

Databank

Project Identity Section

Project Title

An Investigation into Outdoor Rock Climbers' Motivations, Well-Being and Environmental Attitudes

Student Name

Catherine Miles

Supervisor Name

Dr Jackie Abell

Academic year study was performed and submitted

2010

Submission date

7 September 2011

Project Details Section

Abstract (just paste or type from your dissertation)

The relationship between humans and nature has captured the interest of many and from a range of disciplines, resulting in the emergence of some stimulating theories. One of which, is that spending time in nature simultaneously promotes human health and nurtures environmental concern; it is mutually beneficial. Strong links between nature and health have continually been shown throughout academic literature, however support for an automatic link between exposure to nature and pro environmental attitudes is of a more tenuous disposition. There has been suggestion that motivation to participate in an activity is a better predictor of environmental concern than mere participation. In this study motivation was assessed using the Recreation Experience Preference (REP) Scale, environmental attitudes were measured using the New Ecological Paradigm (NEP), while a revised version of the Mental Health Inventory was used to measure well-being (GWB). Using a sample from the British rock climbing community (n = 95) it was shown that motivation is an important dimension in the relationship between outdoor recreation and environmental concern. Those motivated by learning from and being in nature expressed higher levels of environmental concern than those motivated by other reasons. Various findings from this investigation offer continued support to the personal benefits the natural environment can provide whereas little support was found for a direct connection between exposure to nature and environment concern.

Methods Section (just paste text here, or attach document if preferred)

Participants

This study investigated how the motivations of rock climbers impacts upon their well-being and environmental attitudes. A collection of surveys were administered to each participant which consisted of three standardised measures identified from relevant literature and an information sheet containing questions relevant for this investigation. 130 collections of surveys were distributed and 95 were returned fully completed. 23 females and 72 males participated in this study reflecting the same gender bias in climbing found by Hanley, Wright and Koop (2002). Eligibility for this study required participants to consider themselves as outdoor rock climbers and be over the age of 18 years old. Participants were recruited through a variety of methods. Initially a convenience sample of rock climbers from Snowdonia, the Lake District and the Peak District national parks was acquired and participants were asked to complete all parts of the self-report surveys. Participants were approached and asked if they could spare 10 – 15 minutes to take part in some research on rock climbing. The remainder of the participants were recruited from a popular climbing forum, UKClimbing.com. Information regarding the study was posted on the website and people were invited to participate. To accept the invitation participants were required to send an email to the researcher who then forwarded the information needed to complete the study including an electronic copy of the consent form.

Design

The design of this study was a between subject design as all participants were required to complete the same four surveys. Data gathered from the surveys enabled participants to be compared against each other.

Materials

As a measure of environmental attitudes participants were given the NECP (Dunlap et al., 2000) to complete; a modified version of the NEP (Dunlap & Van Liere, 1978). The NECP (Appendix A) consists of 15 statements which attempt to tap ones ideas on limits to growth, the balance of nature, human domination, an eco-crisis and exemptionalism. Participants were required to respond to each of the 15 statements by indicating the number which represented their response, either 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mildly disagree, 3 = unsure, 4 = mildly agree or 5 = strongly agree. Once scored, the NECP provided an overall score which represents a person's environmental position. Agreement with eight odd numbered statements and disagreement with seven even numbered statements indicates the individual has a strong pro-environmental attitude. To score the NECP answers to the seven even numbered questions were reverse so 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2 and 5 = 1. Once these scores were changed the summed score for the NECP was calculated for each participant. A high score indicated a high pro environmental view.

To measure what motivates an individual to participate in rock climbing the Recreation Experience Preference (REP) scale was used (Appendix B). The original REP consisted of 328 items which represented 19 domains and several subdomains (Driver, 1983). Recommendation from Bev Driver who constructed the scale informed those who facilitate the scale to use the two (indicated in the original scale) core items from each subdomain to condense the scale whilst maintaining the reliability and validity of the measure of motivations (Driver, 1983). By using two core items from each subdomain the survey still contained 82 items. As facilitated in other research (Alain, 2010), for the purpose of this study only one core item from each subdomain was used in the final survey. This was to limit the length of the survey due to the fact participants were given two other surveys and an information sheet to complete. The benefits gained from reducing the length of the survey as an attempt keep participants engaged in the study is believed to outweigh the limitations of not including both core items from each subdomain. Participants were required to respond to each sentence by indicating the number which reflected their answer, either 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mildly disagree, 3 = unsure, 4 = mildly agree or 5 = strongly agree. Factor analysis was run on the data once collected which reduced the number of variables and identified the most important motives to participate in rock climbing. Once the number of variables was reduced, motivations could be correlated with the rest of the data.

