oregon in February and March 2007. Four focus groups took place in the city of Portland, Oregon and five took place in rural and suburban settings (one in Prineville and four in Bend). Ages of the youth ranged between 7-18 years old and grouped ages of 7-9, 9-11, 11-13, 13-16, and 16-18 were the divisions for the meetings. Racial/ethnic backgrounds of the youth included Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, and Asian-American. The majority of youth interviewed in the rural settings were Caucasian and the majority of youth interviewed in the urban areas were African-American and Hispanic. The average focus group size was eight participants and the meetings lasted between 30—90 minutes. (Please see the Appendix on Page 11 of this report for the Interview Guide.)

The transcribed interviews from each focus group were analyzed through categorization analysis. Using this technique, the three researchers searched for categories and sub-categories within the text which were then developed into major themes representative of the data (Silverman, 2000). These themes are then linked with examples and quotes from the interviews. The five major themes constructed from the data are divided into the perceptions of youth who lived in rural settings versus youth who lived in urban settings and include:

- 1) preferred recreation activities
- 2) the benefits of recreation: why the youth like playing outdoors
- 3) constraints: what keeps you from playing outdoors more?
- 4) what happens when kids don't go outside?
- 5) how can we get more kids into the parks and outside?

Preferred Recreation Activities

One of the first questions the youth were asked is what they like to do in the outdoors. In addition we asked how much they like participating in these activities, using a scale of 1 to 10, where 10 indicates that they liked to participate very much. Typical answers for preferred activities outside did not indicate a contrast between the youth who lived in the urban versus those who lived in the rural areas of Oregon. Each of these two group types provided activities that varied from passive to active, solitary to social and local to distant.

Urban

One of the teenagers from the Portland area talked about how he enjoyed volunteering to clean-up the environment. He stated, "One of my family members...put together like this little volunteer thing and it's like a big like group. Like we go to parks and or like just walk streets and pick up garbage...It's just that giving back to Mother Nature what they provided to us. It's just my way to give back." Additional responses from urban youth included:

- Outside sports (basketball, football, baseball, soccer, etc.)
- Riding bike
- View nature, wildlife
- Dancing, going to the park
- Play with dogs
- Play with friends
- Work with zoo animals
- Camping
- Walking/hiking
- Volunteering (nature clean-up & with animals)
- Writing and drawing

Rural

One of the 7 year old girls from a rural town explained "I like horseback riding because you get to be with nature. I like skiing because you get to play in the snow. What was the other one, oh yeah camping. I really like camping because you get to go on trips and sleep in a tent." Other activities from the rural youth included:

- Horseback riding
- Camp
- Skateboarding, riding bike/scooter
- Wrestle
- Play in snow, skiing, ice skating
- Play with dogs
- Play with friends

- Soccer, gymnastics
- Walking/hiking
- Outside sports
- Exercise and have fun
- Driving with parents
- Camping with family

In addition to finding out what the youth participants like to do outdoors, we asked how much they liked doing these outdoor activities on a scale of 1-10. The common response by most of the youth ranged between 8—9. This meant they liked being outdoors a great deal; however, there were activities they liked to do indoors (e.g. computer, video games, favorite TV shows, playing in rooms) and some of their responses were seasonally/weather and weekday dependent. The lowest response of 5 came from one of the rural youth who used a wheelchair. He said that he really liked the outdoors, but he also enjoyed watching movies as well.

The Benefits of Recreation: Why Youth Like Playing Outdoors

All youth enjoyed participating in outdoor recreation activities, regardless of their age range or location of where they lived. The youth provided a variety of responses to why they liked to participate in outdoor activities. Again, there was not a contrast between the urban and rural youth in how they responded to the benefits of playing outdoors. The most common answer related to freedom or that the outdoors made them feel free. More specifically, they liked playing outdoors because it provided more options and choices with a greater repertoire of activities and more ways to play with their friends. These responses are significantly tied to a common definition of leisure in how the outdoors facilitates a sense of freedom and choice in activities. Having this freedom and choice then can facilitate a sense of self-determination for the children. In addition to this psychological benefit, they recognized how important it is to their physical and social health as well.

