National Park Service Comprehensive Survey of the American Public

2018 – Current Initiatives

Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/2044

National Park Service Comprehensive Survey of the American Public

2018 – Current Initiatives

Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/2044

Resource Systems Group (RSG)
White River Junction, Vermont

Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center (WYSAC)
Laramie, Wyoming

November 2019

U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Natural Resource Stewardship and Science
Fort Collins, Colorado

The National Park Service, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science office in Fort Collins, Colorado, publishes a range of reports that address natural resource topics. These reports are of interest and applicability to a broad audience in the National Park Service and others in natural resource management, including scientists, conservation and environmental constituencies, and the public.

The Natural Resource Report Series is used to disseminate comprehensive information and analysis about natural resources and related topics concerning lands managed by the National Park Service. The series supports the advancement of science, informed decision-making, and the achievement of the National Park Service mission. The series also provides a forum for presenting more lengthy results that may not be accepted by publications with page limitations.

All manuscripts in the series receive the appropriate level of peer review to ensure that the information is scientifically credible, technically accurate, appropriately written for the intended audience, and designed and published in a professional manner.

This report received formal peer review by subject-matter experts who were not directly involved in the collection, analysis, or reporting of the data, and whose background and expertise put them on par technically and scientifically with the authors of the information.

Views, statements, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and data in this report do not necessarily reflect views and policies of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the U.S. Government.

This report is available in digital format from the [Natural Resource Publications Management website](). If you have difficulty accessing information in this publication, particularly if using assistive technology, please email [irma@nps.gov]().

Please cite this publication as:

Resource Systems Group (RSG) and Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center (WYSAC). 2019. National Park Service comprehensive survey of the American public: 2018 – current initiatives. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/2044. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Contents

Contents (continued)

Tables

Tables (continued)

Tables (continued)

Tables (continued)

Tables (continued)

Tables (continued)

Abstract

In 2018, the National Park Service (NPS) conducted its third Comprehensive Survey of the American Public (CSAP3), a nationwide telephone survey consisting of 25-minute interviews with more than 2,700 adult respondents across the United States. The survey obtained information on public attitudes and behaviors related to programs and services provided by the NPS, demographic characteristics, and recent visitation behavior. This third iteration of the survey also incorporated new modules focused on program awareness and youth engagement with the National Park System. The present report examines the CSAP3 data on program awareness and youth engagement to expand the idea of "engagement" beyond visitation and assess the relevance of NPS to a more diverse, urban, and technology-oriented American public.

The new modules in the NPS Comprehensive Survey of the American Public in 2018 focused on program awareness found that fewer than half of the respondents reported that they had used or that their communities had experience with NPS educational programs, cultural programs, and recreational programs, across almost all questions. Reported levels of awareness and use were also compared across national park visitors/non-visitors and by race/ethnic group. Visitors reported higher levels of experience and use than non-visitors across nearly all questions about program awareness, while race/ethnic groups reported different levels of use and awareness of their community's experience with NPS programs. These results indicate that NPS must continue to raise awareness about the programs and services available to people in their communities. However, a lack of awareness of certain NPS programs could also indicate that those programs are not offered in the communities where certain groups of respondents live; thus, NPS should assess the geographic provision of those programs to ensure that they are reaching underserved communities. Results regarding youth respondents are constrained by small sample sizes; however, they generally imply that NPS is maintaining its relevance to young people. For example, the majority of youth respondents (90%) indicated that "preserving national parks is important to me" was "very true." Overall, results of CSAP3 indicate that NPS should maintain its focus on raising awareness, providing programs in underserved communities, and providing relevant content for all audiences in its second century of service.

Authors

Resource Systems Group, Inc. (RSG)
55 Railroad Row
White River Junction, VT 05001
(802) 295-4999
www.rsginc.com

RSG has a nationally and internationally recognized practice in the field of Public Lands Planning and Management (PLPM). The PLPM practice specializes in socioeconomic data collection, analysis, modeling, and peer-reviewed publication to help the NPS and other federal land management agency clients address nationally significant issues.

Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center (WYSAC)
University of Wyoming, Dept. 3925
1000 East University Avenue
Laramie, WY 82071
(307) 766-2189
www.uwyo.edu/wysac

WYSAC has a staff of 20 full-time employees and numerous part-time student workers, research aides, and interviewers. Together they conduct public opinion surveys, evaluation research, and software development for state and local governments and federal agencies.

Acknowledgments

Introduction

For many Americans, the national parks represent a sense of place, a marker of identity, and a reminder of the country's past (see Runte, 1987; Stokowski, 2002). However, the lands set aside as units of the National Park System do not have the same meaning for everyone. Some Americans visit the parks frequently; others, rarely or not at all. The National Park Service (NPS) uses data from a variety of social surveys to assess the public's relationship to national parks, national monuments, and the other natural, historical, and cultural sites managed by the NPS. Most of these surveys focus only on visitors to specific NPS units, but in the past two decades three surveys sponsored by the NPS have provided comprehensive national data. The distinguishing characteristic of the three national surveys is that non-visitors as well as visitors were interviewed about their behaviors and opinions concerning national parks.

Each of the three national surveys is referred to as a "Comprehensive Survey of the American Public," or CSAP. The first CSAP was conducted in 2000 by Northern Arizona University (hereafter, CSAP1). The second CSAP was conducted in 2008-2009 by the Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center (WYSAC) at the University of Wyoming (hereafter, CSAP2). The third and most recent CSAP was conducted in 2018 by Resources Systems Group (RSG) and WYSAC (hereafter, CSAP3). All three CSAPs were conducted via telephone interviews with a nationwide sample of adults and obtained information on visits to the National Park System, public attitudes and behaviors related to programs and services provided by the NPS, and demographic characteristics of recent visitors and non-visitors. In addition, CSAP3 included new modules assessing current initiatives related to program awareness and youth engagement. These new modules were designed to extend the concept of engagement with the NPS beyond visitation to park lands to include awareness of and participation in NPS programs. Each of the three surveys has generated a national report as well as topical reports on specific issues. Taken together, the three sets of reports derived from these surveys help NPS policymakers understand how the American public relates to the National Park System.

This report uses data from CSAP3 to better understand how the NPS connects with the public beyond traditional park visitation by 1) assessing program awareness and 2) assessing youth park visitation and engagement with online content produced by the NPS. The issue of awareness and relevance of the NPS, national parks, and programs is a critical one in an increasingly diverse, urban, and technological twenty-first century America.

Current Initiatives of the National Park Service

The centennial of the National Park Service in 2016 offered a unique opportunity for the Service to reflect on and celebrate 100 years of public service and support, but also to look ahead for opportunities to connect with the next generation of park visitors, supporters, and advocates. In recognition of these opportunities, a number of strategic planning processes were initiated by President Bush in 2006, engaging the public, stakeholders, and a wide range of national and local partners with NPS to gather feedback, develop reports, and guide preparations for the second century of the NPS. Many of these processes focused on an active recommitment to the core mission of the NPS – to foster stewardship and public enjoyment of national parks for current and future generations – in the context of a growing and changing America.

The U.S. has indeed changed significantly since the creation of the NPS in 1916; today, the U.S. population is rapidly becoming more ethnically and racially diverse (Colby & Ortman, 2014), over 80% of the U.S. population lives in urban areas (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016), and technology is advancing at an unprecedented rate. In addition, the literature has shown that despite efforts to serve the entire American public, the National Park System may not have been accessible and welcoming to all groups of Americans. Racial and ethnic minorities have been historically underrepresented and underserved in outdoor recreation settings, and particularly in national parks (Pease, 2015; Stanfield, Manning, Budruk, & Floyd, 2005; Taylor, Grandjean, & Gramann, 2011), with barriers to visitation by people of color including lack of transportation or access, lack of knowledge or awareness, expenses, language barriers, and the interpretive themes of parks (Burns, Covelli, & Graefe, 2008; McCown, Laven, Manning, & Mitchell, 2012; Roberts, 2007). Access to green space from urban areas is often inequitably distributed based on income and race or ethnicity, which weakens the ties of urban populations to the outdoors and creates environmental justice and public health issues (Byrne, Wolch, & Zhang, 2009; Kimbell, Schuhmann, & Brown, 2009; Wolch, Byrne, & Newell, 2014). Young people are also increasingly becoming separated from parks and natural spaces, due in part to a shift in Americans' relationship to the natural world and rapid technological advances (Jarvis, 2012; Louv, 2008). Research has illustrated that this separation can impact the health of young people, making them more prone to attention deficit symptoms and causing them to miss out on cooperative play opportunities and improved cognitive development (Faber Taylor & Kuo, 2009; Kuo & Taylor, 2004; Louv, 2008; Wells, 2000), while also potentially impacting their appreciation of the natural world (Kimbell et al., 2009; Louv, 2008).

These changes could present a challenge for the future of the NPS; as the U.S. population grows more urban and diverse, and generations steeped in technology and separated from nature age into adulthood, it is possible that the NPS could become less relevant to the American public. As former Director of NPS Jonathan Jarvis put it, "A public that is unaware is indifferent, and an indifferent public will not support the parks in their time of need" (Jarvis, 2012, p. 159). In planning for the centennial, NPS leadership recognized the need to build personal connections with the public and tell stories that are relevant to everyone, building awareness and encouraging park visitation and engagement in NPS programs outside of park visitation in the next generation. By continuing to work towards this core mission while also focusing on welcoming new, young, and diverse audiences and

cultivating an ethic of stewardship, the NPS could enhance the long-term relevancy and sustainability of the organization.

In 2011, NPS Director Jonathan Jarvis launched *A Call to Action*, a strategic plan for the NPS's second century focused on four broad themes: connecting people to parks, advancing the educational mission of the NPS, preserving America's special places, and enhancing professional and organizational excellence (see NPS, 2014). Among other things, these themes emphasized the importance of welcoming and engaging diverse communities and developing lifelong connections between young people and parks. The accompanying NPS Urban Agenda also initiated programs administered beyond the boundaries of the National Park System to connect with Americans "where they live, rather than only where some may spend their vacation" (NPS Stewardship Institute, 2015). These programs expand the idea of "engagement" beyond visitation and allow the NPS to build relationships with individuals in young, urban, and diverse communities who may have limited awareness of, interest in, or ability to visit national parks themselves.

As a result of these and other strategic planning efforts, the 2016 centennial was seen as extremely successful; parks saw high visitation throughout the year and high levels of engagement in programs and messaging efforts like the Every Kid in a Park program and the Find Your Park/*Encuentra Tu Parque* public awareness campaign (NPS, 2016). The celebration of the centennial also generated significant energy and momentum to support the goals of a second-century NPS. However, it can be more difficult to assess whether the NPS is meeting goals of relevance, awareness, and engagement outside of park visitation with target audiences like young, urban, and diverse communities.