The final measure delivered to the participants measured general well-being. A simplified version of the Mental Health Inventory, the General Well Being (GWB) scale was employed which consisted of 20 questions. The questions included in the survey required the participant to reflect on the past month asking them how they had felt, and how things had been for them the majority of the time. Respondents were required to answer the questions by indicating which answer was most relevant to them. Six options for answering the question were provided. All questions resembled the following format, "How happy, satisfied, or pleased have you been with your personal life during the past month?", participants were required to answer either, 1 = Extremely happy, could not have been more satisfied or pleased, 2 = Very happy most of the time, 3 = Generally satisfied, pleased, 4 = Sometimes fairly satisfied, sometimes fairly unhappy, 5 = Generally dissatisfied, unhappy or 6 = Very dissatisfied. All questions resembled this format (see appendix C). To score the GWB scale answers to negatively worded questions were reverses so 1 = 6, 2 = 5, 3 = 4, 4 = 3, 5 = 2 and 6 = 1. Summed scores were then calculated for each participant. A high GWB score indicated high general well-being.

In conjunction with these standard measures the participants were given a demographic information sheet (Appendix D) which included a series of other questions were administered to the participants. The purpose of the extra

questions was to collect information from the participant with respect to other variables which had generated some interesting findings in previous research. This was also an attempt to control for other variables, ensuring any findings were rightly attributed. The questions included in demographics information sheet were informed by previous research (Van Den Berg et al., 2010).

Procedure

Participants were provided with an information sheet which included a brief summary of the research and a consent form (Appendix E) to complete along with the three surveys and the demographic information sheet. Each survey was presented to the participants on separate pieces of paper. Participation in this study took respondents approximately 10 to 15 minutes. Once the participants returned the completed surveys they were given/ emailed a copy of the debrief form (Appendix F). Participation in this research was completely voluntary and respondents were made fully aware they could withdraw from the study at any time and were free to ask any questions. Participants were provided with a contact email address of the researcher in case they had any further questions.

Results Section (just paste text here, or attach document if preferred)

Characteristics of the Sample

A variety of methods were used to analyse this data which included descriptive statistics, factor analysis, independent t –tests, ANOVAs and a selection of correlational analysis techniques. Initially various descriptive statistics were calculated from the data to described the characteristics of the respondents. The age of the participants ranged from 19 to 67 with a mean age of 29.4 years. Each participant was asked about their climbing habits in terms of what type of climbing they usually participate in. 63.2% of participants reported that they predominantly engage in traditional rock climbing which is where gear is placed on the climb and removed after the climb. 16% of participants reported that they usually participate in indoor climbing and 13% of participants usually engage in bouldering which involves short climbing problems where ropes are not needed. Only 6% of participants reported that they predominantly engage in sport climbing where bolts are secured as permanent fixtures in the rock face. The number of years participants had climbed for ranged from six months to 52 years with a mean number of years participating in climbing as 9.8 years. The number of other outdoor activities a person engages in ranged from none to eight, with the majority of participants engaging in two or three other outdoor activities. The number of times per month a person climbed ranged from one to 28 times, with a mean number of 6.6 times per month. The professions of participants varied a lot, however, a large proportion of participants were students (35.8%) and outdoor instructors (20%). The majority of the participants were of British nationality with the exception of three respondents, one who was Australian, one who was French and the other Maltese. There is not enough difference in the nationality of the participants to make any distinctions between different nationalities. Further research is needed to obtain a more varied sample in terms of nationality.