Urban

An answer that portrays such self-determination can be seen through response from a 13 year old boy who lived in Portland. He stated, “I know it stops me from doing something stupid... [and not] be bored”. Other youth revealed benefits of playing outdoors that included:

- You can do anything you want outdoors
- Helps me think better
- I feel cooped up inside
- Exercise
- You can jump around
- Fun and relaxing
- I get to be free
- More space to play
- To be with friends

Rural

Again, the rural youth provided similar reasons why they like to play outdoors. A 7 year old from Prineville explained, “It gives you exercise, I guess. Fresh air. You get a lot more active because you have more room to do stuff. You can get more exercise. More healthy. More healthy and fit and you can exercise and it keeps your body good. It’s very helpful.” Another 11 year old from Bend stated, “The good thing about outside is you can go to different places and then play different things and then inside usually it’s one thing maybe. Outside it’s pretty warm sometimes.” Other reasons from the rural youth included:

- I feel free and happy
- Fresh air—it is good for you
- More room to play
- You can do more things outdoors
- Let out energy and play
- Get to be free
- To be with friends

As we can see from these answers, young children as well as teens are aware of and can verbalize a variety of benefits of playing outdoors that have been discussed frequently in recreation and leisure literature. Research has shown that play-based experiences and early life play in the outdoors can influence the attitudes and behaviors toward the environment into adulthood (Catling, 2005; Lubomira, 2004; Place, 2004). The current argument is that environmental education should start even earlier within the pre-school ages (Lubomira, 2004). It is never too early to learn the benefits of playing and being outdoors whether it is in a family, school, travel, community, field trip context (Catling, 2005). In the current study, proof of understanding of the environment and outdoors even at the 7 year old level was apparent.

Constraints: What Keeps You from Playing Outdoors More?

One of the major constraints to playing outdoors more frequently was technology. The notion that technology represented a barrier by the participants in this study reiterates and supports what we are reading in recent academic and popular literature. Louv (2005) explains the tremendous impact of how technology will keep children inside and from becoming more aware of and learning how to protect the outdoors.

To provide a direct example of how the youth perceive technology to be a constraint, a 16 year old living in Portland stated, “I blame everything on (name brand of computer/video games) and (name brand of computer/video games) because everyone’s got a (name brand of computer/video games).” The rural youth expressed such barriers as well. A 10 year old expressed, “I’ve got a (name brand of four different computer/video games).” Even the youngest participants (7 year old children) knew what kept them from playing outside: TV, video games, and computers.

In his book, *Last child in the Woods*, Louv (2005) also explains how fear and lack of safe neighborhoods have played another role in keeping children and teens from playing outside. The literature has shown that parental fear is a major reason within this constraint. Fisman (2005) concluded from her study on local learning and environmental awareness that children growing up in neighborhoods where they do not feel safe or secure could experience more challenges in applying environmental or ecological knowledge to their home environments.

Within the latter constraint of fear is where the difference in perceptions between the rural and urban youth emerged from the data. The differences came about in more frequency and intensity surrounding the lack of safe neighborhood in relation to human based causes of fear versus natural causes of fear. The urban youth verbalized more fear themselves and as perceived by their parents in relation to violence and crime as associated with living in the inner city (e.g. guns, fighting, gang activity, rape, and drugs) in contrast to fear in relation to living in the rural areas (e.g. getting hurt in the outdoors climbing trees, rocks, skiing, and from living close to animals whose natural habitat is in their backyards).

A constraint as perceived by several of the youth in the study as another barrier caused by parents is explained by a 14 year old from Portland, “Probably some of the reasons why kids don’t go outside is because either their family doesn’t go outside or nobody pushes them to go outside, to eat healthier or to do anything active.” This barrier signifies that opportunities for children need to be just as accessible to their parents/caregivers to help provide more ecological solutions surrounding youths’ lives in relation to connecting them to the outdoors and to become more successful environmental stewards. That is, we have to reach out to the parents as well. According to the Search Institute (1997), an important aspect of youth development incorporates support for youth. This support is exhibited mainly through familial support and communication where youth are willing to seek advice and counsel from parents/caregivers and where parents/caregivers are involved directly in helping their children to transition to successful adults themselves. In addition, this development cannot be expected to only come from the family. Such successful transition to adulthood must also come from community, neighbors and other caring adults to be involved in youths’ lives (e.g. outdoor recreation and education professionals).