The third iteration Comprehensive Survey of the American Public (CSAP3) offers a unique opportunity to provide views from a national audience concerning the current relevancy of the NPS that would otherwise be unavailable. The questionnaire for CSAP3 was updated from CSAP2 to include questions assessing 1) program awareness, to help understand respondents' engagement with NPS programs outside of traditional park visits, and 2) youth engagement, to measure youth (aged 12 to 17 years old) visitation and engagement with online content offered by the NPS. The present report tabulates results related to program awareness and youth engagement from the CSAP3 questionnaire.

Some Notes on Methods

Complete details on survey methodology are provided in the CSAP3 national report, which includes the full text of the interview script and tables of results for each survey item. Only those aspects of method most relevant to assessing program awareness (tabulated against NPS visitation and race/ethnicity) and youth engagement are summarized in this report.

Survey Overview

Telephone interviews were completed with a sample of adults in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Interviews were primarily conducted in English, but Spanish-speaking interviewers were available for callbacks when necessary. Both cell phone and landline telephone numbers were included in the sample, and the sample was stratified by NPS region to provide an approximately equal number of completed surveys from each region. Prior to analysis, the survey data were weighted, with weights calibrated to match census demographics and estimates of the proportion of landline and cell phone users within each region. A total of 2,704 surveys were completed, providing an overall response rate of 9% (AAPOR 2015, RR3).

Split-Ballot Design for Program Awareness Module

To keep the questionnaire to a reasonable length for a telephone interview, respondents were randomly assigned to sets of program awareness questions, such that approximately half of the sample received each survey question within the program awareness module. As a result, although 2,704 surveys were completed in total, only approximately 1,352 respondents were asked each program awareness question.[1] Sample sizes for the race-ethnicity tables are somewhat lower than this, as individuals who refused to provide a race or who selected more than one race were excluded from the summaries. Finally, sample sizes for conditional survey questions are also somewhat lower (for example, only respondents who had children in the household were asked if their child used NPS online content).

Youth Engagement Module

The youth engagement questions were posed directly to children between the ages of 12 and 17. These questions were carefully crafted in relation to the cognitive level of the 12-17 age group. The execution of the youth interviews used the following protocol. At the beginning of the adult interviews, respondents were asked how many children between the ages of 12 and 17 they had living with them. At the conclusion of the adult interviews, those who had indicated, that they have a child/children aged 12 to 17 living with them were asked if they would agree to let their child (if they had only one child in that age group), or the child over the age of 12 with the next upcoming birthday to complete a short (5 minute) survey. Parents were also offered the opportunity to hear the questions intended for their child. Only then could the interviewer proceed with the child interview. If an interview with that child did not commence in conjunction with the adult interview, these households

---

[1] Due to random variation, the percentage of respondents responding to each set of program awareness questions was typically slightly higher or slightly lower than 50%.

were not called back for future attempts. A total of 60 interviews were successfully completed with children in that age group, three of which were completed in Spanish.

Identifying Recent Visitors

Recent visitors were defined as respondents who could name a valid unit of the National Park System they had visited in the previous two years. The main body of the questionnaire began with a question about park visitation: "The National Park System consists of all the units managed by the National Park Service, including national parks, historic and cultural sites, and national monuments. How many times in the past two years have you visited a unit of the National Park System?" Respondents who reported at least one visit over that time span were considered part of the pool of potential "recent visitors," subject to validation. Those who said they had not visited in the past two years were then asked if they had ever visited. At this point, the survey incorporated a timeline check by asking those who said they had ever visited how long ago that was. Those respondents who volunteered that their visit was in fact within the past two years were put back into the pool of potential recent visitors.

Respondents were then asked to name the last NPS unit they had visited in the past two years, and only respondents who identified a valid NPS unit on that question were defined as "visitors" for the analysis; all other respondents were defined as "non-visitors." The interviewers' reference list of NPS units included commonly used aliases to assist in park identification (e.g., "Gateway Arch" for Gateway Arch National Park [formerly Jefferson National Expansion Memorial] or "Mount McKinley" for Denali National Park and Preserve). In addition, several optional probes were used to assist the interviewer in identifying the recently visited park. The probes were, "Do you know what state that's in? Is it in [state]? Is there any other name for it? Can you spell it for me?"

Defining Race and Ethnicity

As noted by Solop et al. (2003), race is a social classification based on perceived differences in physical characteristics. Ethnic status is based on national origin or a shared cultural characteristic. Thus "African American" and "white" are racial categories, but "Hispanic American" (or Latino) is an ethnic category reflecting ancestral ties to Spain. Hispanics can be of any race; for example, a person may self-identify as both Hispanic and African American or Hispanic and white.

Following a survey protocol required by the Office of Management and Budget, respondents were asked first to identify their ethnicity (Hispanic or not Hispanic) and then to select one or more racial categories. In this report, all respondents who self-identified on the first of those questions as "Hispanic or Latino/a," are combined in a single category ("Hispanic"). This categorization is independent of their racial self-identification in the follow-up question, and of the language used for their interview. The remaining racial categories used in this report do not include Hispanic respondents and are based on the respondent's self-identified race as follows: "White," "black or African American" (abbreviated as Afr. Am), "Asian," "American Indian or Alaska Native" (abbreviated as Am. Ind.), and "Other."

Under the OMB protocol, respondents could place themselves in more than one racial category, e.g., black and white, or American Indian and white. Because of the small number of individuals who

chose more than one race, and the wide variety of multi-racial combinations they chose, results for this group are not analyzed in this report. In CSAP1 and CSAP2, there were also too few Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders to include that category in the analyses; however, in CSAP3, respondents who identified themselves as "Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders" are included in the "Other only, non-Hispanic" category. Furthermore, respondents in CSAP3 were given the option to identify themselves as "Other" race. Those respondents are also included in the "Other" category. Respondents who declined to choose any race category are excluded from these analyses, unless they had identified themselves as Hispanic (in which case they are included in the "Hispanic" category). Finally, due to small sample sizes for the "Asian," "American Indian," and "Other" categories, results for these three groups appear in the tables but are not discussed in the narrative.

Margin of Error

For simplicity, the report does not present the margin of error associated with each estimate. Approximate margins of error for estimates of percentages derived from the full sample and from key subgroups are presented in Table 1. The margins of error in Table 1 are based on the standard formula for a proportion, assuming a simple random sample from a large population with equal sampling weights.[2] The margin of error for any specific estimate in the report will ultimately be a function of the sample size for that estimate, the underlying variance of the measure of interest, and the variance of the sampling weights.

Table 1. Margins of error for key subgroups, assuming simple random sample and no weighting.

Group	Number of respondents	Margin of error
All	2704	±2%
Visitor	1674	±2%
Non-visitor	1030	±3%
Hispanic, any race	212	±7%
White only, non-Hispanic	1837	±2%
Black or African American only, non-Hispanic	219	±7%
Asian only, non-Hispanic	68	±12%
American Indian or Alaska Native only, non-Hispanic	35	±17%
Other only, non-Hispanic	74	±11%
Youth engagement respondents	60	±13%

---

[2] The margin of error is calculated as $1.96x \sqrt{0.25/n}$, where n is the sample size.

Statistical Testing

Pearson chi-square tests are used to assess the statistical significance of differences by visitor/non-visitor and across race/ethnic groups. The Pearson chi-squared statistic is corrected for the survey design using the second-order correction described by Rao and Scott (1984) and converted into an F statistic for the calculation of a p-value. Differences are classified as statistically significant if they have a small "p-value" (i.e., $p < 0.05$), indicating that the differences are unlikely to be caused by chance variation in the survey sample. Although the analyses highlight statistically significant effects, they are unable to reveal whether effects have important practical implications. Some effects that fall just short of the 0.05 significance level may have large practical implications while other effects with high statistical significance may have no practical implications. Thus, it is important to consider both the statistical significance and the practical implications of the results.

The chi-square test can be unreliable when the subgroups being examined are very small. As a result, when > 20% of the cells in a cross tabulation have fewer than five respondents, a warning is provided after the p-value associated with the chi-square test. In addition, for analyses involving race/ethnicity, the reported chi-square tests focus only on differences among the three largest race/ethnic groups in the sample (white, non-Hispanic; Hispanic, any race; and black or African American), and the "Don't know/not sure" responses were excluded from all statistical tests.

Results

Program Awareness

As indicated in previous sections, a module on Program Awareness was introduced in CSAP3 as a method of measuring NPS relevance and how the agency connects to the public outside of national park visitation. Data from this new module – which was broken down into sections related to Educational Programs (EP), Cultural Programs (CP), Recreational Programs (RP), National Natural Landmarks (NNL) and Overall Program Awareness (PA) – are summarized based on reported NPS visitation and race/ethnicity of respondents below. See Appendix A for the full script of questions asked about program awareness.

Educational Programs

Questions in this section assessed respondents' use and awareness of NPS educational programs, including online educational content and programming, internet-based/digital activities, and in-person educational opportunities provided by the NPS. As shown in Table 2 through Table 11, fewer than a quarter of respondents used or were aware of all of different NPS educational programs, except for the most popular educational service provided by the NPS: "watch[ing] a park webcam showing a natural setting" (38%). The least popular educational opportunity used by respondents or members of their household was "participat[ing] in scientific data collection, also known as citizen science like BioBlitz" (7%). Overall, fewer than 25% of respondents used or were aware of educational programs other than NPS videos on YouTube or NPS webcams; however, many of the questions in this section asked about *use* of specific programs rather than awareness, which could explain these lower rates.

Visitors vs. Non-visitors

Table 2 through Table 11 illustrate that visitors reported higher use and awareness of NPS educational programs than non-visitors across almost all questions. Still, fewer than half of visitors reported that they had used any of the educational programs discussed in this section of the questionnaire. However, of respondents with children, a greater percentage of non-visitors (30%) reported that their "child used online content and programs such as Every Kid in a Park, Junior Paleontologist, or WebRangers;" only 21% of visitors stated that their child had used those programs (Table 5). While a majority of respondents were able to answer "yes" or "no" to most questions, it is interesting that 20% of non-visitors and 18% of visitors stated that they did not know whether the NPS had "visited [their] community to engage in conversations about issues affecting parks and the environment" (Table 10).

Despite relatively low use and awareness of NPS educational programs, 94% of visitors and 93% of non-visitors agreed that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service offers educational programs which help children and adults learn about historical, cultural, and environmental topics" (Table 12).

Table 2. Percent of respondents who used online content such as Teaching with Historic Places, Network to Freedom, and Virtual Museum Exhibits, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	24.3%	29.1%	19.6%
No	74.6%	69.8%	79.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.02.

Table 3. Percent of respondents who used online content such as Geologic Time, Meet a Paleontologist, or National Fossil Day, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	13.2%	15.8%	10.5%
No	84.3%	82.1%	86.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	2.6%	2.1%	3.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.1.

Table 4. Percent of respondents who used online content such as Discover Biodiversity and Natural Sounds Gallery, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	18.1%	19.9%	16.3%
No	80.6%	78.2%	83.0%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.3%	1.9%	0.7%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.4.

Table 5. Percent of respondents whose child used online content such as Every Kid in a Park, Junior Paleontologist, or WebRangers, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	22.6%	20.7%	29.6%
No	68.5%	70.6%	60.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	8.9%	8.7%	10.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**349**	**239**	**110**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2.

Table 6. Percent of respondents who have listened to a podcast produced by the National Park Service on iTunes, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	11.6%	12.6%	10.5%
No	87.3%	85.9%	88.7%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.2%	1.5%	0.8%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.6.

Table 7. Percent of respondents who have watched a video produced by the National Park Service on YouTube, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	31.2%	38.1%	24.3%
No	65.5%	60.2%	70.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	3.3%	1.7%	4.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.003.

Table 8. Percent of respondents who have watched a park webcam showing a natural setting, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	38.4%	47.3%	29.6%
No	58.7%	50.9%	66.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	2.8%	1.8%	3.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.0003.

Table 9. Percent of respondents who follow the National Park Service or a specific park or program on social media such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	18.3%	21.5%	15.0%
No	81.4%	78.3%	84.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.4%	0.1%	0.6%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1334**	**819**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.09.

Table 10. Percent of respondents who reported that the National Park Service has visited their community to engage in conversations about issues affecting parks and the environment, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	11.6%	16.3%	6.9%
No	69.5%	66.2%	72.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	18.9%	17.5%	20.3%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1366**	**851**	**515**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.0007.

Table 11. Percent of respondents who reported that they or someone in their household has participated in scientific data collection, also known as citizen science like BioBlitz, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	6.5%	6.7%	6.4%
No	91.1%	91.3%	90.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	2.4%	2.0%	2.8%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1367**	**853**	**514**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.9.

Table 12. Rating of the importance of National Park Service offering educational programs which help children and adults learn about historical, cultural and environmental topics, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Very important	59.1%	60.9%	57.3%
Important	34.6%	33.5%	35.7%
Not so important	5.0%	4.8%	5.2%
Not important at all	1.3%	0.8%	1.7%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1367**	**853**	**514**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.8.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 13 through Table 22 illustrate that generally, different race/ethnicity groups have a similar level of use or awareness of most NPS educational programs.[3] However, certain groups seemed to use some educational programs more than others. For example, Hispanic respondents were more likely to use online content like Discover Biodiversity and Natural Sounds Gallery to "learn about biodiversity, habitats, and other environmental issues" than white, non-Hispanic or African American respondents (Table 15). Forty-eight percent of African American respondents indicated that their children had used "online content and programs for example Every Kid in a Park, Junior Paleontologist, or WebRangers," compared to 16% of white, non-Hispanic and 21% of Hispanic respondents (Table 16); however, African American respondents were the least likely of the three largest race/ethnic groups to have watched a video produced by the NPS on YouTube (Table 18). In addition, while "watch[ing] a park webcam showing a natural setting" was the most-used program,

---

[3] Note that the total number of respondents is somewhat smaller in the race/ethnicity tables than in the visitor/non-visitor tables presented above. This is the result of non-response to the race/ethnicity questions and to the removal of respondents who selected multiple races.

use was disproportionately distributed across race/ethnic groups, with 45% of white, non-Hispanic respondents using the program, compared to only 30% of Hispanic respondents and 18% of African American respondents (Table 19).

Table 13. Percent of respondents who used online content such as Teaching with Historic Places, Network to Freedom, and Virtual Museum Exhibits, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	23.4%	22.6%	23.2%	18.8%	15.6%	49.5%	49.4%
No	75.4%	77.4%	75.4%	80.1%	80.8%	50.4%	48.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.2%	0.0%	1.3%	1.2%	3.6%	0.2%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.9.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 14. Percent of respondents who used online content such as Geologic Time, Meet a Paleontologist, or National Fossil Day, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	13.1%	11.2%	12.2%	15.4%	11.2%	49.5%	16.3%
No	84.4%	81.7%	85.8%	84.0%	88.8%	50.5%	83.7%
(Don't know/Not sure)	2.5%	7.1%	2.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.9.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 15. Percent of respondents who used online content such as Discover Biodiversity and Natural Sounds Gallery, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	18.1%	28.7%	14.6%	16.8%	32.9%	58.1%	15.8%
No	80.9%	71.3%	83.9%	82.6%	67.1%	41.9%	82.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.1%	0.0%	1.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 16. Percent of respondents whose child used online content such as Every Kid in a Park, Junior Paleontologist, or WebRangers, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other[b]
Yes	23.3%	21.3%	16.3%	47.5%	13.7%	83.9%	26.4%
No	66.2%	57.1%	74.4%	52.4%	74.3%	0.8%	42.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	10.5%	21.6%	9.3%	0.1%	12.0%	15.3%	30.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	305	34	208	31	14	6	12

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N< 30).

Table 17. Percent of respondents who have listened to a podcast produced by the National Park Service on iTunes, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	11.4%	16.3%	9.1%	14.3%	28.2%	23.7%	7.1%
No	87.3%	83.2%	89.9%	84.4%	71.8%	60.3%	90.2%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.2%	0.5%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	16.0%	2.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.5

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 18. Percent of respondents who have watched a video produced by the National Park Service on YouTube, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	30.5%	36.7%	31.4%	18.2%	55.1%	24.0%	14.9%
No	66.2%	62.4%	65.4%	76.1%	44.9%	76.0%	73.9%
(Don't know/Not sure)	3.2%	0.9%	3.2%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 19. Percent of respondents who have watched a park webcam showing a natural setting, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	39.0%	30.3%	45.1%	18.1%	48.5%	37.8%	28.7%
No	58.4%	68.2%	52.9%	76.2%	48.3%	62.2%	63.1%
(Don't know/Not sure)	2.6%	1.5%	2.0%	5.7%	3.2%	0.0%	8.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.006.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 20. Percent of respondents who follow the National Park Service or a specific park or program on social media such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	17.9%	15.8%	18.7%	14.5%	25.8%	37.1%	9.0%
No	81.7%	84.2%	81.2%	85.4%	74.2%	62.9%	77.9%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1190	100	893	105	34	19	39

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.8.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 21. Percent of respondents who reported that the National Park Service has visited their community to engage in conversations about issues affecting parks and the environment, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	11.3%	8.9%	12.2%	6.4%	14.9%	22.8%	10.6%
No	70.5%	79.1%	66.6%	87.6%	62.7%	76.9%	67.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	18.2%	12.0%	21.2%	6.0%	22.4%	0.3%	21.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1252	112	941	114	34	16	35

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.3.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 22. Percent of respondents who reported that they or someone in their household has participated in scientific data collection, also known as citizen science like BioBlitz, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	6.3%	4.8%	7.4%	3.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.6%
No	91.5%	89.8%	90.8%	96.5%	100.0%	99.6%	95.6%
(Don't know/Not sure)	2.2%	5.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1254**	**112**	**943**	**114**	**34**	**16**	**35**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.5.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Agreement that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service offers educational programs which help children and adults learn about historical, cultural, and environmental topics" was relatively similar across race/ethnic groups, ranging between 87% and 95% for the three largest race/ethnic categories (see Table 23).

Table 23. Rating of the importance of National Park Service offering educational programs which help children and adults learn about historical, cultural and environmental topics, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Very important	58.9%	46.7%	59.8%	67.7%	49.8%	55.2%	83.9%
Important	34.4%	48.3%	34.0%	19.5%	47.3%	0.5%	14.5%
Not so important	5.4%	4.4%	4.5%	12.3%	2.8%	44.3%	0.0%
Not important at all	1.3%	0.6%	1.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1253**	**112**	**942**	**114**	**34**	**16**	**35**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Cultural Programs

Questions in this section assessed respondents' awareness of their community's experience with NPS cultural programs, including assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people. As shown in Table 24 through Table 29, fewer than half of respondents stated that their community had experience with almost all of the different NPS cultural programs. Overall, the largest percentage of respondents indicated there is a National Historic Landmark within their community (52%), while the smallest percentage of respondents indicated that their community has "received technical assistance from the National Park Service to identify, preserve, manage, or protect cultural

resources" (23%). For many respondents in this section, their level of awareness was not high enough to allow them to answer "yes" or "no" to these questions; between 17% and 39% of respondents indicated that they "did not know" whether their community had experience with that particular NPS cultural program. Furthermore, it is possible that awareness levels would have been even lower if "don't know" had been an explicit component of the survey question (rather than a voluntary response).

<u>Visitors vs. Non-visitors</u>

Table 24 through Table 29 illustrate that higher percentages of visitors than non-visitors reported that their community had experience with NPS cultural programs across all questions. The greatest disparity between visitors and non-visitors was in responses indicating that their community had "received help from the National Park Service to document buildings, landscapes, or other resources of significance to our cultural heritage" (43% of visitors, vs. 28% of non-visitors) (Table 24). However, more non-visitors reported that they "did not know" about their community's experience with NPS cultural programs than visitors on every question. These results could either indicate that visitors are simply more aware of NPS cultural programs in their community, or that visitors are more likely to live in communities where NPS cultural programs are offered.

Table 24. Percent of respondents whose community received help from the National Park Service to document buildings, landscapes, or other resources of significance to our national cultural heritage, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	35.4%	43.0%	28.1%
No	38.2%	37.9%	38.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	26.4%	19.1%	33.5%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1348**	**836**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.04.

Table 25. Percent of respondents whose community received financial assistance from the National Park Service in the form of grants and/or tax credits to support historic preservation projects, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	27.8%	30.0%	25.8%
No	34.8%	35.6%	34.1%
(Don't know/Not sure)	37.3%	34.5%	40.1%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.7.

Table 26. Percent of respondents whose community received technical assistance from the National Park Service to identify, preserve, manage, or protect cultural resources, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	23.1%	25.1%	21.0%
No	37.6%	38.1%	37.1%
(Don't know/Not sure)	39.3%	36.8%	41.8%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.6.

Table 27. Percent of respondents who indicated there is property within their community listed in the National Register of Historic Places, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	47.7%	55.1%	40.5%
No	29.5%	28.7%	30.2%
(Don't know/Not sure)	22.8%	16.2%	29.3%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.1.

Table 28. Percent of respondents who indicated there is a National Historic Landmark within their community, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	51.6%	57.8%	45.5%
No	31.1%	29.8%	32.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	17.3%	12.4%	22.1%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.1.

Table 29. Percent of respondents who indicated that their community is part of or near a National Heritage Area, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	36.7%	41.8%	31.6%
No	39.6%	36.6%	42.6%
(Don't know/Not sure)	23.7%	21.6%	25.8%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1348**	**837**	**511**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.06.

In general, 93% of visitors and 87% of non-visitors agreed that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service offers communities assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people" (Table 30).

Table 30. Rating of the importance that National Park Service offers communities assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Very important	47.6%	52.7%	42.5%
Important	42.6%	40.6%	44.5%
Not so important	8.2%	5.5%	10.8%
Not important at all	1.3%	1.1%	1.6%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.4%	0.1%	0.6%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1348**	**836**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.04.

Race/Ethnicity

Lower percentages of African American respondents than white, non-Hispanic or Hispanic respondents indicated that their community had experience with receiving help with documentation of significant cultural resources (Table 31), financial assistance to support historic preservation projects (Table 32), or technical assistance from the NPS with identifying, preserving, managing, or protecting cultural resources (Table 33); however, more Hispanic respondents indicated that their communities had experience with financial and technical assistance than white, non-Hispanic respondents. African American respondents were slightly more likely than white, non-Hispanic respondents to indicate that there is a National Historic Landmark within their community or that their community is part of a National Heritage Area (see Table 35 and Table 36). It is worth noting

that Hispanic respondents were more likely than white, non-Hispanic respondents and African American respondents to indicate that they "did not know" about their community's experience with NPS cultural programs on four out of the six questions.

Table 31. Percent of respondents whose community received help from the National Park Service to document buildings, landscapes, or other resources of significance to our national cultural heritage, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	35.9%	32.3%	38.5%	26.1%	9.4%	98.7%	31.3%
No	37.9%	19.9%	39.7%	46.2%	57.3%	0.0%	47.7%
(Don't know/Not sure)	26.2%	47.9%	21.8%	27.7%	33.4%	1.3%	21.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1213**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**29**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: $p = 0.2$.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size ($N < 30$).

Table 32. Percent of respondents whose community received financial assistance from the National Park Service in the form of grants and/or tax credits to support historic preservation projects, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	28.1%	45.1%	26.2%	22.9%	14.2%	19.9%	19.6%
No	34.2%	20.1%	35.6%	43.2%	34.5%	0.6%	44.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	37.7%	34.8%	38.2%	34.0%	51.3%	79.6%	35.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1214**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**30**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: $p = 0.04$.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size ($N < 30$).

Table 33. Percent of respondents whose community received technical assistance from the National Park Service to identify, preserve, manage, or protect cultural resources, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	23.5%	43.2%	22.2%	13.3%	6.8%	25.6%	8.5%
No	37.7%	21.6%	38.4%	53.9%	32.7%	0.1%	49.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	38.8%	35.2%	39.4%	32.7%	60.5%	74.3%	42.2%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1214**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**30**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: $p = 0.004$.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size ($N < 30$).

Table 34. Percent of respondents who indicated there is property within their community listed in the National Register of Historic Places, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	48.4%	39.9%	52.0%	43.5%	31.6%	26.0%	39.4%
No	28.6%	19.1%	28.5%	37.3%	39.6%	0.7%	43.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	23.0%	41.0%	19.5%	19.2%	28.9%	73.4%	17.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1214	89	927	111	30	16	41

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.5.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 35. Percent of respondents who indicated there is a National Historic Landmark within their community, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	51.3%	58.9%	49.1%	52.5%	35.8%	99.4%	60.3%
No	30.9%	12.9%	33.7%	37.8%	50.3%	0.1%	19.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	17.8%	28.3%	17.1%	9.7%	13.9%	0.5%	20.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1214	89	927	111	30	16	41

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.04.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 36. Percent of respondents who indicated that their community is part of or near a National Heritage Area, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	36.9%	24.3%	38.6%	44.9%	15.0%	26.5%	45.9%
No	39.7%	46.9%	38.3%	37.3%	67.5%	45.6%	26.9%
(Don't know/Not sure)	23.4%	28.8%	23.1%	17.9%	17.6%	27.9%	27.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total N	1213	89	926	111	30	16	41

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.3.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Agreement that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service offers communities assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people" was relatively similar

across race/ethnic groups, ranging between 90%-93% for the three largest race/ethnic categories (see Table 37).

Table 37. Rating of the importance that National Park Service offers communities assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Very important	47.8%	28.3%	52.8%	42.8%	61.9%	20.2%	42.6%
Important	42.6%	65.0%	36.9%	50.6%	16.8%	79.3%	46.7%
Not so important	7.8%	6.7%	8.5%	3.4%	12.6%	0.5%	10.5%
Not important at all	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%	3.1%	8.7%	0.0%	0.1%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1213**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**29**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.01.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Recreational Programs

Questions in this section assessed respondents' awareness of their community's experience with NPS recreational programs, including assistance with creating trails, open space, and parks, and receiving grants from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As shown in Table 38 through Table 41, fewer than half of respondents stated that their community had experience with the different recreational programs offered by the NPS. Overall, the largest percentage of respondents indicated their community has or is near a designated National Trail System (38%), while the smallest percentage of respondents indicated that their community has "created a new park or expanded an existing park with the help of the National Park Service through a transfer of federal land" (14%). For many respondents in this section, their level of awareness was not high enough to allow them to answer "yes" or "no" to these questions; between 17% and 48% of respondents indicated that they "did not know" whether their community had experience with that particular NPS recreational program. Furthermore, it is possible that awareness levels would have been even lower if "don't know" had been an explicit component of the survey question (rather than a voluntary response).

Visitors vs. Non-visitors

Table 38 through Table 41 illustrate that higher percentages of visitors than non-visitors reported that their community had experience with NPS recreational programs across all questions. In particular, 45% of visitors indicated that their community had or was near a designated National Trail System, while only 31% of non-visitors stated the same (Table 40). Similar to the cultural programs results, more non-visitors reported that they "did not know" about their community's experience with NPS recreational programs than visitors on every question. Again, this could indicate that visitors are

simply more aware of NPS recreational programs in their community, or that visitors are more likely to live in communities where NPS recreational programs are offered.

Table 38. Percent of respondents whose community has received assistance from the National Park Service to create new or expand existing local trails and open space, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	27.8%	29.9%	25.7%
No	40.3%	39.6%	41.0%
(Don't know/Not sure)	31.9%	30.5%	33.3%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.5.

Table 39. Percent of respondents whose community has received a grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	17.4%	18.9%	16.0%
No	34.6%	35.7%	33.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	48.0%	45.3%	50.6%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.7.

Table 40. Percent of respondents whose community has or is near a designated National Trail System, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	37.6%	44.6%	30.6%
No	45.1%	43.3%	47.0%
(Don't know/Not sure)	17.3%	12.1%	22.4%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1085**	**672**	**413**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.03.

Table 41. Percent of respondents whose community has created a new park or expanded an existing park with the help of the National Park Service through a transfer of federal land, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	14.3%	13.8%	14.9%
No	51.2%	53.1%	49.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	34.5%	33.1%	35.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**837**	**512**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.7.

In general, 93% of visitors and 95% of non-visitors agreed that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service assist local communities with conserving river corridors, developing recreational trails, and protecting park land, wildlife habitat, and open space" (Table 42).

Table 42. Rating of the importance that National Park Service assists local communities with conserving river corridors, developing recreational trails, and protecting park land, wildlife habitat, and open space, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Very important	60.3%	63.2%	57.4%
Important	33.7%	29.9%	37.5%
Not so important	3.8%	5.6%	1.9%
Not important at all	1.8%	0.7%	3.0%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1348**	**837**	**511**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.01.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 43 and Table 44 illustrate that similar percentages across the three largest race/ethnic groups indicated that their community had received assistance from NPS to create new or expand existing local trails and open space (between 24%-29%), or received a grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (between 17%-19%). However, larger disparities between the three largest race/ethnic groups were reported for the other two questions. For example, 19% of African American respondents and 31% of Hispanic respondents indicated that their community had or is near a designated National Trail System, compared to 42% of white, non-Hispanic respondents (Table 45). In addition, only 10% of white, non-Hispanic respondents stated that their community has "created a new park or expanded an existing park with the help of the National Park Service through a transfer of federal land," as compared to 21% of African American respondents and 31% of Hispanic

respondents (Table 46). Still, in many cases, the percentages of respondents in each group indicating that they "did not know" about their community's experience with NPS recreational programs exceeded the percentage of respondents indicating that their community did have experience with those recreational programs, indicating an overall lack of awareness of these programs.

Table 43. Percent of respondents whose community has received assistance from the National Park Service to create new or expand existing local trails and open space, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	27.8%	29.0%	28.9%	24.4%	20.6%	6.8%	16.6%
No	41.0%	46.0%	39.1%	48.7%	20.4%	0.1%	55.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	31.3%	25.1%	32.0%	26.9%	59.1%	93.1%	27.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1214**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**30**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.8.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 44. Percent of respondents whose community has received a grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	17.7%	17.3%	18.1%	19.4%	9.3%	5.9%	13.5%
No	34.4%	24.6%	34.4%	46.7%	36.2%	0.2%	42.7%
(Don't know/Not sure)	47.9%	58.1%	47.5%	33.9%	54.6%	93.8%	43.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1214**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**30**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.7.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 45. Percent of respondents whose community has or is near a designated National Trail System, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	37.5%	31.0%	42.4%	19.2%	27.2%	25.3%	24.8%
No	45.1%	38.6%	45.2%	57.5%	39.9%	0.1%	44.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	17.5%	30.4%	12.4%	23.3%	32.9%	74.6%	30.7%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**985**	**76**	**734**	**106**	**29**	**5**	**35**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.1.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 46. Percent of respondents whose community has created a new park or expanded an existing park with the help of the National Park Service through a transfer of federal land, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	14.1%	30.6%	10.2%	20.8%	2.6%	5.7%	10.1%
No	50.8%	28.0%	57.3%	45.7%	39.4%	0.2%	47.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	35.1%	41.3%	32.5%	33.5%	58.1%	94.0%	42.6%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1214**	**89**	**927**	**111**	**30**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.006.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Again, these communities felt that the existence of these programs was very important. Agreement that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service assist local communities with conserving river corridors, developing recreational trails, and protecting park land, wildlife habitat, and open space" ranged between 93%-99% for the three largest race/ethnic categories (Table 47).

Table 47. Rating of the importance that National Park Service assists local communities with conserving river corridors, developing recreational trails, and protecting park land, wildlife habitat, and open space, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Very important	60.6%	50.1%	62.8%	52.2%	81.1%	92.9%	69.4%
Important	33.5%	48.6%	30.3%	44.4%	11.1%	6.3%	14.5%
Not so important	3.6%	1.3%	4.0%	1.0%	4.3%	0.8%	14.5%
Not important at all	2.0%	0.0%	2.3%	2.5%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1213**	**89**	**926**	**111**	**30**	**16**	**41**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2. Warning: > 20% of cells have < 5 respondents.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

National Natural Landmarks

Questions in this section assessed respondents' awareness of National Natural Landmarks (NNLs) in their states (e.g., Mount Shasta in California or Monhegan Island off the Maine coast), as well as their use of NPS resources to learn more about NNLs. Delaware, Louisiana, and the District of Columbia do not have any NNLs, so respondents residing in these locations were not asked the NNL questions.

As shown in Table 48, 70% of respondents had heard of or were familiar with at least one of three NNLs in their state that were presented by the interviewer, and 47% of those respondents were aware that those areas are designated as NNLs (Table 50). However, out of respondents who did not recognize the NNLs named by the interviewer and respondents who recognized at least one site but did not know that they were NNLs, 42% indicated that they were familiar with at least one NNL in their state (Table 49). Only 26% of all respondents indicated that they had used "resources, for example the National Park Service website, to find out more about these areas" (Table 51).