Motivation to Climb and Factor Analysis

Motivation to climb was measured using the recreation experience preference (REP) scale (Driver, 1983) which consisted of 43 motivations to climb. To analyse the REP a variety of descriptive statistics were derived from the data and factor analysis; a data reduction technique was used to reduce the number of variables.

Table 1

Frequency of Recreation Experience Preference Scale Items

I climb to...	Mean
View the scenery	4.34
Test abilities	3.33
To have others think highly of you doing it	2.06

To be away from family for a while	2.08
------------------------------------	------

Note. The two highest and two lowest scored items on the recreation experience preference scale. Scores are out of a maximum of 5.

Table 1 shows the two highest and lowest scored items on the REP. *To view scenery* and *to test own ability* received the most agreement whereas *to have others think highly of you doing it* and *to be away from the family for a while* received least agreement. Calculating the mean responses has shown that the landscape and the skill of climbing are important to the participants in this study, whereas reasons to impress or escape and unimportant as motivations to participate in rock climbing.

Table 2

Motivating Factors to Rock Climb

Factors	Mean	Eigen Value	% Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha
1.Social Interaction	3.35	9.30	21.6	.805
2.Active Change	3.76	3.43	8.0	.806
3.Leadership	2.45	2.96	6.9	.754
4.Learning from Nature	3.31	2.62	6.1	.801
5.Experience Nature	4.05	2.44	5.7	.682
6.Freedom	3.16	2.02	4.7	.619
7.Challenge	4.12	1.63	3.8	.682
8.Tell others	2.36	1.50	3.5	.687
9.Ownership	3.4	1.35	3.1	.613
10.Relaxation	2.85	1.26	2.9	.582

Note. The 10 factors extracted from the Recreation Experience Preference scale through factor analysis.

Principle components analysis with varimax rotation was performed in order to derive factors which consistently represented motivations to climb from the REP scale. The Bartlett test of sphericity and the Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin measure of sampling adequacy were referred to in order to establish whether factor analysis was a suitable method to use to reduce this data. Bartlett's test which is designed to detect the homogeneity of variance among scale items was

found to be significant ($p < 0.001$), which signifies that the variances are equal and factor analysis is appropriate (Bartlett, 1950). The Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin measure of sampling adequacy which is designed to measure the strength of the correlation between scale items was .68 which is considered adequate for employing factor analysis as the data reduction technique for this data (Kaiser, 1974).

Initially, PASW revealed that 12 factors from the scale have Eigen Values greater than 1 which many trust as the default boundary for including a factor in the final number of factors (O'Connor, 2000). This greater- than-one rule has often found to overestimate the number of components (Zwick & Velicer, 1986). As a result it is strongly recommended that the scree plot is consulted as an alternative rule (Cattell & Vogelman, 1977). Consulting the scree plot indicated that 10 factors would be a more suitable extraction for this set of data. The final factor structure included 10 factors based on the 43 motivational items. These ten factors accounted for 66.3% of the variance and included, *Social Interaction*, *Active Change*, *Leadership*, *Learning from nature*, *Experience Nature*, *Freedom*, *Challenge Self*, *Tell Others*, *Ownership* and *Relaxation* (see appendix G for expanded list).

Cronbach's alpha; a measure of how well the items are related to each other, was calculated for all the factors to assess how reliable they are in accounting for the various items from the REP (Table 2). Usually, a Cronbach's alpha of above .7 is an indicator of good reliability of the factors (Raykov, 1998). In this study four of the factors have considerably high Cronbach's alpha scores indicating that these factors are highly related to one another. Six factors have lower Cronbach's alpha scores but are only just short of .7. *Relaxation* is the only factor which has a lower Cronbach's alpha than .6 which suggests that the items included in this factor are not highly related to each other. Although Cronbach's alpha is considered an adequate measure of testing for reliability amongst a set of data (Raykov, 1998) it is useful to refer back to the actual items on REP to look for similarities when interpreting the data. For example, the items loaded onto *Relaxation* are statistically considered to be poorly related to each other. In this data set the factor *Relaxation* includes the items *to have your mind move at a slower pace*, *to relax physically* and is negatively correlated with *to take risks*. The negative association means that the opposite of taking risks is related to this factor. Although the Cronbach's alpha is low for this factor it makes conceptual sense that the items loaded onto *Relaxation* are dominated by relaxation related items.