Overall, constraints to participating in outdoor activities as perceived by all the youth in this study included and will be divided into the urban and rural responses:

Urban

- Electronics (tv, video games, internet)
- Not cool to hang out outside
- Peer pressure
- Nobody pushes kids to go outside
- Other family members do not go outside, so I do not either

- Drugs—they are bad, slow you down
- Mom will not let me
- Advertising—it does not suggest that we go outside
- Bus system is poor
- Weather
- Fear- crime, gangs, getting hurt
- Just being a couch potato
- Playing inside with pets
- Homework

Rural

- Electronics (TV, video games, internet)
- School and homework
- Weather (e.g. cold, rain)
- Chores
- Too neat and don't like to get dirty
- Organized athletic events (parents take kids to these events)
- Nobody pushes kids to go outside
- Cougars have been seen near my house
- Like to do stuff with family and friends
- Sick parent or grandparent
- Parent's job

What happens when kids don't go outside?

An interesting theme that emerged from the data is what the youth knew no matter their age or where they lived as consequences of kids not spending time outdoors. They provided explanations including:

- Get really, really bored... “they will rot with boredom and go bad”
- Get lazy
- Become unhealthy
- They're missing part of their life
- Don't exercise anymore
- Become TV addicts
- They will just get into their work
- Don't get any sun
- They'll become couch potatoes

How can we get more kids into the parks and outside?

Many solutions that were perceived by the youth to help get more “kids in the woods” were common between the two areas of locations. However, the solutions did subtly vary between what should be the focus within urban settings versus rural settings. The suggestions in the urban setting does have to take into consideration that the “wilderness” or acres of natural surroundings find themselves non-existent or in close proximity to concrete, high rises, and mass transportation. Louv (2005) encourages outdoor recreation and natural resource professionals to find innovative and unique ways to bring nature to the urban youth of today. We cannot always take them out of the city, so how can we bring nature to them into the city. Solutions include ways that are already being implemented with the Portland Zoo teen internship program on the premises and through their environmental outreach and mentor programs to other youth programs (e.g. after school, Boys and Girls Clubs). However, the youth had additional suggestions to make nature and outdoor recreation more appealing to other kids. Such suggestions focused on the arts, music, and social events in the outdoors.

Other suggestions as divided into urban and rural youth perceptions included:

Urban

- Advertise on TV, posters, email, internet
- Just stop using all electronics
- Advertise at and provide more funding to schools
- Make it like a carnival, have food stands
- Have social events in nature
- Make outdoors cool
- Pay money to get kids outdoors
- Something exciting happening
- Better weather
- More and better facilities
- Better transportation
- Get recreation providers out of their offices and into the community
- Have special events focused on art and/or music to attract teens

Rural

- Make outdoors cool
- Advertise on TV, posters, email, internet
- Just stop using all electronics
- Outdoor sports, structured activities
- More fun things, food and people
- More playground, more toys
- Inform parents to get kids out
- Outdoor camps
- Have contests, raffles, all related to getting kids outdoors

Summary and Conclusions

The focus groups conducted within this study provide insight from one of the most powerful voices we should listen to when we are exploring youth and the outdoors. Conducting focus groups with the youth themselves is a mechanism to incorporate two of the 20 external developmental assets listed under the category of empowerment which is necessary in positive youth development: 1) Community Values Youth-young person perceives that adults in the community value youth and 2) Youth as Resources- youth are given useful roles in the community (Search Institute, 1997).

A major question emerges from focusing on what youth like to do in the outdoors, why they like to play outdoors, what constraints they experience, and what more can we do to get more kids in the woods. This question is how are recreation, natural resource managers, environmental educators and other human service professionals going to meet the challenges we are continuing to face if more kids do not get outdoors. We are already facing major health challenges for today's youth. But in the large context of the world if children who grow into adults who are too unhealthy to take care of and unaware of how to take of the earth... what is going to happen to the environment if we don't get more kids outside? How can we help youth become life long learners and advocates who will in turn become healthier adults, adult ambassadors for the environment and appreciate all types and locales of nature? Jeronen and Kaikkonen (2002) developed a model that focused on the education of the young child or learner that would help them become ready and responsible adults over four areas related to the environment: natural, cultural, aesthetic and ethical. They found that before we provide knowledge and awareness that a child needs to become sensitive to nature. What better way through outdoor recreation activities can a child be exposed to nature... to be sensitive to it through enjoyment, pleasure, choices, and freedom.