Visitors vs. Non-visitors
Table 48 through Table 51 illustrate that overall familiarity with NNLs was higher among visitors than non-visitors. In particular, 75% of visitors were familiar with the specific NNLs mentioned by the interviewer, compared to 64% of non-visitors (Table 50). Visitors (32%) were also more likely than non-visitors (19%) to have used NPS resources to learn more about NNLs (Table 51). Nevertheless, similar percentages of visitors and non-visitors agreed that it is either "very important" or "important" that "National Park Service works with local communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources" (97% and 92%, respectively) (Table 52).

Table 48. Percent of respondents who are familiar with or have heard of at least one of three NNLs in their state named by the interviewer, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	69.5%	75.0%	64.0%
No	29.0%	24.2%	33.8%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.5%	0.9%	2.1%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1177**	**708**	**469**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.04.

Table 49. Percent of respondents who are familiar with at least one NNL in their state, out of respondents who did not recognize the NNL sites named by the interviewer and respondents who recognized at least one site but did not know that they were NNLs, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	41.8%	47.7%	36.6%
No	50.8%	44.4%	56.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	7.4%	7.9%	7.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**709**	**399**	**310**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.07.

27

Table 50. Percent of respondents who recognized that the areas named by the interviewer are designated as NNLs, out of respondents who had heard of at least one of the NNL sites named by the interviewer, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	46.8%	49.5%	43.7%
No	51.9%	50.0%	54.2%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.3%	0.5%	2.1%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**905**	**580**	**325**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.4.

Table 51. Percent of respondents who have used resources like the NPS website to find out more about NNLs, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Yes	25.8%	32.3%	19.2%
No	73.6%	66.9%	80.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.6%	0.8%	0.4%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1178**	**708**	**470**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.001.

Table 52. Rating of the importance that National Park Service works with local communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources, by NPS visitation.

Response[a]	All	Visitor	Non-visitor
Very important	67.2%	71.9%	62.3%
Important	27.3%	24.6%	30.0%
Not so important	2.2%	1.1%	3.3%
Not important at all	2.3%	2.2%	2.4%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.1%	0.1%	2.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1349**	**833**	**516**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.2.

Race/Ethnicity

Overall, more white, non-Hispanic respondents (74%) were familiar with at least one of the specific NNLs mentioned by the interviewer than Hispanic respondents (65%) or African American respondents (56%) (Table 53); however, only 44% of those white, non-Hispanic respondents knew

that those areas were designated as NNLs, as compared to 52% of Hispanic respondents and 47% of African American respondents (Table 55). Out of those respondents who did not recognize the NNLs named by the interviewer and respondents who recognized at least one site but did not know that they were NNLs, 48% of white, non-Hispanic respondents were familiar with an NNL in their state, as compared to 32% of Hispanic respondents and 15% of African American respondents (Table 54). White, non-Hispanic respondents were also the most likely to have used NPS resources to find out more about those areas (30%), as compared to Hispanic (21%) or African American (9%) respondents (Table 56).

Table 53. Percent of respondents who are familiar with or recognized at least one of three NNLs in their state named by the interviewer, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other[b]
Yes	70.1%	65.1%	73.8%	56.1%	58.0%	65.9%	73.9%
No	28.5%	32.6%	25.9%	37.2%	38.5%	34.1%	26.1%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.4%	2.4%	0.3%	6.7%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1074**	**104**	**825**	**66**	**33**	**19**	**27**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.3.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 54. Percent of respondents who are familiar with at least one NNL in their state, out of respondents who did not recognize any of the NNL sites named by the interviewer and respondents who recognized at least one site but did not know they were NNLs, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other[b]
Yes	41.9%	32.0%	48.3%	15.2%	46.7%	21.1%	54.8%
No	50.7%	64.5%	42.5%	82.2%	53.3%	78.9%	30.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	7.4%	3.5%	9.2%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**642**	**62**	**481**	**48**	**23**	**11**	**17**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.002.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 55. Percent of respondents who knew that the areas named by the interviewer are designated as NNLs, out of respondents who had recognized at least one of the NNL sites named by the interviewer, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other[b]
Yes	46.6%	52.3%	44.0%	46.7%	61.0%	87.8%	43.5%
No	52.1%	41.8%	55.3%	53.3%	39.0%	12.2%	56.5%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.4%	5.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**828**	**71**	**667**	**40**	**19**	**11**	**20**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.6.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 56. Percent of respondents who have used resources like the NPS website to find out more about NNLs, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Yes	26.0%	21.2%	29.5%	8.5%	42.9%	26.3%	14.7%
No	73.4%	78.8%	69.6%	91.5%	57.1%	73.7%	85.3%
(Don't know/Not sure)	0.6%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1075**	**104**	**828**	**64**	**33**	**19**	**27**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.06.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Similar to all other NPS programs, these race/ethnic groups felt that the existence of these programs was very important. Agreement that it is either "very important" or "important" that "the National Park Service works with local communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources" ranged between 94%-97% for the three largest race/ethnic categories (Table 57).

Table 57. Rating of the importance that National Park Service works with local communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Very important	66.7%	75.4%	64.3%	65.1%	69.0%	67.4%	82.2%
Important	27.6%	18.6%	29.6%	32.1%	31.0%	32.5%	6.5%
Not so important	2.1%	1.8%	1.9%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.6. Warning: > 20% of cells have < 5 respondents.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 57 (continued). Rating of the importance that National Park Service works with local communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources, by Race/Ethnicity.

Response[a]	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian	Am. Ind.[b]	Other
Not important at all	2.4%	4.2%	2.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
(Don't know/Not sure)	1.1%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.8%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**1226**	**122**	**908**	**108**	**38**	**19**	**31**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.6. Warning: > 20% of cells have < 5 respondents.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Overall Program Awareness

Questions in this section of the questionnaire assessed respondents' overall awareness of NPS programs. First, respondents were asked an open-ended question, which asked them to provide the "ONE most important thing the National Park Service can do to encourage you to participate in their assistance or educational programs outside of visiting a national park." Participant responses are coded into themes in Table 58, which reveals that the most popular suggestion was to advertise, publicize, provide more information, keep existing information up to date, and/or raise awareness about programs.

Table 58. Frequency of themes of open-ended responses about the one most important thing NPS can do to encourage respondents to participate in their assistance or educational programs outside of visiting a national park.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Advertise, publicize, provide more information, keep information up to date, raise awareness	588	45.1%	49.7%
Nothing, no suggestion, no ideas	55	4.2%	4.8%
Engage young people through targeted programs and activities, or school programs	50	3.8%	3.6%
(Don't know/Not sure)	374	28.7%	26.1%
Multiple themes provided	10	0.8%	0.3%
Other	227	17.4%	15.5%
Total valid	**1304**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	50	–	–
(Not asked)	1350	–	–
Total missing	**1400**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**2704**	**–**	**–**

Interviewers then asked respondents how much they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements. Five response choices were offered, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with "neither agree nor disagree" as the middle option. While most statements were worded in the positive, meaning that agreement with any of them indicates some awareness or approval of the NPS, one statement was worded in the negative: "National parks are only important for people who visit them." The majority of respondents agreed (either "strongly" or "somewhat") with each positively-worded statement. In particular, 95% of respondents agreed that "The National Park Service is important to the national identity of the United States of America." Only 15% of respondents agreed that "National parks are only important for people who visit them" (Table 59).

Visitors vs. Non-visitors

Table 59 presents the percentage of respondents who agreed (either strongly or somewhat) with each statement, broken down by reported NPS visitation over time. Visitors were more likely to agree with all positively-worded statements than non-visitors. The largest disparity between visitors and non-visitors is in levels of agreement that "the National Park Service contributes to my understanding of historical and cultural events and environmental topics" (90% and 76%, respectively).

Table 59. Percent of respondents agreeing with a series of statements about NPS program awareness, by NPS visitation.

Question	All	Visitor	Non-Visitor
The National Park Service is important to the national identity of the United States of America.[a]	94.9%	97.4%	92.4%
The National Park Service contributes to the character of my state.[a]	84.4%	90.5%	78.2%
The National Park Service works to preserve historical places in my community.[a]	74.7%	80.9%	68.2%
The National Park Service works to preserve natural areas in or near my community.[a]	76.4%	82.1%	70.3%
National parks are only important for people who visit them.	14.7%	14.7%	14.7%
The National Park Service contributes to my understanding of historical and cultural events and environmental topics.[a]	82.9%	89.8%	75.8%
The National Park Service works to expand recreational opportunities in or near my community.[a]	**61.8%**	**68.4%**	**55.0%**

[a] The difference between visitors and non-visitors is significantly significant (p < 0.05).

Race/Ethnicity

Table 60 presents the percentage of respondents who agreed (either "strongly" or "somewhat") with each statement, broken down by race/ethnic group. Hispanic respondents had a higher level of agreement on five of the seven statements than either white, non-Hispanic respondents or African American respondents. In particular, 92% of Hispanic respondents agreed that "The National Park Service works to preserve natural areas in or near my community," as compared to 72% of white, non-Hispanic respondents and 71% of African American respondents. Furthermore, 77% of Hispanic

respondents agreed that "the National Park Service works to expand recreational opportunities in or near my community," as compared to only 59% of white, non-Hispanic respondents and 50% of African American respondents. These results could imply either a greater lack of awareness of NPS program offerings in those communities, or a lack of programs provided in communities where white, non-Hispanic and African American respondents live

Table 60. Percent of respondents agreeing with a series of statements about NPS program awareness, by NPS visitation.

Question	All	Hisp.	White	Afr. Am.	Asian[b]	Am. Ind.[b]	Other[b]
The National Park Service is important to the national identity of the United States of America.	95.0%	91.7%	96.3%	89.5%	96.0%	100.0%	99.9%
The National Park Service contributes to the character of my state.	84.4%	93.2%	83.7%	72.8%	89.2%	99.9%	77.9%
The National Park Service works to preserve historical places in my community.	75.0%	82.1%	71.1%	82.9%	91.7%	93.1%	69.8%
The National Park Service works to preserve natural areas in or near my community.[a]	76.2%	91.8%	72.4%	70.8%	100.0%	59.5%	91.8%
National parks are only important for people who visit them.	15.1%	23.1%	13.0%	19.6%	5.8%	13.1%	7.8%
The National Park Service contributes to my understanding of historical and cultural events and environmental topics.	83.2%	90.3%	81.9%	78.0%	93.2%	91.9%	79.6%
The National Park Service works to expand recreational opportunities in or near my community.[a]	**61.5%**	**77.4%**	**58.9%**	**49.8%**	**86.3%**	**41.1%**	**69.4%**

[a] The three largest race/ethnicity categories (Hispanic, non-Hispanic white, and African American) are significantly different from one another ($p < 0.05$).

[b] Results for the remaining three race/ethnicity categories should be interpreted with caution due to small sample sizes.

Youth Engagement

A new module was also introduced in CSAP3 as a method of measuring youth (ages 12-17 years old) visitation, engagement with NPS online content, and experiences with both (see Appendix A for the full list of questions). Overall, 60% of youth respondents were female, while 40% were male. Youth respondents of every eligible age were represented in the sample; overall, 35% of youth respondents were 12 years old, 30% were 13 years old, 4% were 14, 2% were 15, 22% were 16, and 7% were 17 years old. Due to the small sample size (N = 60), results for this section of the questionnaire should be interpreted with caution.

The overall response rate for the youth engagement module was 19%. When adults with eligible children who completed an interview are compared to adults with eligible children who did not complete an interview, two notable differences emerge. Specifically, adults with eligible children

who completed an interview are less likely to be male (22% versus 51%) and less likely to be white (39% versus 68%) than adults with eligible children who did not complete an interview. On the other hand, the two groups are relatively similar with respect to age, education, overall satisfaction with the National Park Service, and recent park visitation.

Visit Characteristics and Experiences

The first question in the Youth Engagement section asked the youth respondents if they had ever visited a national park. While adult respondents were defined as visitors if they had visited a valid unit within the past two years, youth respondents were only asked whether they had ever visited a national park, and their responses were not validated against a list of NPS units. Overall, 64% of youth respondents had visited a national park.

Table 61 breaks down the responses of youth respondents by whether the adult in the household was categorized as a visitor or a non-visitor. Nearly all (94%) of youth visitors were in a household with an adult visitor, as compared to 36% of youth visitors who were in a household with an adult non-visitor. As shown in Table 62, the majority of youth visitors (73%) visited with family and friends, while 22% visited with a school, church, or community group.

Table 61. Percent of youth respondents who have ever visited a national park, by NPS visitation of household adult.

Response[a]	All	Adult visitor	Adult non-visitor[b]
Yes	64.2%	94.2%	36.2%
No	31.9%	5.8%	56.3%
(Don't know/not sure)	3.9%	0.0%	7.5%
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Total N	**60**	**42**	**18**

[a] Chi-square test: p = 0.002. Warning: > 20% of cells have < 5 respondents

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Table 62. Percent of youth visitors visiting with family/friends, school/church/community group, or both.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Family/friends	34	70.8%	73.2%
School, church, or community group	5	10.4%	22.1%
Both	9	18.8%	4.8%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**48**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	**1**	**–**	**–**

Table62 (continued). Percent of youth visitors visiting with family/friends, school/church/community group, or both.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
(Not asked)	11	–	–
Total missing	**12**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Youth visitors were then offered three statements about their visit and asked whether their level of agreement was "very true," "slightly true," or "not true" (see Table 63 through Table 65). The vast majority of youth visitors (94%) stated that "I had a good time when I visited" was "very true," with no youth visitors stated that this was "not true" (Table 63). Similarly, the majority of youth visitors (88%) indicated that the statement, "Given the chance, I would visit again," was "very true" (Table 64).

Table 63. Percent of youth visitors agreeing "I had a good time when I visited".

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	44	91.7%	93.6%
Slightly true	4	8.3%	6.4%
Not true	0	0.0%	0.0%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**48**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	1	–	–
(Not asked)	11	–	–
Total missing	**12**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 64. Percent of youth visitors agreeing "Given the chance, I would visit again".

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	40	83.3%	87.9%
Slightly true	8	16.7%	12.1%
Not true	0	0.0%	0.0%
(Don't know/not sure)	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**

Table64 (continued). Percent of youth visitors agreeing "Given the chance, I would visit again".

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Total valid	**48**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	1	–	–
(Not asked)	11	–	–
Total missing	**12**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

When asked about the statement "During my visit, I felt that the national park did a good job of providing information and activities for kids my age," a slightly smaller majority of youth visitors (75%) indicated that this statement was "very true," while 25% indicated that this statement was only "slightly true" or "not true" (Table 65).

Table 65. Percent of youth visitors agreeing "During my visit I felt that the national park did a good job of providing information and activities for kids my age".

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	31	64.6%	74.8%
Slightly true	14	29.2%	24.2%
Not true	3	6.2%	1.0%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**48**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	1	–	–
(Not asked)	11	–	–
Total missing	**12**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Engagement with NPS Online Content

Youth respondents were then all asked a series of questions to assess their engagement with NPS online content. A majority of youth respondents indicated that they have watched a video about a national park (77%) (Table 66). A slightly smaller majority of youth respondents indicated that they use any form of social media (71%) (Table 67), and out of those youth respondents, 66% had used social media to view pictures, watch a video, or read about a national park (Table 68).

Table 66. Percent of youth respondents who have watched a video about a national park.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Yes	43	71.7%	76.6%
No	12	20.0%	19.9%
(Don't know/not sure)	5	8.3%	3.5%
Total valid	**60**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	0	–	–
(Not asked)	0	–	–
Total missing	**0**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 67. Percent of youth respondents who use any form of social media.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Yes	42	70.0%	70.9%
No	18	30.0%	29.1%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**60**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	0	–	–
(Not asked)	0	–	–
Total missing	**0**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 68. Percent of youth respondents who have used social media to view pictures, watch a video, or read about a national park, out of youth respondents who use social media.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Yes	26	61.9%	66.2%
No	15	35.7%	33.8%
(Don't know/not sure)	1	2.4%	0.0%
Total valid	**42**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	**0**	**–**	**–**

Table 68 (continued) Percent of youth respondents who have used social media to view pictures, watch a video, or read about a national park, out of youth respondents who use social media.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
(Not asked)	18	–	–
Total missing	**18**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 69 shows the specific types of social media used by youth respondents to engage with NPS online content. Out of the youth respondents who had used social media to view pictures, watch a video, or read about a national park, 66% indicated that they used Facebook, 37% indicated that they used Snapchat, and 60% indicated that they used Instagram.

Table 69. Percent of youth respondents using different forms of social media to engage with NPS content, out of youth respondents who have done so (N = 26).

Social Media	Weighted percent[a,b]
Facebook	66.3%
Snapchat	36.7%
Instagram	59.5%
Twitter	0.0%
Other	12.7%
(Don't Know/Not Sure)	**0.0%**

[a] Multiple selections were allowed, so percentages sum to greater than 100%.

[b] Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size (N < 30).

Relevance of NPS to Young People

The last set of questions assessed the relevance of NPS to young people by asking all youth respondents to rate a series of statements as "very true," "slightly true," or "not true." As Table 70 illustrates, the majority of youth respondents (89%) indicated that "preserving national parks is important to me" was "very true." Slightly smaller majorities indicated that "learning about science and the environment is important to me" and "learning about history and culture is important to me" were "very true" (80% and 72%, respectively) (Table 71 and Table 72). However, the last statement, "hiking and other outdoor activities is important to me," did not resonate as strongly with youth respondents. Only 54% indicated that this statement was "very true," while 34% stated that this was "slightly true," and 13% indicated that this was "not true" (Table 73). On all of the other questions, fewer than 4% of respondents indicated that the statement was not true. Results from youth respondents indicate that if the NPS is hoping to engage a broader population of young people, the NPS should focus messaging on national parks, science and the environment, and history and culture, more than hiking and other outdoor activities.

Table 70. Percent of youth respondents agreeing that "preserving national parks is important to me.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	52	86.7%	89.1%
Slightly true	7	11.7%	8.2%
Not true	1	1.7%	2.7%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**60**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	0	–	–
(Not asked)	0	–	–
Total missing	**0**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 71. Percent of youth respondents agreeing that "learning about science and the environment is important to me.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	47	78.3%	79.9%
Slightly true	11	18.3%	19.0%
Not true	2	3.3%	1.2%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**60**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	0	–	–
(Not asked)	0	–	–
Total missing	**0**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 72. Percent of youth respondents agreeing that "learning about history and culture is important to me.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	43	71.7%	71.9%
Slightly true	**16**	**26.7%**	**24.7%**

Table72 (continued). Percent of youth respondents agreeing that "learning about history and culture is important to me.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Not true	1	1.7%	3.4%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**60**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	0	–	–
(Not asked)	0	–	–
Total missing	**0**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Table 73. Percent of youth respondents agreeing that "hiking and other outdoor activities is important to me.

Response	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted percent	Weighted percent
Very true	37	61.7%	53.6%
Slightly true	18	30.0%	33.9%
Not true	5	8.3%	12.6%
(Don't know/not sure)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total valid	**60**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
(No Answer/Refused)	0	–	–
(Not asked)	0	–	–
Total missing	**0**	**–**	**–**
Total N	**60**	**–**	**–**

Conclusions

Prior to the centennial, the NPS recognized that increasing the relevance of the NPS outside of national park visitation was a priority for the second century of the NPS. In order to remain sustainable and succeed in its mission, the NPS must ensure that it provides engaging content and welcomes all components of the increasingly urban, diverse, and technologically advanced American population. In an attempt to meet this demand and foster the next generation of national park visitors, stewards, and supporters, the NPS has expanded the idea of "engagement" beyond visitation into programs offered outside of national park lands and renewed a focus on providing services and programs targeted to young people. The purpose of the present report is to inform this effort by investigating program awareness across NPS visitors and non-visitors and race/ethnic groups, as well as providing some measurement of youth engagement.

The new modules in the NPS Comprehensive Survey of the American Public in 2018 focused on program awareness found that fewer than half of the respondents reported that they had used or that their communities had experience with NPS educational programs, cultural programs, and recreational programs, across almost all questions. While respondents reported higher levels of familiarity with places that are categorized as NNLs, fewer than half of those respondents knew that those places are categorized as NNLs.

These reported levels of awareness and use are compared across visitors/non-visitors and across race/ethnic group. Visitors reported higher levels of experience and use across nearly all questions about educational programs and cultural programs, and across all questions about recreational programs and NNLs. Race/ethnic groups also reported different levels of use and awareness of their community's experience with NPS programs. While these different levels of use and awareness do not seem to follow a particular pattern across race/ethnic groups, these results could indicate that efforts to raise awareness about NPS programs have varying levels of success across different race/ethnic groups. In addition, the numbers of respondents reporting "Don't Know/Not Sure" for questions related to cultural programs and recreational programs were quite high (up to nearly half of respondents on some questions). In many cases when broken down by race/ethnic groups, the percentages of respondents indicating that they "did not know" about their community's experience meet or exceed the percentages of respondents indicating that their community did have experience with those programs. These results imply an overall lack of awareness of NPS programs among the American public.

Results from the youth engagement module imply that NPS is maintaining its relevance to young people. The majority of youth respondents had visited an NPS unit, and these youth visitors were generally content with their visits; in addition, many youth respondents had engaged with NPS content on social media platforms. Between 88%-99% of youth respondents felt that statements about the importance of preserving national parks, learning about science and the environment, learning about history and culture, and the importance of hiking and other outdoor activities, were either "very true" or "slightly true." However, these results are constrained by small sample sizes and required an adult to allow the child to participate in the study; it is likely that adults who approved of

the NPS, and who may pass those same feelings on to their children, were more likely to allow their child to participate.

Raising Awareness

Results of the program awareness module indicate that despite NPS efforts to provide programs and services to people in their communities leading up to and after the centennial, many people, especially "non-visitors," may not be aware of these programs or services. As a result, large segments of the American public may not recognize the role that the NPS plays in extending the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation outside of NPS lands.

To rectify this lack of awareness, NPS could intensify its focus on increasing knowledge of NPS programs and services available to the American public outside of national park visitation. Indeed, when respondents were asked the one most important thing that NPS could do to encourage them to participate in their assistance or educational programs, by far the most popular suggestions from respondents were advertising, publicizing or providing more information about programs to create more awareness. Raising awareness with non-visitors is particularly important, not only because racial and ethnic minorities, urban, and lower-income groups often have diminished abilities to visit national parks (Byrne et al., 2009; Pease, 2015; Stanfield et al., 2005; Taylor et al., 2011; Wolch et al., 2014) but also because non-visitors reported lower levels of awareness of NPS programs in this study.

Furthermore, results from this survey indicate that while only 18% of adult respondents follow the NPS on some form of social media, 71% of youth respondents use social media, and 66% of those have used it to engage with NPS content. Raising awareness about NPS social media, and providing content that is interesting for visitors and non-visitors alike, is becoming a particularly important way to engage different segments of the population, especially young people. Campaigns like "Fat Bear Week" at Katmai National Park, which involved live-streams of brown bears and an online bracket ranking the fattest bears, and "Sunset Wars," a friendly online competition between Joshua Tree National Park and Saguaro National Park to determine who had the "best sunsets," both became viral sensations (Brown, 2018; Chow, 2018). Similar campaigns could provide an opportunity for parks to share educational content and encourage visitation while also allowing the American public to feel involved with their national parks, even from afar. Consultation with local communities and scholarship is also vital when exploring methods of improving awareness. The literature contains numerous suggestions for spreading awareness with diverse communities, including using varied, bilingual media and partnerships with organizations that serve diverse communities, including churches, schools, and community centers (Roberts, 2007; Clarke, Rodriguez, & Alamillo, 2015; Mott, 2016; Burns et al., 2008).

Assessing NPS Program Provision

Many questions in this survey asked respondents to share whether their community had experience with different NPS programs. Responses of "No," "Don't Know/Not Sure," or disagreement on these questions could be a result of a lack of awareness of those programs on the part of the respondent; however, they could also indicate a lack of these programs in certain communities. For example, non-visitors are less likely than visitors to state that their community has experience with many

cultural or recreational programs. African American respondents were also less likely than either Hispanic or white, non-Hispanic respondents to agree that the NPS works to preserve natural areas or expand recreational opportunities in or near their communities. While these results could illustrate a lack of awareness, they could also indicate that NPS programs may not be offered in the communities where non-visitors or African American respondents live.

The literature has shown that national park visitation is constrained by geography (Burns et al., 2008; Byrne et al., 2009), but NPS programs under the NPS Urban Agenda are explicitly intended to serve urban, diverse, and underserved communities that may not have access to parks (NPS Stewardship Institute, 2015). In tandem with increasing awareness of NPS programs and services, the NPS should also assess the geographic provision of those programs to ensure that these programs are reaching underserved communities.

Relevance for All Audiences

Despite low levels of awareness of NPS programs, the value of and services provided by the NPS do still seem to resonate with the American public. The majority of respondents across the board indicated that the services provided by NPS programs are either "important" or "very important," and 95% of question respondents agreed that "The National Park Service is important to the national identity of the United States of America."

Still, as this survey revealed, visitors had higher levels of awareness and more positive impressions of the NPS than non-visitors; race/ethnic groups indicated different levels of awareness and community experience with NPS programs; and youth respondents implied that there is room for growth in NPS services targeted at young people. As the NPS moves forward through its second century, it will be important to recommit to the NPS mission in the context of the desires, preferences, and needs of visitors and non-visitors, diverse and urban populations, and young people throughout the United States. By maintaining efforts that welcome underserved populations, and continuing to find creative and innovative ways to reach out to and engage all audiences, the NPS can provide valuable experiences to the American public both inside and outside national park lands, for the next one hundred years and beyond.

Literature Cited

Brown, R. 2018, May 23. See "sunset wars" pictures of national parks' amazing skies. National Geographic, May 27, 2019. Available at: https://www.nationalgeographic.com/travel/destinations/north-america/united-states/national-parks/photos-sunset-wars-instagram-saguaro-joshua-tree/.

Burns, R. C., E. Covelli, and A.R. Graefe. 2008. Outdoor recreation and nontraditional users: Results of focus group interviews with racial and ethnic minorities. Pages 123-137 *in* D.J. Chavez, P.L. Winter, and J.D. Absher, eds., Recreation visitor research: studies of diversity. General Technical Report PSW-GTR-210. U.S. Forest Service, Albany, CA. Available at: https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/documents/psw_gtr210/psw_gtr210_123.pdf.

Byrne, J., J. Wolch, and J. Zhang. 2009. Planning for environmental justice in an urban national park. Journal of Environmental Planning and Management:52(3):365–392. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560802703256.

Chow, A. R. 2018. There are fat bears in Alaska, and you can vote on your favorite. The New York Times, October 8, 2018. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/07/science/fat-bears-alaska.html.

Clarke, T., D. Rodriguez, and J. Alamillo. 2015. Engaging Latino/a communities in national park programs: Building trust and providing opportunities for voice. Environmental Management and Sustainable Development 4(1):136–148. Available at: http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/emsd/article/view/7109/6077.

Colby, S. L., and J. M. Ortman. 2014. Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014 to 2060 (No. P25-1143). U.S. Census Bureau: Washington, DC.

Faber Taylor, A., and F. E. Kuo. 2009. Children with attention deficits concentrate better after walk in the park. Journal of Attention Disorders 12(5):402–409. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054708323000.

Jarvis, J. B. 2012. The relevance of national parks. *In* S. Weber (Ed.), Rethinking protected areas in a changing world: Proceedings of the 2011 George Wright Society biennial conference on parks, protected areas, and cultural sites. The George Wright Society: Hancock, Michigan.

Kimbell, A., A. Schuhmann, and H. Brown. 2009. More kids in the woods: Reconnecting Americans with nature. Journal of Forestry. Available at: https://pubag.nal.usda.gov/pubag/downloadPDF.xhtml?id=48806&content=PDF.

Kuo, F. E., and A. F. Taylor. 2004. A potential natural treatment for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Evidence from a national study. American Journal of Public Healthz94(9): 7.

Louv, R. 2008. Last child in the woods: Saving our children from nature-deficit disorder. Algonquin Books.

McCown, R. S., D. Laven, R. Manning, and N. Mitchell. 2012. Engaging new and diverse audiences in the national parks: An exploratory study of current knowledge and learning needs. The George Wright Forum 29(2):272–284.

Mott, E. 2016. Mind the gap: How to promote racial diversity among national park visitors. Vermont Journal of Environmental Law 17(3):443–469.

National Park Service. 2014. A call to action: preparing for a second century of stewardship and engagement. National Park Service. Available at: https://www.nps.gov/calltoaction/.

National Park Service. 2016. National Park Service centennial final report: Realizing the vision for the second century (p. 17).

National Park Service Stewardship Institute. 2015. Urban agenda: Call to Action initiative. National Park Service. Available at: https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1412/upload/UrbanAgenda_web-508-2.pdf

Pease, J. 2015. Parks and underserved audiences: An annotated literature review. Journal of Interpretation Research 20(1):11–56.

Rao, J. N. K., and A. J. Scott. 1984. On chi-squared tests for multiway contingency tables with cell proportions estimated from survey data. Annals of Statistics 12:46-60.

Roberts, N. S. 2007. Visitor/non-visitor use constraints: Exploring ethnic minority experiences and perspectives. General Technical Report. Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service. San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA. Available at: http://userwww.sfsu.edu/nroberts/documents/research/SFSU_GGNRA-FocusGroups_FinalReport07.pdf.

Runte, A. 1987. National parks: The American experience. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Solop, F.I., K.K. Hagen, and D. Ostergren. 2003. Racial and ethnic diversity of National Park System visitors and non-visitors technical report: The National Park Service comprehensive survey of the American public. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Stanfield, R., R. Manning, M. Budruk, & M. Floyd. 2005. Racial discrimination in parks and outdoor recreation: An empirical study. In Proceedings of the 2005 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium (pp. 247–253). Northeastern Research Station: USDA Forest Service.

Stokowski, P.A. 2002. Languages of place and discourses of power: constructing new senses of place. Journal of Leisure Research 34:368–382.

Taylor, P.A., B.D., Grandjean, and J.H. Gramann. 2011. National Park Service comprehensive survey of the American public, 2008-2009: Racial and ethnic diversity of National Park System visitors and non-visitors. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/SSD/NRR—2011432. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2016. New census data show differences between urban and rural populations. Available at: https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2016/cb16-210.html.

Wells, N. M. 2000. At home with nature: Effects of "greenness" on children's cognitive functioning. Environment and Behavior 32(6):775–795. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/00139160021972793.

Wolch, J. R., J. Byrne, and J.P. Newell. 2014. Urban green space, public health, and environmental justice: The challenge of making cities 'just green enough.' Landscape and Urban Planning 125:234–244. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.01.017.

The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2015. Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys (8th ed.). Available at: https://www.aapor.org/AAPOR_Main/media/publications/Standard-Definitions2015_8theditionwithchanges_April2015_logo.pdf

Appendix A. Current Initiatives Questions

Section 4: Program Awareness

Educational Programs (EP)

[Questions EP1 through EP11, were included in the split sample method of reducing survey length as follows, EP1 through EP8 were asked of a random half of all respondents; EP9 through EP11 were asked of the remaining random half of all respondents]

The National Park Service offers numerous <u>programs</u> outside of the National Parks. These programs range from education to assisting communities with preserving their cultural heritage, protecting local natural resources, and expanding recreational opportunities. This next series of questions concerns these four types of National Park Service programs.

The National Park Service offers a variety of online educational content and programming.

Has anyone in your household ever used online educational programs or content provided by the National Park Service:…

> 1. **Yes**
> 2. **No**
> 8. (Don't know/Not sure)
> 9. (No Answer/Refused)

EP1. **To explore and learn about historical places important to U.S. history have you used online content for example Teaching with Historic Places, Network to Freedom, and Virtual Museum Exhibits?**

EP2. **To learn about geology or paleontology have you used online content for example Geologic Time, Meet a Paleontologist, or National Fossil Day?**

EP3. **To learn about biodiversity, habitats, and other environmental issues have you used online content for example Discover Biodiversity and Natural Sounds Gallery?**

> [Skip to EP5 if question 4 = 0]

EP4. **Has your child used online content and programs for example Every Kid in a Park, Junior Paleontologist, or WebRangers?**

I'm going to list some additional internet-based/digital activities offered by the National Park Service and ask if you or anyone in your household has ever participated in these activities.

EP5. **Have you listened to a podcast produced by the National park Service on iTunes?**

EP6. **Have you watched a video produced by the National Park Service on You Tube?**

EP7. **Have you watched a park webcam showing a natural setting?**

EP8. **Do you follow the National Park Service or a specific park or program on social media such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram?**

EP9: **To the best of your knowledge, has the National Park Service visited your community to engage in conversations about issues affecting parks and the environment?**

EP10. **Many national parks provide opportunities for the public to actively participate in scientific data collection. Have you or has any one in your household participated in scientific data collection, also known as citizen science like BioBlitz, with the National Park Service?**

EP11. **How important is it to you personally that the National Park Service offers educational programs which help children and adults learn about historical, cultural and environmental topics?**

    1. **Very important**

    2. **Important**

    3. **Not so important**

    4. **Not important at all**

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

Cultural Programs (CP)

[Questions in this section were included in the split sample method of reducing survey length as follows: these questions were asked of **a random half** of all respondents. This random half of respondents are also asked the following section (RP).]

Next, I am going to ask about your awareness of your community's experience with cultural programs provided by the National Park Service. Cultural programs include assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people.

When thinking about your community, think about your town, or city if you live in a small town, or city. Or if you live in a metropolitan place like New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, think about your section, or side of the town, or area you live in. But do not limit your thinking to your immediate neighborhood.

Please tell me yes or no based upon your current level of awareness …

    1. **Yes**

    2. **No**

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

CP1. Has your community received help from the National Park Service to document buildings, landscapes or other resources of significance to our national cultural heritage?

CP2. Has your community received financial assistance from the National Park Service in the form of grants and/or tax credits to support historic preservation projects?

CP3. Has your community received technical assistance from the National Park Service to identify, preserve, manage, or protect cultural resources?

CP4. Is there property within your community listed in the National Register of Historic Places?

CP5. Is there a National Historic Landmark within your community?

CP6. Is your community part of or near a National Heritage Area?

CP7. How important is it to you personally that the National Park Service offers communities assistance with the preservation of local historic buildings and sites which commemorate American history and culture or significant events and people? As I mentioned before, the assistance provided may be financial, or it may be technical.

    1. **Very important**

    2. **Important**

    3**. Not so important**

    4. **Not important at all**

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

Recreational Programs (RP)

*[Questions in this section were included in the split sample method of reducing survey length as follows: these questions were asked of the **random half** of all respondents asked the previous section (CP).]*

Next, I am going to ask about your awareness of your community's experience with recreational programs offered by the National Park Service.

Please tell me yes or no based upon your current level of awareness …

    1. **Yes**

    2. **No**

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

RP1. Has your community received assistance from the National Park Service to create new or expand existing local trails and open space?

RP2. **Has your community received a grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund?**

RP3. **Does your community have or is it near a designated National Trail System such as the** [regional specific: trail 1, trail 2 and trail 3]?

RP4. **Has your community created a new park or expanded an existing park with the help of the National Park Service through a transfer of federal land?**

RP5. **How important is it to you personally that the National Park Service assist local communities with conserving river corridors, developing recreational trails, and protecting park land, wildlife habitat, and open space?**
1. **Very important**
2. **Important**
3. **Not so important**
4. **Not important at all**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)
9. (No Answer/Refused)

National Natural Landmarks (NNL)
*[Questions in this section were included in the split sample method of reducing survey length as follows: these questions were asked of the **second random half** of all respondents. This random half of respondents are also asked the following section (PA).]*

NNL1.**The following questions concern the National Park Service's efforts to works with communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources.**
if (state=8 | state=51 | state=18 | state=98 | state=99) skip to NNL4

NNL2. **Have you heard of or are you familiar with any of the following areas in** [state]**:** [area 1]**,** [area 2]**, or** [area 3]?
1. **Yes**
2. **No**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)
9. (No Answer/Refused)
   [If ans=1 skip to NNL3]
   [If ans>1 ask NNL2a]

NNL2a. Are you familiar with ANY National Natural Landmarks in **[state]:**
1. **Yes**
2. **No**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)

9. (No Answer/Refused)

        NNLkno2=1

        if (Ans=1) skp NNL4

        if (ans>1)

            if (NNLkno1=99) skp NNL4

        endif

        if (Ans>1)

            NNLkno2=99

            skp NNL4

        endif

NNL3. **Did you know that these areas are designated as National Natural Landmarks?**

    1. **Yes**

    2. **No**

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

        NNLkno1=1

        if (ans>1)

            NNLkno1=99

            skp NNL2a

        endif

NNL4. **Have you ever used resources, for example the National Park Service website to find out more about these areas?**

NNL5. **How important is it to you personally that the National Park Service works with local communities and landowners to protect local ecological, biological and geological resources?**

    1. Very important

    2. Important

    3. Not so important

    4. Not important at all

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

Overall Program Awareness (PA)

*[Questions in this section were included in the split sample method of reducing survey length, as follows: these questions were asked of the **random half** of all respondents asked the previous section (NNL)]*

PA1. **What is the ONE most important thing the National Park Service can do to encourage you to participate in their assistance or educational programs outside of visiting a national park?**

_____ (Type answer here)

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

Now I am going to read a few statements. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each.

    1. Strongly agree

    2. Somewhat agree

    3. Neither agree nor disagree

    4. Somewhat disagree

    5. Strongly disagree

    8. (Don't know/Not sure)

    9. (No Answer/Refused)

PA2. **"The National Park Service is important to the national identity of the United States of America."**

PA3. **"The National Park Service contributes to the character of my state."**

PA4. **"The National Park Service works to preserve historical places in my community."**

PA5. **"The National Park Service works to preserve natural areas in or near my community**

PA6. **"National parks are only important for people who visit them."**

PA7. **"The National Park Service contributes to my understanding of historical and cultural events and environmental topics**

PA8. **"The National Park Service works to expand recreational opportunities in or near my community."**

Section 6: Youth Engagement (YEPAR) – Parent Questions
YEPAR. **Earlier in the survey you stated that you have children living with you between the ages of 12 and 17. We are interested in understanding their perspectives on national parks. The survey will only take 5 minutes. Would that be alright?**

1. **Yes**

2**. Not Sure/Hesitation**

3. **No**

      [If ans=2, skip ParInfo]

      [If ans=3, skip to End]

      [If ans =1 and (vQ5=1) skip to yeintro]

      [If ans =1 and (vQ5>1) skip to yesel]

ParInfo**. I can read you those questions if you like.**

1. **OK, continue**

2. **No, my child will not take the survey.**

      [If (Q5=1) skip to yeintro]

      [If (Q5>1) skip to yesel]

      [If (ans=2) skip to end]

yesel **If possible, may I speak to the child over the age of 12 with the next upcoming birthday?**

1. **Yes**

2. **No, that child will not take the survey.**

      [If ans=1 skip to yeintro]

      [If ans=2, skip to end]

yeintro**. Hello, my name is _____. I just completed a survey about national parks with your parent and they agreed to let me ask you a few questions about national parks. The survey will only take 5 minutes. Is that OK with you?**

1. **Yes**

2. **No**

      [If ans =2 skip to End]

      [If ans=1 skip to volun]

volun. **Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary. That means you don't have to answer any questions you don't want to and you can stop at any time. May I continue?**

1. **Yes**

2. **No**

      [If ans = 2, skip to End]

      [If ans=1, skip to YE1]

YE1. **Ok. Before I start, you should know the National Park System includes all national parks, national seashores, historic sites, battlefields, national monuments and other designations.**

Have you ever visited a national park?
- 1. **Yes**
- 2. **No**
- 8. (Don't know/not sure)
- 9. (No answer/Refused)

> [If (ans>1) skip to YE6a]

YE2. **Was the visit with only family/friends or part of a school, church, or community group?**
- 1. **Family/friends**
- 2. **School, church, or community group**
- 3. **Both**
- 8. (Don't know/not sure)
- 9. (No answer/Refused)

YE3. **For each of the following statements, please tell me how true or not true you feel each statement is.**

I had a good time when I visited. Would you say this is…
- 1. **Very true**
- 2**. Slightly true**
- 3**. Not true**
- 8. (Don't know/not sure)
- 9. (No answer/Refused)

YE4. **Given the chance, I would visit again**. **Would you say this is…**
- 1. **Very true**
- 2. **Slightly true**
- 3. **Not true**
- 8. (Don't know/not sure)
- 9. (No answer/Refused)

YE5. **During my visit I felt that the National Park did a good job of providing information and activities for kids my age. Would you say this is…**
- 1. **Very true**
- 2. **Slightly true**

3. **Not true**

8. (Don't know/not sure)

9. (No answer/Refused)

YE6a. **Have you ever watched video about a National Park?**

1. **Yes**

2. **No**

8. (Don't know/not sure)

9. (No answer/Refused)

YE6b. **Do you use any form of social media?**

1. **Yes**

2. **No**

8. (Don't know/not sure)

9. (No answer/Refused)

         [If (ans>1) skp YE7]

YE6c. **Do you or have you ever used social media to view pictures, watch a video, or read about a National Park?**

1. **Yes**

2. **No**

8. (Don't know/not sure)

9. (No answer/Refused)

         [If (ans>1) skp YE7]

YE6cc. **Which social media did you use?**

READ RESPONSE CHOICES ONE AT A TIME; SELECT FOR EACH 'YES'

1**. Facebook**

2. **Snapchat**

3. **Instagram**

4. **Twitter**

5. **Other**

6. (Don't know/Not sure)

7. (No Answer/Refused)

YE7. **For each of the following statements, please tell me how true or not true you feel each statement is.**

Preserving national parks is important to me. **Would you say this is**…

    1. **Very true**

    2. **Slightly true**

    3. **Not true**

    8. (Don't know/not sure)

    9. (No answer/Refused)

YE8. **Learning about science and the environment is important to me.**

Would you say this is…

    1. **Very true**

    2**. Slightly true**

    3. **Not true**

    8. (Don't know/not sure)

    9. (No answer/Refused)

YE9. **Learning about history and culture is important to me**.

Would you say this is…

    1. **Very true**

    2. **Slightly true**

    3. **Not true**

    8. (Don't know/not sure)

    9. (No answer/Refused)

YE10. **Hiking and other outdoor activities is important to me.**

Would you say this is…

    1. **Very true**

    2. **Slightly true**

    3. **Not true**

    8. (Don't know/not sure)

    9. (No answer/Refused)

YE11. **Now I would like to know a little about you.**

Are you male or female?

    1. **Male**

    2. **Female**

8. (Don't know/not sure)

9. (No answer/Refused)

YE12. **And how old are you?**

Age:

Enter 998 for "Don't know/Not sure"

999 for "No Answer/Refused"

End. **That is the end of our survey. Thank you so much for participating.**

Natural Resource Stewardship and Science
1201 Oakridge Drive, Suite 150
Fort Collins, CO 80525