The factor which explained the majority of variance in this study was *Social Interaction* which had a mean score of 3.35 out of 5 (a score of 5 indicates strong agreement with a statement) and explained 21.6% of the variance (Table 2). The factor *Social Interaction* can be characterised as *a desire to be with others who enjoy the same things as you do*, *to talk to new and varied people*, *to be near considerate people* and *to be with members of your group whilst using your equipment* based on the REP items. Although *Social Interaction* accounted for most of the variance of the motivational items, *Challenge Self* was the most important motive to the respondents demonstrated by the highest mean score of 4.12. *Challenge Self* was characterised by the motives *to test endurance*, *test abilities* and *to become better at it*. *Experience Nature* closely followed as the second most important motive with a mean score of 4.05, categorised by a desire *to view the scenery* and *to be close to nature*.

The factor which accounted for the least amount of variance was *Relaxation* which only accounted for 2.9% of the variance of the data with a mean of 2.85 out of 5. This finding is consistent with the research carried out by McIntyre (1991) who found relaxation to be very low in importance as to why people climb. Although to be motivated by *Relaxation* accounted for the least amount of variance, the factor with the lowest mean was actually *Tell Others* with a mean of 2.36. This indicates that telling others about the climbing experience is unimportant to most climbers. 12 additional items from the REP scale did not load onto any of the ten factors extracted through factor analysis. The factor analysis revealed that these items did not correlate well with any of the others items and were not regarded as important to the participants on a whole; therefore they were removed from further analysis.

Interestingly, there appears to be a gender difference with respect to the importance of each of these factors. For women the two factors with the highest means are *Experience Nature* and *Social Interaction* with means of 4.26 and 3.79 respectively. Whereas the two factors with the highest means for men are *Challenge Self* and *Experience Nature* with means of 4.11 and 3.97 respectively. Although, as already established, it does not account for the overall maximum variance, *Experience Nature* consistently receives high mean responses for motivation to participate in rock climbing amongst both males and females.

Environmental Attitudes

Environmental attitudes were assessed using the New Environmental Paradigm (NECP) scale (Dunlap et al., 2000). Various descriptive statistics were calculated from the NECP.

Table 3

Frequency of New Ecological Paradigm Items

I.....that.....	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mildly Disagree (2)	Unsure (3)	Mildly Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Mean
Despite our special abilities, humans are still subject to the laws of nature.	1.1%	2.1%	6.3%	18.9%	71.6%	4.58
Plants and animals have as much right as humans to exist.	3.2%	3.2%	5.3%	22.1%	66.3%	4.46
Humans were meant to rule over the rest of nature.	57.9%	15.8%	15.8%	4.2%	6.3%	1.85
The balance of nature is strong enough to cope with the impacts of modern industrial nations.	40.0%	31.6%	16.8%	9.5%	2.1%	2.02

Note. The two highest and two lowest scored items of the New Ecological Paradigm.

The mean scores of the two highest and the lowest items which received agreement are shown in table 3. The items that received the most agreement were *Despite our special abilities, humans are still subject to the laws of nature* and *Plants and animals have as much right as humans to exist*, demonstrating that in general the respondents regard themselves as equal to the rest of nature. Whereas *Humans were meant to rule over the rest of nature* and *The balance of nature is strong enough to cope with the impacts of the modern industrial nations* received the most amount of disagreement, reiterating that participants believe they are not supposed to dominate over nature and that when they try to, the consequence are vast.

The scores in Table 3 were calculated from the raw data before negatively worded scores were reversed. To calculate the overall environmental position of the participants in the study, negatively worded questions were reversed. This ensured that the direction of environmental attitudes remained consistent throughout the scale. Once the negatively worded scores were reversed the mean score for the group of participants was computed as 3.75 out of 5 indicating an overall pro environmental view from participants, similar to the results found by Alain (2010) regarding the environmental views of climbers. Once the scores were reversed, summed scores could be calculated for each participant. The summed scores for each participant enabled a quantified analysis of their environmental position to be calculated. The highest possible score on the NECP is 75; therefore in this analysis high scores indicate a pro environmental position. The mean summed score for the participants was 56.32. An independent t –test revealed that the difference in scores on the NECP between men (M = 55.9, SD = 7.57) and women (M = 57.6, SD = 8.67) was not significant, $t(33) = .818$, $p = .419$. There was no significant gender difference in environmental attitudes in this study.

General Well Being

The well-being of the participants was measured by the General Well Being (GWB) scale (Heubeck & Neil, 2000).

Table 4

Estimates of Frequency of Self-Reported General Well-Being Items

How often during the last month have you....	Always (1)	Very Often (2)	Fairly Often (3)	Sometimes (4)	Almost Never (5)	Never (6)	Mean
Felt down in the dumps and nothing	0%	1.1%	2.1%	2.1%	18.9%	75.8%	5.66

can cheer you up.							
Found difficultly trying to calm down.	0%	1.1%	4.2%	17.9%	43.2%	33.7%	5.04
Been a happy person.	12.6%	49.5%	22.1%	9.5%	5.3%	1.1%	2.48
Generally enjoyed things.	6.3%	52.6%	24.2%	12.6%	4.2%	0%	2.56

Note. The two highest and two lowest scored items of the GWB scale.

In general respondents rarely reported having '*felt down in the dumps*' and regularly felt they had '*been a happy person*' over the course of the previous month as illustrated in table 4. In order to calculate a total GWB score for each participant the scores from the positively worded questions were reversed. Once the scores from the positively worded questions (Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15 and 18) were reversed, a high score indicated a high level of general well-being. Once the scores were reversed an overall mean response from all participants was calculated as 4.5 out of 6 indicating that generally rock climbers have high general well-being. The mean of the summed scores for GWB was 89.99 out of a total of 120. Women had a mean summed score of 89.09 and men a mean summed score of 90.28. An independent t - test revealed that the difference in scores on the GWB between men ($M = 90.3$, $SD = 14.65$) and women ($M = 89.1$, $SD = 13.36$) was not significantly different, $t(40) = .363$, $p = .718$. There was no significant gender difference in levels of general well-being in this study.

The Impact of Motivations to Climb Upon General Well-Being and Environmental Attitudes

Motivations to participate in rock climbing were addressed in this investigation in order to explore whether certain motives had a more significant impact on a person's general well-being and/ or on their environmental attitudes as opposed to others. To facilitate a comparison of these variables, summative scores were calculated for the GWB and the NECP for each participant as described above. The summation of these scales allowed participants' environmental attitudes and their levels of general well-being to be correlated with the 10 factors extracted through factor analysis from the REP. Using Pearson's r , correlations were drawn between the 10 factors and environmental attitudes and the 10 factors and general well-being.

Table 5

Pearson's r Correlations with Factors and Total Scores for the NECP and the GWB

Factor	NECP	GWB
1.Social Interaction	.019	.134
2. Active Change	.014	-.225*
3. Leadership	-.024	.116
4. Learning from nature	.212*	.008
5. Experience Nature	.211*	-.081

6. Freedom		-.087	-.150
7. Challenge		-.003	.067
8. Tell Others		-.078	.063
9. Ownership		.161	.069
10. Relaxation		.189	-.191

Note. Correlations demonstrating motivations that significantly related to the NECP or the GWB.

* Significant at the < 0.05 level (two-tailed level).

There are some significant relationships between the 10 factors which represent the most popular motivations to climb, environmental attitudes and well-being, indicating that some motivations have more of an impact than others upon general well-being and environmental attitudes as illustrated in table 5. There is a positive significant relationships between scores on the NECP and those predominantly motivated by *Learning from Nature*; $r(95) = .21$, $p < .05$. A positive significant relationship is also present between scores on the NECP and those primarily motivated by *Experience Nature*; $r(95) = .21$, $p < .05$. That is, those who are motivated by learning from and experiencing nature display higher levels of pro environmental attitudes than those motivated by other reasons. This provides support for the notion that a person's motivation to participate in climbing has a significant impact on their level of environmental concern.

In the present study, the summed scores for participants' environmental views ranged from 39 indicating a very negative environmental view, to 74 out of a maximum possible score of 75 indicating a very positive environmental view. Considering the large range in participants environmental views these results offer continued support to the Teisl and O'Brien's (2003) suggestion that classifying people simply by activity could be a problematic way of investigating outdoor recreationists' environmental attitudes. These findings pioneer the suggestion that a person's motivation to do any activity is a stronger predictor of environmental attitudes than merely engagement in outdoor recreation as once proposed by Dunlap and Heffernan (1975).

The comparison of REP factors and GWB scores revealed a negatively significant relationship between those who are motivated to rock climb by an *Active Change* and scores on the GWB; $r(95) = -.23$, $p < .05$. *Active Change* is defined by a need for something different and a change to routine that involves exercise. Those who are motivated by *Active Change* displayed significantly lower levels of well-being than those motivated by other factors. Table 5 illustrates that difference in motivation to climb accounts for very little variation in a person's well-being.

The Impact of Climbing Style on Environmental Attitudes and Well-Being

A one way ANOVA was conducted on climbing style to enquire into any significant relationships between the summed scores of the GWB and the NECP. No significant relationship was found between climbing style and environmental attitudes, $F(9, 91) = .167$, $p = .426$. However, consistent with previous research a significant difference was found between climbing style and well-being, $F(3, 91) = 3.373$, $p < .05$. When Tukeys post hoc analysis was run on this ANOVA it failed to reveal a significant result in any of the comparisons. The closest to a significant result was indoor climbing compared to traditional climbing revealing a significance value of .055 which is almost significant at the .05 level. To compensate for this, in attempt to distinguish between well-being levels of those who climb predominantly outside and those who usually climb inside the categories for climbing style were reduced to *Climbing Outside* or *Climbing Inside*. Using an independent t – test a significant result was established between the two climbing styles. At the 2 tailed level the comparison between general well-being levels for *Climbing Outside* ($M = 91.5$, $SD = 13.21$) and *Climbing Inside* ($M = 82.4$, $SD = 17.27$) was significant, $t(93) = 2.375$, $p < .05$. Although results imply that being motivated by nature does not necessarily have an impact on well-being, this significant relationship between those who climb outside more often than those that do not supports the theory that engaging in, specifically *outdoor* recreation positively impacts upon a person's general well-being.

Regularity of Participation and Well-Being

The number of times a person climbs per month also reveals some interesting findings with respect to levels of general well-being. Analysis of variance showed a main effect of climbing regularity on GWB, $F(5, 89) = 2.99, p < .05$. Post hoc analyses using Tukey's HSD indicated that GWB levels were higher for those who climb two to three times per week ($M = 100.2, SD = 12.49$) than GWB levels of those who climb less than once a week ($M = 82.1, SD = 16.52$). This finding could potentially be attributed to one's love of climbing and not necessarily just be accredited to being outside in nature. However, considering the significant findings present in this research that both climbing style and number of times a month a person climbs are positively related to general well-being this sufficiently adds additional support to the theory that spending time outside in nature positively impacts upon general well-being.

Climbing Specialisation

Some studies have suggested that specialisation in an activity is a strong predictor of environmental attitudes (Bryan, 1977). Although climbing ability was not specifically inquired about in this study, participants *were* asked how long they have been climbers for and also how regularly they climb which could potentially be considered as effective indicators of climbing specialisation. It has also been suggested that awareness of environmental issues could differ depending on commitment to an activity (Land Use Consultants, 2010). That is those who take part in an outdoor activity regularly are likely to express greater environmental concern than part-time enthusiasts in the particular activity. However, in this research neither the number of years climbing or regularity of climbing were significant indicators of high scores on the NECP, $F(4, 90) = 7.60, p = .554$. It is possible that these unexpected findings are due to the measure of environmental attitudes employed in this study.

Environmental Attitudes and Well-Being

Interestingly, there was no significant correlation between participant responses to the NECP and the GWB, $r(95) = .069, p = .51$. Whilst previous research has suggested that there is a potential relationship between environmental attitudes and well-being, the measure of environmental attitude used in this study, the NECP is more a measure of a person's environmental worldview rather than tapping into one's sustainable behaviour; a point which will be elaborated on later in this investigation.

In this study there were no other factors which significantly accounted for the differences in people's environmental attitudes or general well-being.

Keywords (key analysis and methods techniques relevant to your work). More info here.

New Ecological Paradigm, Recreation Experience Preference scale, Mental Health Interventions, Well-Being, Environmental Attitudes, Rock Climbing

Consent Form (attach a (blank) participant consent form)

Information Sheet and Consent Form

An investigation into outdoor rock climber's motivations, well-being and environmental attitudes.

Thank you for accepting the invitation to participate in my research. Your contribution is voluntary and you are able to withdraw from the study at any point if you wish to do so. This research project is being undertaken as part of a Masters course in Social Psychology at the University of Lancaster. The research explores the relationship between humans and nature and how people's motivations to participate in outdoor activities, specifically rock climbing may mediate this relationship. The research collected in this study will remain confidential at all times and anonymity will be ensured when presenting findings. If you have any questions about the research or interview process, do not hesitate to e-mail me at c.miles1@lancaster.ac.uk. Participation in this study should take no more 10 – 15 minutes.

Please complete the following details.

These details will kept separate from the data you will provide for the study.

Name

Please answer the following statements by circling the appropriate answer.

Do you agree to participate in this research? Y N

Is this agreement of the participants own free will? Y N

Have you had the opportunity to ask any questions if you wish? Y N

Are you aware that you may withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason and with no adverse consequences? Y N

Have you been given a Participant Information Sheet containing full information about the study? Y N

Have you been given contact information for the researchers? Y N

Have you been provided with information regarding the confidentiality of the data you will provide? Y N

Name of Participant Date Signature

Researcher Date Signature

Participant number (to be filled out by the researcher):

**Accompanying materials (attach and describe any relevant materials).
More info here.**

Demographics survey.docx
New Ecological Paradigm.docx
REP Survey.doc
Well being survey to use.doc

Data Section

Data Files (attach one or more files; .zip small files together). More info here.

NEP.sav
GWB.sav
REP.sav

Codebooks (attach any files explaining data marking / format). More info here.

The REP and the GWB documents include only the raw data for those surveys. The NEP is a bit like a master data set: it includes the raw data for the NE and the raw data for the demographic information, and it includes the summed scores of the REP and GWB to enable comparison. The summed scores for the NEP and the GWB have been calculated whereby scores for certain have been reversed in order to keep the direction of the scale (this should be

obvious if you look at the surveys). The master document NEP also includes the results from the factor analysis which enabled further calculations to be drawn.

Much of the coding is quite straight forward, however, those that are not are explained below.

Rows 27 - 36 are the factors extracted from factor analysis of the REP.

Inout - this is climbing style changed to inside or outside rather than the 4 original categories.

Describe measures taken, or that need to be taken, for data anonymisation.

There is nothing included in these data sets which reveals any identity of the participants.

Please specify your view of the appropriate use of data as (a) - (c):

(a) I believe the data can be used in the future for teaching purposes

If your answer is (b) or (c), please explain your choice

N/A

Completion confirmation

This page has now been completed (enter "yes" to 'sign off' this form)

Yes

Comments and notes

Comments and notes from supervisor on project and data

xxx

Additional comments and notes from student on project and data

xxx

Comments / Feedback on this databank system

xxx

Comments and notes from databank coordinators (to be used after student submission)

xxx

Help

This form contains pre-loaded information already gathered from you. Simply fill in the remaining sections replacing the "xxx" with your text.

To edit this page,

- Click the pencil icon at the top of the form (next to the " " and the "-" symbol).
- When you start to edit a page, formatting options become available above the document edit window.
- Click the save button when you have finished a session.
- You can return to make future changes / additions to the page later.

Click on links to load a new page with annotations / explanation of what is required for each section, or how to carry out tasks.

For questions about this form, contact "psych_datasets@lancs.ac.uk".

Document Info

Tags

- nosearch

Related

Comments

Show more