Feelings and emotions are features of experiences which provide the foundation for environmental sensitivity (2002). We can see from this study that this foundation is present in the youth. The youth expressed honest, passionate, and in-depth feelings about what the outdoors meant to them and how it made them feel. We need to "tap into" this sensitivity through the youth themselves as well as within an ecological approach to include their peers, teachers, programmers, and parents in order to take it to the next step (Autry & Anderson, 2007; Jeronen & Kaikkonen, 2002; Witt & Caldwell, 2005). This next step of helping the young child or learner want to play in and protect the outdoors includes environmental knowledge and awareness. In turn the young learner will progress to the next step of becoming ready and responsible adolescents and then adults who will act for a better life and where environmental values are taken into account.

One of the major principles of youth development is sustainability. Program sustainability whether focused in one discipline or within a multidisciplinary program is critical to the success of the program itself and is critical to gaining the trust and involvement of the youth (Witt & Caldwell, 2005). Efforts in youth programs must begin early (Catling, 2005; Lubomira, 2004; Witt & Caldwell, 2005) and sustain through adolescents and meet a variety of challenges and skill levels. "Finally, we need to

develop a system of services that are ongoing and inclusive of the variety of services necessary to meet youth's needs" (Witt & Caldwell, p. 21). Connecting youth to the outdoors and to nature is a critical need within our society and it is critical for positive youth development.

There are major challenges associated with determining how these research findings relate to kids in the state of Oregon. Specifically, how can recreation resource managers provide outdoor recreation opportunities in Oregon that will facilitate youth participation? What impact will increased youth recreation participation have on the youth and on the environment? These are questions that will not be answered quickly, but will require long-term monitoring and in-depth analysis.

Recommendations. Specific recommendations resulting from the statewide youth focus group interviews in Oregon are as follows:

- **Recreation Opportunity Inventory.** A complete inventory of the recreation providers should be completed. This inventory would include the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of each recreation entity within each of the 11 Oregon regions (identified by Oregon State Parks on website). The agencies could be classified as *governmental* (e.g., federal, state, local), *not-for-profit* (e.g., Boys/Girls Clubs, Scouting, church groups, community recreation centers, schools, etc.), and *for-profit* (e.g., REI, local outfitters, local recreation shops, etc.).
 - Strengths-what are the success stories, or programs and processes that are currently working in each agency? These might include the agency's staff, facilities, partnerships, etc.
 - Weaknesses-similarly, an objective list of each recreation entity's weakness should be created. This list may include similar items outlined in the strengths, such as poorly trained staff, poor facilities, etc.
 - Opportunities- what untapped resources exist for each agency within the community? Are there opportunities to partner with other agencies to reduce redundancy, to shore up weaknesses? Do opportunities exist in partnering with for-profit and not-for-profit agencies that may have trained staff, facilities, etc.?
 - Threats-what impending threats exist? These threats typically come from outside the recreation agency, and may be in the form of financial (tax cuts, higher rent/liability costs, etc.), facility (an agency may offer a similar program, thus creating the unintended consequence of unfriendly competition in a community).

- **Statewide Facilities.** Oregon recreation resource managers should attempt to understand if their existing and proposed facilities are appropriate for Oregon's youth. Are the facilities and recreation areas developed so they will facilitate the recruitment of new participants (e.g., racial/ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, non-English speaking youth, etc.)? This could be accomplished by comparing the findings of previous Oregon SCORP findings with current statewide SCORP findings. What trends have been identified, what demographic changes will occur, and will the facilities be appropriate for that future user group? The literature review completed by Dr. Kreg Lindberg, (see Oregon SCORP website) should be examined to understand the changing demographics of Oregon residents (this includes racial/ethnic minority use, aging Oregonians, etc.).
- **Partnerships.** Recreation resource managers should strive to develop partnerships with appropriate recreation entities. These partnerships may include communities partnering with public, private and non-for-profit entities. Each partner should have its niche identified and should understand how the other contributes. Discussion about partnering topics is included in the recommendations listed below.
- **Electronic Toys.** The topic of children staying indoors to play with electronic toys instead of playing outside warrants considerable discussion. Not only has this type of indoor play been identified as a problem in constraints literature, but the children who participated in this study identified this problem themselves. Recreation resource managers will need to understand the role of their agency in this matter. Parents may support the use of tv, internet and other electronic games by their kids, thus the potential for conflicting goals may exist between parents and recreation providers. This type of entertainment may keep their kids busy while the parents are engaged in other activities. Oregon recreation resource managers may want to consider a public awareness campaign touting the importance of outdoor recreation and include awareness about sedentary activities. However, we must take into account the notion that playing indoors, while not promoting a healthy lifestyle, in itself is not particularly bad. Kids who are engaged in these indoor activities may have chosen this activity in lieu of other, more harmful activities, including abusive behavior such as drinking alcohol or using harmful drugs.
- **Crime and Safety.** The notion of safety during outdoor recreation pursuits was mentioned by kids in both the urban and rural areas, although the type of threat was different in the different settings. Children in the urban settings mentioned gang-related crime as a threat, while a rural children mentioned the reports of wild animals (cougar) in his neighborhood. This issue overlaps with the earlier suggestion that recreation resource managers focus on partnerships. Many communities have been participating in a "community policing" method, where police are present in neighborhoods to prevent criminal activity, rather than

respond to crimes. Partnerships between police and other safety/security agencies in communities with crime threats would be an important component, and may allow kids to feel more comfortable recreating outdoors.

- **Marketing.** Recreation resource managers should consider a pointed marketing campaign touting the benefits and potential outcomes of playing outside. Partnering with statewide recreation entities (public, private and not-for-profit) would be appropriate and perhaps the most cost effective method of communicating the importance of outdoor recreation in children's lives.

Future Research

The findings of this study and that of the larger SCORP study within the state of Oregon indicate that the needs of youth must be identified and efforts must be addressed in a systematic, statewide approach. Accordingly, the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department has requested that researchers develop an implementation plan that will be tested in 2008. The crux of this implementation plan is to test an outreach method; to develop a methodology that will provide the youth and parents of Oregon with a conduit to the services and facilities that youth seek in participating in outdoor recreation experiences in Oregon. Although this process and methodology is still being researched, many of the concepts expressed in the recommendations section (above) will be tested in the Bend, Oregon area. Federal, state, local, private and not-for-profit entities will be engaged and provided with the opportunity to develop specific tool-kits that will facilitate outdoor recreation participation by youth.

Appendix

Youth Focus Group Interview Guiding Questions

We want to hear from all of you and so if you want to answer our questions and you are hesitant remember there is no right or wrong answer to these. We just feel like your feedback is very important.

Guides and Probes:

Introductions:

1) Tell us a little bit about yourselves... backgrounds, age, where you live, what type of neighborhood do you live in (urban, suburb, rural).

Enjoyment:

2) How much do you enjoy participating in outdoor activities? What influences this enjoyment? Probe: On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 you don't like it and 10 you really like it) how much do you like being outdoors and why did you pick the number you did?

Time spent:

3) How much time do you spend outdoors now? (Pick a percentage.) How important is it for you to increase your outdoor activities in the future?

How spend time:

4) How do you spend your time in nature or outdoors? (Backyard, at school, park, neighborhood, fields, vacant lots, woods?)

Free and imaginative?

Structured or programmed?

By yourself?

With others? Family, friends, classmates?

How important is it for you to spend time participating in outdoor activities alone? With others? (family members, friends, others) Explain.

Barriers:

5) What obstacles, restrictions or barriers keep you from participating in outdoor activities or in participating in MORE outdoor activities?

Challenge or relaxation:

6) How important is it for you to feel [challenged] in the outdoors? [Relaxed] in the outdoors? [one with nature] in the outdoors?

Suggestions

7) How can we get more kids outdoors? What ideas do you have?

References

- Autry, C. E., & Anderson, S. C. (2007). Recreation and the Glenview neighborhood: Implications for youth and community development. *Leisure Sciences*, 29, 267-285.
- Catling, S. (2005). Seeking younger children's 'voices' in geographical education research. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 14, 297-304.
- Jeronen, E. & Kaikkonen, M. (2002). Thoughts of children and adults about the environment and environmental education. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 11, 341-353.
- Louv, R. (2006). *Last child in the woods: Saving our children from nature-deficit disorder*. Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill.
- Lubomira, D. (2004). Environmental education at pre-school. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 13, 258-263.
- Place, G. (2004). Youth recreation leads to adult conservation. *Parks and Recreation*, 39, 29-38.
- Search Institute. (2007). *40 developmental assets*. Retrieved May 22, 2007, from <http://www.search-institute.org>.
- Witt, P. A. & Caldwell, L. L. (Eds.). (2005). *Recreation and youth development*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing