2006

Evaluation of environmental youth internet forums for small island nations

Darcy L. Nugent
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Nugent, Darcy L., "Evaluation of environmental youth internet forums for small island nations" (2006).
Master's Theses. 2914.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.tnk8-4m22>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2914

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL YOUTH INTERNET FORUMS
FOR SMALL ISLAND NATIONS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Environmental Studies

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Darcy L. Nugent

May 2006

UMI Number: 1436940

Copyright 2006 by
Nugent, Darcy L.

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1436940

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Darcy L. Nugent

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Dr. Gary A. Klee, Committee Chair
Department of Environmental Studies

Dr. David G. Asquith
Department of Sociology

Dr. Victor M. Ordonez, Senior Education Fellow
East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii
Former Director, Office for Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL YOUTH INTERNET FORUMS FOR SMALL ISLAND NATIONS

by Darcy L. Nugent

Small Islands Voice, SIV, was established by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, in 2002 as a global format for several small island nations to collaborate and disseminate information regarding all of UNESCO's initiatives. Part of SIV is an Internet-based youth discussion forum to educate students regarding environmental issues across island nations and share possible solutions. Students are exposed to global communication and different cultures through the internet.

This study evaluated the SIV Youth Forum. A student survey was administered and interviews were conducted either in person or through the mail and the telephone. Quantitative and qualitative analyses of collected data found significant value in the SIV Youth Forum. Teacher participation was the most critical component for success. It also identified island youths' environmental concerns and made recommendations in the areas of communication, age groupings, web enhancements, and local activities to improve the forum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were many individuals and corporations who supported this research. I would like to thank my committee members for their guidance, knowledge, and time. Their patience throughout this process has been helpful. The chair of my committee, Dr. Gary Klee, encouraged me to choose a topic that brings me passion and inspired me to finish my research. My statistical advisor, Dr. David Asquith, gave expertise for my survey design and analyses. Many thanks to Dr. Victor Ordonez whose advise and assistance were invaluable.

While conducting my fieldwork, numerous people offered assistance. Symantec Corporation supported this project and provided computer software to the schools. In addition, they granted my husband a leave to assist me on the islands. Mackay Communications discounted a satellite phone for our travels. Dr. Gillian Cambers and Claire Green, Directors of Small Islands Voice for UNESCO, provided feedback, contacts, and information. The teachers, students, and coordinators on each island I traveled were hospitable, generous, and central to my work. I enjoyed working with everyone on this research.

Family and friends supported me unconditionally. Thank you to my mom, Jeanne, and my neighbor Shannon, for tending to my house and cat while I was in the field. My sister, Leslie, cared for my daughter, Amelia, while I completed my thesis. And Brandon, my husband, provided technical expertise and gave me confidence to “keep at it.” I thank him most for all his love and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS	ix
TABLES	x
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Importance.....	4
C. Objectives.....	6
II. RELATED RESEARCH.....	8
A. Internet Programs	8
B. Computer-mediated Communication	10
C. Environmental Education Programs.....	13
III. METHODS	17
A. Study Sites.....	17
B. Study Population	17
C. Research Design and Data Collection.....	18
1. Countries Visited	18
2. Countries Not Visited	19
3. UNESCO Program Directors and Forum Administrators	19
4. Documentation.....	20
D. Data Analysis	21
IV. RESULTS	23
A. Survey Respondent Profile.....	23

B. Frequencies.....	23
C. Factor Analyses	26
D. The Level of Engagement.....	28
1. Age as a Predictor for Factor One Variables	28
2. Region as a Predictor for Factor One Variables	29
3. Gender as a Predictor for Factor One Variables	30
E. The Level of Ambivalence	30
1. Age as a Predictor for Factor Two Variables.....	30
2. Region as a Predictor for Factor Two Variables.....	31
3. Gender as a Predictor for Factor Two Variables	32
F. The Level of Indifference	32
1. Age as a Predictor for Factor Three Variables.....	32
2. Region as a Predictor for Factor Three Variables.....	32
G. Questions 21 to 25.....	33
1. Region as a Predictor	33
2. Age as a Predictor	34
3. Gender as a Predictor	35
H. Qualitative Findings.....	36
V. DISCUSSION	39
A. Local Behavior.....	39
B. Technology.....	41
C. Location.....	44

D. Student Feedback	46
E. Limitations.....	47
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	49
A. Next Steps	49
B. Conclusions	55
ILLUSTRATIONS	57
TABLES	68
REFERENCE LIST	200
APPENDICES	203
A. RESEARCH DESIGN	204
B. STUDENT SURVEY.....	205
C. SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	208
D. HUMAN SUBJECTS IRB APPROVAL.....	209
E. AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH LETTERS	210

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Caribbean island states undertaking activities within the Small Island Voice Project	58
2. Indian Ocean island states undertaking activities within the Small Island Voice Project	59
3. Pacific Ocean island states undertaking activities within the Small Island Voice Project.....	60
4. Muri Beach, Rarotonga Island, Cook Islands.	61
5. Rosalie Beach, Dominica.....	61
6. Riverside community, Viti Levu, Fiji	62
7. Students and teachers representing multiple schools, St. Kitts.....	62
8. Author administering survey at All Saints Secondary School,.....	63
9. Mountainous island of Dominica.....	63
10. Hope Town School, Abaco Island, Bahamas.....	64
11. Teachers participating in SIV YIF at Bequia Community H.S.....	64
12. Effects of Cyclone in 2005, Mangaia Island, Cook Islands.....	65
13. Students who participated in SIV YIF	65
14. Lighthouse, Abaco Island, Bahamas.....	66
15. Mauke Island, Cook Islands.....	66
16. Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park, St. Kitts.....	67
17. Bequian model ship makers.	67

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Participating schools in the SIV YF survey	69
2. Countries and technology rankings.....	70
3. Frequency - By region	71
4. Frequency - By country	71
5. Frequency - Age.....	72
6. Frequency - Recoded ages	72
7. Frequency - Gender.....	73
8. Frequency - The forum is easy to use	73
9. Frequency - I log on the forum outside of school.....	74
10. Frequency - I check the forum for new messages.....	74
11. Frequency - I know how to put messages on the forum	75
12. Frequency - Other students respond fast on the forum.....	75
13. Frequency - I would use the forum if it were not part of.....	76
14. Frequency - It is easy to share problems on the forum.....	76
15. Frequency - The messages from older kids are hard to read	77
16. Frequency - I have made new friends on the forum	77
17. Frequency - I know more about other countries as a result of the forum	78
18. Frequency - Others have same the concerns I do on the forum.....	78
19. Frequency - I have tried ideas on the forum for the environment	79
20. Frequency - I changed how I care for environment as a result of the forum.....	79
21. Frequency - I have not learned more about environment	80

22. Frequency - The topics on the forum are interesting	80
23. Frequency - I did not like the topics on the forum.....	81
24. Frequency - I talk to my parents about the forum.....	81
25. Frequency - The forum should continue at my school	82
26. Frequency - More students should use the forum.....	82
27. Frequency - The forum is a good way to talk to others	83
28. Frequency - Environmental concern - Pollution, general, air, noise	83
29. Frequency - Environmental concern - Litter, garbage, keeping the island clean and beautiful	84
30. Frequency - Environmental concern - Water pollution, dirty water.....	84
31. Frequency - Environmental concern - Deforestation, forest management, cutting trees.....	85
32. Frequency - Environmental concern - Waste, solid, chemical, industry waste, waste management.....	85
33. Frequency - Environmental concern - Endangered species, over-fishing, coral reefs, poaching	86
34. Frequency - Environmental concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise.....	86
35. Frequency - Environmental concern - Environmental other.....	87
36. Frequency - Environmental concern - Beach/land pollution, marine and coastal areas	87
37. Frequency - Environmental concern - Non environmental answer	88
38. Frequency - The topic I like best - Island life, living, culture	88
39. Frequency - The topic I like best - Generic environment	89
40. Frequency - The topic I like best - Other	89
41. Frequency - The topic I like best - Water, water pollution, marine life, beaches.....	90

42. Frequency - The topic I like best - Environmental (other than pollution, garbage, and water).....	90
43. Frequency - The topic I like best - Pollution (general pollution/non water pollution).....	91
44. Frequency - The topic I like best - Money/finance.....	91
45. Frequency - The topic I like best - Garbage/litter.....	92
46. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – Communicating and learning from other youth	92
47. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – It is informative	93
48. Frequency - What I like most about the forum - Other.....	93
49. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – Environmental issues.....	94
50. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – The topics	94
51. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum – “Nothing”	95
52. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Poor communication with coordinators, students do not respond quickly.....	95
53. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Other	96
54. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Content related concerns and topics	96
55. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Technology related answers.....	97
56. Frequency - My ideas to make forum better - Include more youth	97
57. Frequency - My ideas to make forum better - Other	98
58. Frequency - My ideas to make forum better - Look of forum.....	98
59. Frequency - My ideas to make forum better - Better Internet access	99
60. Frequency - My ideas to make forum better - More topics	99
61. Factor analysis - KMO and Bartlett's test	100

62. Factor analysis - Communalities.....	101
63. Factor analysis - Total variance explained.....	102
64. Factor analysis - Component matrix	103
65. Correlation -Region and check forum for new messages	104
66. Correlation - Age and check forum for new messages	105
67. Correlation - Gender and check forum for new messages	106
68. Correlation - Region and I know how to put messages on the forum.....	107
69. Correlation - Age and I know how to put messages on the forum	108
70. Correlation - Gender and I know how to put messages on the forum	109
71. Correlation - Region and I know more about other countries	110
72. Correlation - Age and I know more about other countries	111
73. Correlation - Gender and I know more about other countries	112
74. Correlation - Region and others have same concerns that I do.....	113
75. Correlation - Age and others have same concerns that I do	114
76. Correlation - Gender and others have same concerns that I do	115
77. Correlation - Region and I have tried ideas on the forum.....	116
78. Correlation - Age and I have tried ideas on the forum	117
79. Correlation - Gender and I have tried ideas on the forum	118
80. Correlation - Region and I have changed how I care for the environment.....	119
81. Correlation - Age and I have changed how I care for the environment.....	120
82. Correlation - Gender and I have changed how I care for the environment.....	121
83. Correlation - Region and I have not learned more about the environment.....	122
84. Correlation - Age and I have not learned more about the environment.....	123
85. Correlation - Gender and I have not learned more about the environment	124

86. Correlation - Region and topics on the forum are interesting.....	125
87. Correlation - Age and topics on the forum are interesting.....	126
88. Correlation - Gender and topics on the forum are interesting	127
89. Correlation - Region and I talk to my parents about the forum	128
90. Correlation - Age and I talk to my parents about the forum.....	129
91. Correlation - Gender and I talk to my parents about the forum.....	130
92. Correlation - Region and I log on outside of school.....	131
93. Correlation - Age and I log on outside of school.....	132
94. Correlation - Gender and I log on outside of school.....	133
95. Correlation - Region and messages from older kids are hard to read.....	134
96. Correlation - Age and messages from older kids are hard to read.....	135
97. Correlation - Gender and messages from older kids are hard to read.....	136
98. Correlation - Region and I made new friends on the forum	137
99. Correlation - Age and I made new friends on the forum	138
100. Correlation - Gender and I made new friends on the forum	139
101. Correlation - Region and I did not like the topics on the forum	140
102. Correlation - Age and I did not like the topics on the forum	141
103. Correlation - Gender and I did not like the topics on the forum.....	142
104. Correlation - Region and the forum should continue at my school	143
105. Correlation - Age and the forum should continue at my school	144
106. Correlation - Gender and the forum should continue at my school	145
107. Correlation - Region and more students should use the forum.....	146
108. Correlation - Age and more students should use the forum.....	147
109. Correlation - Gender and more students should use the forum	148

110. Correlation - Region and the forum is a good way to talk.....	149
111. Correlation - Age and the forum is a good way to talk.....	150
112. Correlation - Gender and the forum is a good way to talk.....	151
113. Correlation - Region and the forum is easy to use.....	152
114. Correlation - Age and the forum is easy to use.....	153
115. Correlation - Gender and the forum is easy to use.....	154
116. Correlation - Region and other students respond fast.....	155
117. Correlation - Age and other students respond fast.....	156
118. Correlation Gender and other students respond fast	157
119. Correlation - Gender and I would use the forum if it was not part of school	158
120. Correlation - Region and I would use the forum if it was not part of school	159
121. Correlation - Age and I would use the forum if it were not part of school.....	160
122. Correlation - Region and it is easy to share problems	161
123. Correlation - Age and it is easy to share problems	162
124. Correlation - Gender and it is easy to share problems	163
125. Correlation - Region and environmental concern - Beach/land pollution, marine and coastal areas	164
126. Correlation - Region and environmental concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise.....	165
127. Correlation - Region and environmental concern - Deforestation, forest management, cutting trees	166
128. Correlation - Region and topics I like best - Money/finance.....	167
129. Correlation - Region and topics I like best - Environmental (other than pollution, garbage, and water)	168
130. Correlation - Region and topics I like best - Generic environment	169

131. Correlation - Region and topics I like best - Water, water pollution, marine life, beaches.....	170
132. Correlation - Region and what I like most about the forum – Communicating and learning from other youth.....	171
133. Correlation - Region and what I do not like about the forum - Content related concerns and topics	172
134. Correlation - Region and what I do not like about the forum - Better communication with program and faster responses from students.....	173
135. Correlation - Region and what I do not like about the forum - Technology related answers.....	174
136. Correlation - Region and ideas to make forum better - Look of forum.....	175
137. Correlation - Region and ideas to make forum better - Better Internet access..	176
138. Correlation - Gender and environmental concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise.....	177
139. Correlation - Gender and environmental concern - Endangered species, over fishing, coral reefs, poaching	178
140. Correlation - Gender and topics I like best - Money/finance.....	179
141. Correlation - Gender and what I like most about the forum - Environmental issues	180
142. Correlation - Gender and ideas to make forum better - Better Internet access..	181
143. Correlation - Age and environmental concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise.....	182
144. Correlation - Age and environmental concern - Litter, garbage, keeping the island clean and beautiful.....	183
145. Correlation - Age and environmental concern - Deforestation, forest management, cutting trees	184
146. Correlation - Age and environmental concern - Pollution, general, air, noise	185
147. Correlation - Age and topics I like best - Money/finance.....	186

148. Correlation - Age and topics I like best - Environmental (other than pollution, garbage, and water)	187
149. Correlation - Age and topics I like best - Generic environment	188
150. Correlation - Age and topics I like best - Garbage/litter.....	189
151. Correlation - Age and ideas to make forum better - Include more youth	190
152. Correlation - Age and ideas to make forum better - Look of forum.....	191
153. Correlation - Age and ideas to make forum better - Better Internet access	192
154. Frequency - Technology ranking	193
155. Correlation - Technology ranking and I log on outside of school	194
156. Correlation - Technology ranking and I check the forum for new messages	195
157. Correlation - Technology ranking and I know how to put messages on the forum.....	196
158. Correlation - Technology ranking and other students respond fast	197
159. Correlation - Technology ranking and my ideas to make the forum better - look of forum	198
160. Correlation - Technology ranking and my ideas to make forum better - Better Internet access.....	199

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, established Small Islands Voice, SIV, in 2002 as a global format for several small island nations to collaborate and disseminate information regarding all of UNESCO's initiatives. Strengthening local media and internet communications with other islands, SIV creates opportunities for the small island developing nations to communicate more effectively and interact with each other regarding global issues that small islands face regardless of whether they are located in the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean, or the Pacific Ocean. Figures 1 to 3, located in the illustration section of this thesis, depict the countries and regions participating. Topics such as development, sustainability, capacity building, tourism, conservation, education, and biodiversity play an important role in the daily preservation of these culturally unique yet similar island countries. In the global arena, one small island nation does not have a loud voice, but collectively their voices can give them a venue to voice their concerns for global environmental issues that affect them all.

As part of SIV, UNESCO launched internet-based youth discussion forums. Over the past four years, students from 12 different island nations have logged on to the forum and expressed their opinion on many topics. The Small Islands Voice Youth Internet Forum, SIV YIF, website is www.sivyouth.org. The site only allows students involved in SIV to post articles, but it can be viewed by entering the username *view* and password *only* (UNESCO 2002a).

The selected forum topics enticed young people to discuss environmental and sustainable development issues. For example, the topic “Advantages and Disadvantages of living on my island” brought responses on tourism, whaling, conservation, and solid waste disposal (UNESCO 2003, 44). This subject, from phase one of the forum, received 18 responses from Caribbean, Indian Ocean, and Pacific Ocean students.

As part of SIV, opinion surveys were conducted. While each islands’ surveys were unique, primary concerns were listed. Questioned in 2002 and 2003, the economy was islanders’ top priority, and the environment was sixth (UNESCO 2004b, 27). However, the opinion polls were not specifically targeted at youth. A few islands specifically published youth opinions and attitudes. In the Cook Islands, the beach and lagoon were identified as favorite places by 70% of the students surveyed (Figure 4) (Malone 2002, 19). In the Caribbean, on the island of Bequia in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, students, 15 to 17 years of age, conveyed garbage disposal and litter were environmental issues affecting them (Belmar 2002).

These documented opinions directed the activities of the SIV YIF. One topic from phase four asked youth to list changes they would like to see on their islands. Thirty-six messages were posted. From litter to crime, youth expressed their concerns and began a dialog with other youth across the world (UNESCO 2002a). Topics spurred discussion about ways to improve island living. One of SIV’s initiatives, “to assist islanders in determining how they want to see their islands develop” (UNESCO 2005b), was emphasized by the forum. Island sustainability and preserving culture are two topics being discussed in the fifth phase.

After the first two phases of the forum, SIV requested comments from the participating schools. The preliminary feedback was favorable, and suggestions were made to improve the YIF. Three schools, representing the Cook Islands, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Seychelles, provided comments after phase one was completed (UNESCO 2002c). Students liked the interaction with other youths in different countries, but many schools had only one computer connected to the internet. Teachers seemed enthusiastic about the program despite limited internet access on campuses.

Upon conclusion of phase two, comments were provided to UNESCO by students, teachers, and program coordinators. Views remained positive. Students enjoyed learning about other island nations. For example, some participants improved their understanding of geography. One barrier to actively participating in the program was time. During exam months, teachers stated their time needed to be directed toward preparation. Again, difficulties with internet access continued in many schools, but the benefit outweighed the problem. “Without exception every island wanted to see their involvement in the forum continue” (UNESCO 2002b).

Feedback was requested by the SIV YIF Director. Participants filled out opinion forms or discussed forum attitudes directly with the UNESCO representatives. Now in its fifth iteration, a formal, external evaluation of the program would validate the benefit to the participants and assist UNESCO in its efforts to enhance the user experience (Cambers 2004).

B. Importance

Small island developing states share many challenges. At the UN Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, SIDS, in Barbados, May 1994, they recognized their vulnerability to natural as well as environmental disasters (UNDESA 1994). In addition, their small land size and location exacerbate many other environmental issues such as limited natural resources, climate change, sea-level rise, waste management, and pollution. Large areas of SIDS are considered endangered habitat, accommodating a wide range of species. For example, on the island of Dominica, some beaches are protected habitat (Figure 5).

There is a delicate balance between economic prosperity and protection of these unique environments. Collaborations between government agencies, non government organizations, NGOs, and educational institutions can enhance environment and sustainable development curricula. These joint ventures create awareness for the students as well for the general population. For example, St. Lucia opened an educational zoo on the grounds of the Department of Forests and Lands. Students learned environmental practices on fieldtrips, tourists came to the site, bringing in funding, and the local community visited to learn about indigenous plants (Filho, de Carvalho, and Hale 1998, 131). The successes of this program and others like it need continued support on all levels.

For environmental programs to reach the most individuals, cooperation locally, regionally and internationally is critical. Working with others globally, small island nations can share resources and utilize knowledge and previous experience from others.

International partnerships allow everyone interested in a particular issue an opportunity to join the discussion (Filho, de Carvalho, and Hale 1998, 14).

Youths' opinions regarding the environment on island nations are similar. While local traditions and cultures are unique, many have common perceptions of environmental problems. Studies by Fien, Yencken, and Sykes (2002, 5), carried out in the Asia Pacific, provide strong support for a global philosophy of nature. Their conclusions suggest local traditions or global approaches alone will not assist nations with the complex challenges of environmental degradation. While students in Fiji wanted to participate in environmental improvement, they preferred community contributions over individual action. Pacific traditions encourage cooperation over individualism. Yet the education system did not teach much local environmental information (Fien, Yencken, and Sykes 2002, 136).

When UNESCO started SIV, it aimed to address these concerns. Exchanges regarding experiences between small islands in different regions have been central since its inception. One of the goals of SIV is to improve the daily lives of inhabitants and the environment without sacrificing the ability of future generations to do the same (UNESCO 2004a, 1). As a result, young people's needs are prevalent not only in SIV but throughout all of UNESCO's initiatives. The SIV YIF is one activity designed to empower youth and begin dialogs to promote their participation in solving problems their countries face.

Last, technology is a primary tool in realizing these objectives. "The Web has an immediacy and an emergent quality that you would never get through a textbook"

(Wheeler and Bijur 2000, 206). Students on small islands lose any sense of isolation by connecting with others and sharing their similarities. It is through computer driven education, the youth of these nations may collaborate on issues.

C. Objectives

This study assessed the SIV Youth Internet Forum program for UNESCO and furthered understanding regarding the effectiveness of youth forums for environmental education. The specific objectives of this study were:

1. Determine whether the global forum has encouraged the students to modify their local behavior and utilize suggestions derived from the internet discussions
2. Inventory the technology used to connect to the forum and assess whether the level of connectivity plays a role in the students' opinions of the forum
3. Assess the possible correlation between the students' location and their survey answers
4. Survey students' opinions on global communication, the forum, the internet, and the effectiveness of the forum on sharing environmental issues and solutions
5. Evaluate the Small Island Voice Youth Internet Forum and surrounding activities to determine next steps for the forum

These five objectives provided UNESCO with quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate the forum and gain insight into the benefits and areas for improvement. The data documented youth opinions of communication on internet forums as well as quantified any benefit as an educational tool. It detailed the role of technology for successful implementation of internet forums. Best methods to create internet-based

forums for environmental curricula provided valuable suggestions for starting additional forums in other locations. Last, these objectives added to the literature regarding internet forums as environmental educational curricula tools.

II. RELATED RESEARCH

A. Internet Programs

Internet resources for environmental education, EE, have increased dramatically (Moore and Huber 2001, 21). Environmental education objectives such as providing issue-oriented curricula, emphasizing hands-on learning, and instilling environmental awareness are being met in many EE Internet programs. Research on Internet resources is expansive. The following are some examples similar to the SIV YIF.

Moore and Huber's research examines several Internet resources in use. One program from their investigation, Global Learning and Observation Program (GLOBE), requests students retrieve environmental data and publish their results on the Internet site (Moore and Huber 2001, 23). "It increases student awareness of their environment from a scientific viewpoint, without advocacy relative to issues" (GLOBE 2004). Administered by governmental agencies and partners, there are more than 4,000 schools in 60 countries utilizing its resources. An international cadre of scientists reviews the data submitted by the students and helps them assess their findings. While both SIV YIF and GLOBE encourage students to engage in environmental activities, GLOBE is a much more prearranged program with teacher training models and K-12 curriculum. SIV YIF's flexible discussion format can be used to enhance curriculum, but not to replace it.

International Education and Resource Network, IEARN, provides a venue for students to participate in programs with other schools (IEARN 2004). Teachers and pupils log on to forums and connect with others to collaborate on a wide range of topics. It is designed to create opportunities for youth to get involved in community issues with

the intent they will mature to be civic minded individuals. IEARN does not limit topics to science and environmental issues. All areas of curriculum are available. With a reported 20,000 schools in over 110 countries, IEARN hopes to unite young people for the common good. SIV YIF and IEARN share a forum based platform. However, like GLOBE, IEARN's programs require funding to participate. In addition, students are brought together based on the project rather than similar location.

The Young Masters Program for sustainable development, YMP, focuses on environmental strategies and uses the Internet to connect students (McCormick et al 2005, 1107). It is broken down into three pieces: studying environmental topics, learning preventative strategies, and applying knowledge to real situations. The students in the program, ages 15 to 18, then share their results with other schools via the Internet. Evaluative surveys and interviews show positive results. The YMP has increased environmental knowledge, improved communication skills, and created friendships through the Internet (McCormick et al 2005, 1109). While more structured than SIV YIF, YMP has similar issues. The evaluation recognizes time constraints and integration into regular curricula difficulties. Technical problems and funding issues restrict access at times.

Taking IT Global.org is an online community allowing youth to get involved in a wide range of activities, both local and international (TakingITGlobal 2005). The website offers students a featured theme to discuss every second month. In addition, it houses a global gallery encouraging individuals to post creative articles or express their thoughts relating to the theme. TakingITGlobal's educational programs assist teachers by

describing ideas to increase technology and opening global topics for discussion in the classroom. TakingITGlobal is partnering with another UNESCO initiative, Youth Visioning. Like SIV YIF, Youth Visioning is specific to small islands. It promotes proposals on how island youth can envision the sustainable development of their nation. However, SIV YIF is a forum primarily for the classroom.

These programs encourage participation, discussion, and learning via the Internet. Similar to SIV YIF in many ways, there are a few core differences. SIV YIF's bulletin style format allows islands with the slowest connections access. This is critical for SIV since many of the developing states SIV services are extremely isolated. SIV YIF's flexibility is comparable to other forums, but SIV YIF is used in the classroom to supplement teachings and engage students in directed debate. Last, SIV YIF does not charge its users a fee. In fact, most of the schools and islands participating receive money or computers to participate.

B. Computer-mediated Communication

Several studies examined the benefit of computer-mediated communication, CMC, for educational purposes. Macchia and Freedman (2004, 200) reviewed the online forum for the library education internship program at the University of Alabama. The purpose of the forum was to allow students and faculty to share updates and compare ideas on a range of topics. Because internships were conducted in the field, the forum gave the students an opportunity to garner advice from faculty and lessen feelings of isolation. The discussion boards permitted students the freedom to respond online in the forum or directly via email since email addresses were required during registration.

Three main points were discussed. The forum connected library media specialists with others in the field from the internship program. This, in turn, linked theoretical topics with practical experience. Also, the forum provided educators an opportunity to offer some online instruction. The additional virtual component assisted students while in the field when contact with instructors may have been minimal. Last, new professional relationships were a primary benefit of the forum. Interchanges amongst individuals with diverse backgrounds created a basis for collaboration where, otherwise, one may not have existed (Macchia and Freedman 2004, 208).

Garrison, Anderson, and Archer reviewed the keys for an educational experience and analyzed computer conferences. They considered cognitive, social, and teaching presence as main elements. From these findings, they concluded computer conferencing created “educational communities of inquiry” (Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000, 103). However, additional research was needed to transfer the information to a text-based environment. While their research was inconclusive for text based education like the SIV YIF, their elements for success can be used as guidelines for designing a productive educational experience via the computer.

A number of aspects reviewed by Northover (2002) were essential for the success of discussion boards. Students needed to understand the value, provide feedback, and feel safe. The best discussion boards also challenged participants and held their interest. The environment online encouraged individuals and was realistic at all times. He also recognized the positive atmosphere generated by an accomplished moderator.

Northover recommended three components for assessing discussion boards.

Effective evaluations reviewed the quantity (expected postings), the quality (expected contents, and timeliness (expected due date) (Northover 2002). These suggestions concluded that discussion boards worked best in the educational arena when they were properly planned and implemented. This research reviewed all the plans and workings of the SIV YIF forum based on Northover's tips.

Morse (2003, 37) reviewed asynchronous learning in multicultural environments. Listed advantages of CMCs were education independent of time and location, and improvements in quality. While difficulties such as varying technology skills and language differences were considered drawbacks, the overall benefit outweighed the negative comments. Morse (2003, 40) asserted that culture played a role in determining how CMCs were perceived.

His analysis, through exploratory research, indicated people's cultural backgrounds affected the priority of benefits and challenges posed. Participants, previously categorized by cultural background, ranked the pros and cons of CMCs as well as compared CMCs with face to face learning. Cultures were organized by low context learners and high context learners. Low context learners emphasized learning outcomes as opposed high context learners which centered on teaching inputs. The groupings showed different emphases in responses. The low context group ranked personal convenience as the main advantage of CMCs over face to face instruction while the latter preferred the ability to say what they thought (Morse 2003, 47). Like Morse, the evaluation of the SIV YIF in this research concluded regions helped determine attitudes regarding computer-assisted education.

Redfern and Naughton (2002, 201) examined collaborative virtual environments (CVEs) in the context of distance education. Their research explored the need for communication and a sense of community in distance education. Collaboration for problem solving benefited from social discussions. Some of the traditional online tools included both asynchronous and synchronous instruction. Email and bulletin boards (asynchronous) were recognized to be important to distance education. Students liked the ability to construct and edit their thoughts and opinions on their own time. However, drawbacks included a limited social presence and a lack of nonverbal communication.

They proposed CVEs further enhanced communication and community in distance education. CVEs were described as “virtual places in which people can meet and interact with others” (Redfern and Naughton 2002, 204). They varied from 3D to text based environments. Debate, brainstorming, and project collaboration were techniques that were most effective in the CVE format. In the CVE, users provided more than text. Their personalities and identities were expressed, enriching the experience.

In looking at their research, SIV YIF could utilize CVEs in the future. While the current format is a forum/bulletin style, perhaps the next iteration of the forum would be enhanced by CVEs. Since there are varying types, a streamlined text based CVE with minimal graphics would be best. Internet connectivity on many islands hinders the advancement of the look and feel of the forum.

C. Environmental Education Programs

Research conducted by Volk and Cheak (2003, 12) examined an environmental education program on the island community of Molokai, Hawaii. Students (5th and 6th

grade) participated in a course designed to review local environmental problems and, upon learning the issues, derived solutions. Volk and Cheak assessed impacts from this program on three variables: the student, the parents, and the community.

Their methodology, along with the research in this thesis, utilized both quantitative and qualitative data. As part of their evaluation, existing measurements were used to determine student environmental literacy and critical thinking skills. This study primarily evaluated opinions of the SIV YIF program and whether students thought they had learned. Therefore, it only surveyed what students felt about their experience. Both programs supplemented the quantitative information with qualitative interviews. For Volk and Cheak (2003, 14), the qualitative data, producing nine themes, provided the framework for the findings (2003, 14). This evaluation contextualized findings based on the objectives of the research and the quantitative factors and validated findings with the qualitative data.

Another study assessed a Scarlet Macaw conservation program in Costa Rica (Vaughan et al 2003, 12). Its purpose was to analyze the success of the environmental program using quantitative methods. Limited data existed on measuring the transfer of information from program participants (3rd and 4th grade students) to adults. Therefore Vaughan et al included tests designed for a parental group as well as the students. Pretests and posttests were given to both groups. In addition, a control group was implemented (2003, 15). This research, on the SIV YIF, questioned participants on whether they spoke to their parents about the forum, but did not request information directly from the adults.

The conclusions from Vaughan et al made recommendations for environmental projects and their assessments. They suggested pretests and posttests for evaluating projects. They also recognized the value of outdoor activities in conjunction with classroom discussion (Vaughan et al 2003, 18). Students in the scarlet macaw program benefited from field trips to enhance the learning.

Krapfel agreed that local ecological investigations deepened environmental education programs (Smith and Williams 1999, 47). By incorporating outdoor activities into study, he found children continued observations and experiments on their own time. Teachers concurred with Krapfel. The children learned more about the environment surrounding the school, and they saw stronger interest in the corresponding topics in the classroom. Some schools that did not have a water source nearby to participate in the Adopt A Stream program. Instead of opting out of field study, teachers taught students about other environmental concerns in their vicinity.

During interviews, this evaluation discovered comparable results. For example, in Fiji, some schools used the forum to discuss water issues. As part of their science curriculum, Fijian teachers worked with NGO Live and Learn on their RiverCare program. Students sampled local water sources and analyzed results (Figure 6). They commented about their water concerns on the SIV YIF. Combining fieldwork with classroom study and writing an article for the forum created an effective teaching model. Students retained the information from this cross disciplined research.

Monroe and Kaplan stated environmental education program assessments need to be valuable to the teacher and relevant (Mrazek 1993, 145). In their review, well thought

out research goals aligned with program plans provided the most complete evaluation. In order to explore the details of a program as well as review the overall model of a particular program, both qualitative and quantitative methods added understanding. In addition, stakeholders internalized the findings when presented as examples in the analysis (Mrazek 1993, 149). The intent of this research was to maximize the usefulness of the findings by incorporating these suggestions.

III. METHODS

A. Study Sites

This study had multiple study sites. Twelve island nations participated in the SIV Youth Forums. Figures 1 through 3 depict the islands involved in the Small Islands Voice Youth Internet Forum project:

1. The Caribbean: *the Bahamas, Cuba, Dominica, San Andres Archipelago, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines*
2. The Indian Ocean: *the Maldives, Seychelles, and Mauritius*
3. The Pacific Ocean: *Fiji, Palau, and the Cook Islands*

An attempt was made to evaluate each island in person or through mail and telephone communication. Schools on nine of the twelve island nations responded (Table 1). (Tables are located after the illustration section of this thesis) They utilized the Youth Internet Forum for discussions as part of their educational curricula. Teachers and NGO representatives played a critical role in maintaining interest in the forums and ensured students logged on and either wrote reports or commented on other islands' disseminated information. However, each of these study sites utilized the forum differently based on the environment of the school, the capabilities of the technology, and the amount of time devoted to the forum by the teachers. The forum at the study sites was incorporated into the classroom without distracting from the schools' daily requirements.

B. Study Population

The study population for this research included all the students at each school

involved in the SIV Youth Internet Forum. Across the globe, approximately 400 students have been introduced to the forum over the past three years, though the level of involvement has varied. Students were not selected at random. All students participating received a survey either in person or through the mail. Six of the twelve countries that participated (Bahamas, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Fiji, and the Cook Islands) were assessed by personal visits, while the other six (Cuba, San Andres Archipelago, Maldives, Mauritius, Palau, and the Seychelles) were mailed surveys with follow-up telephone calls.

C. Research Design and Data Collection

1. Countries Visited

Six of the twelve countries' programs were evaluated in person (Appendix A). For each island, the main contact was interviewed prior to any school visits to understand how that particular program operated. The SIV Youth Internet Forum was managed differently on each country. For example, St. Kitts and Nevis had two to three children represent a school on the forum (Figure 7), while in Fiji, entire classes participated (Maynard 2005). At one school in Fiji, students received individual internet access as a bonus (Figure 8). The coordinator was asked open-ended qualitative questions regarding the internet forums and to evaluate the success of the past few years.

At each site, school names and the numbers of participating students were confirmed. Students who were involved in the program filled out a questionnaire. In addition, students were interviewed. Teachers and any school representatives who assisted with the forums were interviewed as well.

The technology used to access the internet forum was documented. Discussions with the technology expert validated the hardware, software and networking equipment used by the students. Computer software at the locations was also inventoried. The researcher previously secured Symantec Corporation's assistance. Symantec Corporation offered free computer software to the schools such as internet anti-virus software based upon the schools' needs.

2. Countries Not Visited

Six countries did not have personal visits. The survey questionnaire (Appendix B), personally handed out at country visits, was mailed to the participating schools and a request made to have the country SIV Internet Forum coordinator or teacher administer the survey to the students. Schools initially had eight weeks to return completed surveys, but eventually received more time. In actuality, only three countries (San Andres, the Maldives, and the Seychelles) responded. Cuba, Mauritius, and Palau did not participate. NGO representatives, SIV Internet Youth Forum coordinators, and specific teachers were contacted by telephone. The interview questions were the same as the country visit questions (Appendix C).

3. UNESCO Program Directors and Forum Administrators

The director of the SIV Youth Internet Forum for UNESCO and other key UNESCO representatives were interviewed either in person or via the telephone. The program administrators requested this data to determine the future of the forum (Cambers 2004). It was important to understand the goals of the program and how it was perceived by the directors. The intent was compared to the actual usage via the findings of this

research.

4. Documentation

The survey had both a structured answer format as well as narrative answers (Appendix B). Both agree/disagree style questions and directed open-ended questions can be most useful for program evaluation and program improvements. Demographic items were at the end of the survey (Posavac and Carey 1997, 82).

At each site, a technology inventory was conducted and the level of technology at the site was categorized (Table 2). Based on tests run at each site, a value was given to the level of technology and connectivity to the Internet. A value of one meant a higher level of technology and faster connectivity than a value of three.

Qualitative data was obtained from several sources. The researcher interviewed SIV coordinators, teachers, technology experts, and students. Demographic information was addressed first. This helped build rapport with the individuals (Posavac and Carey 1997, 83). Structured questions were used, but since flexible interviews prevailed, conversations varied (Appendix C).

Several pieces of equipment were used for the data collection. At each site visit, photographs were taken of the location and the computer forum technology. Participants were also photographed upon consent. Group photos predominated, but occasionally individual photographs were taken. A digital audio recorder documented the qualitative interviews. A lap top computer for downloading pictures and entering survey answers was brought to each site. A locked backpack stored the surveys to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of the data collected. The backpack remained in the

researcher's possession. Only the researcher and her assistant had access to the backpack.

Finally, archival data was collected at each country visited. Libraries and educational sites provided additional information regarding the environmental education programs in the local school systems.

D. Data Analysis

Survey data collected was entered into a database and analyzed with the computer program SPSS (originally named Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). For questions one to twenty, number values were entered to express the students' opinions. Strongly Agree was given a value of one, and Strongly Disagree equaled five (Appendix B). Questions 21 to 25 were open-ended questions. Answers were entered into SPSS by creating categories and assigning values (1 if the student mentioned this category as an answer or 0 if he/she did not). The researcher and her assistant read every survey independently and assigned each written answer to an appropriate category. Any discrepancies in category selections were discussed and the best category was selected. For example, a student wrote drinking water as an environmental concern. One researcher categorized this answer as Water Issues while the other selected Environmental Issues – Other. After discussion, drinking water was grouped with water issues.

Frequencies, factor analysis, and chi square tests were performed and correlations between the variables were analyzed. For the frequencies, cross tabulation and chi square level of significance tests, survey responses for questions one to twenty were recoded.

Strongly Agree was merged with Agree, and Strongly Disagree was merged with Disagree. Low frequencies in the extreme categories made it necessary to recode the questions. This made the percentages and counts more statistically reliable and easier to read.

Demographic information also determined whether gender, region, and age affected how respondents answered the survey. Age was recoded. Rather than listing each age individually, ages were grouped (twelve and under, thirteen to sixteen, seventeen and older). This breakdown represented primary level students, mid range secondary students and final year students. In addition, the values from the technology inventory were entered into the database as an additional variable to check for significance.

The recordings of the qualitative interviews were transcribed. All field notes were coded to look for similarities in answers. Opinions that were mentioned in multiple interviews were highlighted and numbered. Themes and evaluative conclusions from respondents' answers were documented. Preliminary impressions were discussed with key stakeholders in the program. This provided feedback and allowed those familiar with the program to clear up any misunderstandings in the data (Posavac and Carey 1997, 225).

The qualitative interviews added breadth to the research and "filled in the gaps." This section of the report was lengthy. However, capturing individual comments, as well as recognizing similarities in respondents' answers, provided the most complete program evaluation.

IV. RESULTS

A. Survey Respondent Profile

One hundred and eighty-five surveys were collected from nine of the twelve countries in the program. Six of the nine countries had surveys administered by the researcher. San Andres Archipelago, the Seychelles, and the Maldives submitted surveys through the mail. Surveys were collected from February 2005 to October 2005.

As listed in Table 3, 25% of the respondents represented the Caribbean region, 41.7% the Indian Ocean region, and 33.3% the Pacific Ocean region. The individual country frequencies are found in Table 4. In Dominica only one student who graduated completed the survey. This was due to the loss of faculty in the program and technical issues that made it difficult to restart the forum program again (Burton-James 2005). Dominica's mountainous terrain and yearly hurricanes made maintaining equipment and internet connectivity complicated (Figure 9). The Seychelles submitted one survey for an entire class. As a result, the survey was only counted as one individual.

The age of the respondents ranged from ten to twenty years of age. Sixty-six percent were between thirteen and sixteen years of age. Tables 5 and 6 provide a complete age breakdown. Ages were categorized by twelve and under, thirteen to sixteen, and seventeen and older. There were a larger number of female students (63.1%) than male (36.9%) (Table 7).

B. Frequencies

Frequency counts and percentages were calculated for all the questions of the survey. Tables 8 through 27 list the results. Overall, students' opinions of the forum

were positive. When asked questions about the future of the forum, 90.2% felt the forum should continue at their school (Table 25), 93.0% thought more students should use the forum (Table 26), and 93.5% agreed that the forum is a good way to talk to other students (Table 27). Most (81.3%) found the topics interesting (Table 22), although 32.1% agreed that some of the messages on the forum are difficult to read (Table 15).

Questions regarding usage showed while students found the forum easy to use (71.0%) (Table 8), only 43.6% know how to put messages on the forum (Table 11). When asked if they would use the forum if it were not part of their school activities, only 39.6% responded that they would (Table 13). The qualitative interviews discovered that many students used the forum in class, but only a few students or teachers posted articles and replies. Also, many students did not have computers or internet at home, so the forum was not available to them outside school.

Three questions pertained to the environment. Only a small percentage (18.1%) had not learned more about the environment from the forum (Table 21), and 73% said it had changed the way they cared for the environment at home (Table 20). In addition, 72.1% had tried an idea to improve the environments on their island homes (Table 19).

Respondents wrote in their own answers for questions twenty-one through twenty-five (Appendix B). Tables 28 through 60 list the results. In order to quantify these results, answers were categorized. The top three environmental concerns of the students were pollution (general pollution, air or noise) (48%) (Table 28), litter and garbage/keeping the island clean and beautiful (44.1%) (Table 29), and water issues such as pollution and dirty water (31.8%) (Table 30). Deforestation and forest management

garnered 31.3% of the responses (Table 31). In reviewing these results, many of the students listed more than three answers. Several wrote down non-environmental answers (13.4%) (Table 37). There were also cases where the student listed two concerns that were in the same category. For example, students may have listed both ozone layer depletion and global warming. Because the statistics listed either a 1 for selected or a 0 for not selected, these two answers were only counted as one concern (selected) in the analysis. The frequencies and percentage tables listed whether a category such as water pollution was written down (selected) or not.

Many questions examined the preferences of the respondents. When asked to write down their favorite topic on the forum (Tables 38 through 44), 39% liked discussing island life and culture (Table 38). While this looked like the highest percentage, it should be noted that topics relating to the environment were not listed in one table. Roughly 30% listed the word “environment” as their favorite topic (Table 39) while 19.2% stated topics surrounding water, water pollution, and marine life (Table 41). Other environmental issues such as garbage (8.5%) and pollution (14.1%) were written down often enough to create a separate category (Tables 45 and 43). Again, students wrote down more than one favorite topic.

What students liked most and least about the forum elicited a wide range of responses. Communicating with others and learning about topics from other youths were respondents’ favorite things about the forum (53.3%) (Table 46). Other reasons such as “It’s informative” (26.7%) and talking about environmental issues (18.2%) were listed (Tables 47 and 49). For least favorite things on the forum, students wrote “nothing”

(31.8%) (Table 51). The need for better communication about the program and faster response time from students on the forum (26.4%) were issues as well (Table 52).

Last, when requested to list ideas to make the forum better, 39.7% felt the forum would benefit from more youth participating (Table 56). This question received a lot of suggestions that did not fall into a specific category easily. Trips to visit participants in other countries, more solution oriented articles, and continued contact with students after they graduate are examples of responses that were in this category. For this reason, the category “Other” has 34.6% (Table 57). The researcher can be contacted to receive a more detailed list of all answers.

C. Factor Analyses

Factor analysis was conducted on the first twenty questions of the survey to determine if certain opinions could be grouped or clustered together. If respondents had a tendency to agree with one question, did they also agree with another question? The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity (Table 61) found that these questions could be factored. Communalities were created using principle component analysis (Table 62). Six components or factors received an Eigenvalue greater than one (Table 63). For simplicity, each question was applied to one component only. When the questions were sorted by highest value in the component matrix, three of the components had only one or two questions. As a result, only three components/factors remained in the analysis (Table 64). If the highest value fell into one of the three components eliminated, the second highest or the highest negative correlation was used.

Factor one, Level of Engagement, had the most dependent variables grouped together. These questions tended to favor the students' positive opinions of usage, level of involvement and interest. This grouping had high forum commitment and environmental dedication. For example, they learned more about other countries and changed how they cared for the environment. Nine of the twenty questions were in the level of engagement factor, which made sense since the frequency results of the survey overall were positive.

Factor two, the Level of Ambivalence, tended to have a lower opinion. While they logged on outside of school and made new friends on the forum, they conversely found messages harder to read and did not think the forum should continue at their school. They did not want more students on the forum and felt the forum was not a good way to talk to others. Seven questions are included in factor two.

Factor three, the Level of Indifference, showed moderate levels of interest and involvement. This grouping thought the forum was easy to use and to share problems, but did not think students responded fast and would not use it outside of school. This grouping did not try ideas on the forum which is the opposite of factor one. There were four questions grouped in this component.

Responses to questions in all three factor results were cross tabulated with the independent variables of region, age and gender. Pearson Chi-square tests analyzed each of these correlations and tested for significance. This analysis recognized both region and age as the strongest predictors in how most of the questions were answered in all factors. All percentages discussed in the following sections are statistically significant

($P \leq .05$).

D. The Level of Engagement

Of the nine dependent variables in factor one, eight correlated with a significance level of less than 0.05 for age, eight for region, and only one for gender (Tables 65 through 91). So what did this mean?

1. Age as a Predictor for Factor One Variables

Two themes emerged when age was cross tabulated with the Level of Engagement factor. The youngest group (12 and younger) showed the highest percentage of don't know/not sure. When asked if they checked for messages, knew how to put messages on, tried ideas on the forum, changed how they cared for the environment, found the topics interesting, talked to their parents about the forum, had NOT learned more about the environment, and knew more about other countries as a result of the forum, the youngest group responded with don't know, not sure more than the other two age groups. For example 54.5% of the respondents twelve and younger replied don't know/not sure to whether they had tried ideas on the forum (Table 78).

As the students aged, the percentage of agreement increased. Only 8.3% of the 12 and younger group checked the forum for new messages compared to 43.6% for ages 13 to 16, and 60.4% for the 17 and older group (Table 66). This was also the case for several other variables. For example, 83.3% of the oldest age group changed how they care for the environment (Table 81), while 68.9% of 13 to 16 year olds and 58.3% of the 12 and younger group changed.

2. Region as a Predictor for Factor One Variables

The Pacific region showed the most enthusiastic results. In seven of the eight questions, the Pacific region garnered the highest positive feedback. When asked if they know more about other countries as a result of the forum, 91.7% of respondents from the Pacific agreed compared to 63.5% in the Indian Ocean and 75.6% in the Caribbean (Table 71). The six other statements were: I know how to put messages on the forum, I tried ideas on the forum, I changed how I care for the environment, I learned more about the environment, topics on the forum are interesting, and I talk to my parents about the forum. The statement, “Others on the forum have the same concerns as I do” was the exception. Roughly eighty-two percent, 82.2%, agreed in the Caribbean compared to 78% in the Pacific and 50.7% in the Indian Ocean (Table 74).

The Indian Ocean respondents exhibited lower percentages in the agreement category and higher disagree or don’t know percentages. In seven out of eight statements, the Indian Ocean students were the least enthusiastic about the forum. 25.7% said they had not learned more about the environment (Table 83), and 32% did not change how they cared for the environment (Table 80). Only 17.8% in the Caribbean and 10% in the Pacific did not change. However, the Indian Ocean respondents (70.3%) did try more ideas on the forum than the Caribbean respondents (52.3%) (Table 77).

The Caribbean region responses typically fell between the other two regions. For five of the eight statements, this region had the highest percentage of “don’t know/not sure” responses. Twenty-one percent did know if they had learned more about the environment (Table 83), 22.7% were not sure if the topics were interesting (Table 86),

and 20.5% did not know if they had tried ideas from the forum (Table 77). The statement, “I talk to my parents about the forum,” (Table 89), showed the Caribbean more balanced across the three categories. The Pacific Region agreed the highest – 72.9%; the Indian Ocean showed the same trend but at lower percentage levels. The Caribbean was more evenly distributed across the three categories (45.5% agree, 25% don’t know, 29.5% disagree).

3. Gender as a Predictor for Factor One Variables

Females tried ideas on the forum to improve their environment at home. Comparatively, males (29.7%) had not tried ideas from the forum (Table 79). This was the only question that showed gender with a significance level less than 0.05.

E. The Level of Ambivalence

Seven dependent variables were grouped in factor two. Age correlated with five of these variables, region with six, and gender with one (Tables 92 through 112).

1. Age as a Predictor for Factor Two Variables

A few similarities emerged when looking at age. As with the level of engagement, high percentages of the younger group responded to the questions don’t know/not sure. Fifty percent did not know if the messages were hard to read (Table 96), 66.7% circled don’t know/not sure when asked if they made new friends (Table 99) and if they did not like the topics (Table 102). In fact, 0% agreed to have made new friends in the younger group compared to 41.2% for the 13 to 16 year olds and 35.4% for 17 years and older (Table 99).

Age was significant when asked if the students logged on outside of school. In

this case, the youngest group and the oldest group answered similarly with 66.7% of each group disagreeing. Thirteen to sixteen year olds were logging on more than any other age group (43.6%) (Table 93). Also, when respondents were asked whether the forum should continue (Table 105), 100% of the youngest group and 100% of the oldest group agreed. The older students liked the topics the most (83.3%) (Table 102).

2. Region as a Predictor for Factor Two Variables

When looking at each of the questions that correlated with region in factor two, no themes immediately emerged. Each question needed to be looked at individually to see what the frequencies and percentages stated. For example, reviewing logging on outside of school (Table 92), region had a Pearson Chi-Square level of significance of .000. The Caribbean and the Indian Ocean respondents answered similarly, split between agree and disagree. However, 68.3% in the Pacific region disagreed. The question asking if they did NOT like topics on the forum also had a significance of .000 (Table 101). But in looking at this question, the Indian Ocean deviated from the other two countries by 17.3% agree to dislike the topics. The Pacific islanders liked the topics and disagreed with this statement 83.3%. Since the Pacific islanders liked the topics, it is no surprise that they did not find the messages hard to read (75%) (Table 95). Along those lines, in the Indian Ocean, 50% agreed that the messages were hard to read which could explain why they also had the highest percentage disliking the topics. When asked if more students should use the forum, all three regions agreed, however in the Indian Ocean 9.3% circled don't know/not sure and 6.7% disagreed whereas none disagreed in the other regions (Table 107).

3. Gender as a Predictor for Factor Two Variables

With a significance level of 0.10, both male and females agreed that more students should use the forum, but 7.6% of males disagreed. No females disagreed (Table 109).

F. The Level of Indifference

Factor three was the smallest with four questions clustered together. Opinions as to whether the forum was easy to use, the students responded quickly, problems were easy to share and respondents would use the forum if it were not part of school were represented in this factor. Region was significant for all four of these variables. Age was significant for ease of use and problem sharing. Gender was not significant in this factor (Tables 113 through 124).

1. Age as a Predictor for Factor Three Variables

The oldest respondents did not find the forum as easy to use as the younger groups. Although the two oldest age groups agreed (79%) that it was easy to share problems on the forum (Table 123), the 17 and older age category circled disagree for ease of use 21.3% (Table 114). Only 3.4% (13 to 16 year olds) and 0% (12 and younger) disagreed. In fact, 91.7% of respondents 12 and younger found the forum easy to use.

2. Region as a Predictor for Factor Three Variables

In this category, the Pacific region differed from the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean for three of the questions. When asked if the forum was easy to use, the Caribbean and Indian Ocean answered similarly with over 73% percent agreeing. While 63.8% agreed in the Pacific, 17.2% disagreed whereas the Caribbean and Indian Ocean

only had 6.7% and 2.7% (Table 113). The Pacific Ocean also differed from the other regions with regards to opinions on student response times. Fifty-six percent (56%) thought response times were fast in the Pacific, compared to the 34.9% percent in the Caribbean and 33.3% in the Indian Ocean (Table 116). Finally, all regions may have agreed that it was easy to share problems (69.0% in the Caribbean to 81.3% in the Indian Ocean), but 20% of the Pacific islanders disagreed while the other regions had only 5% disagree (Table 122).

Fewer respondents who resided in the Indian Ocean would use the forum outside of school. Only 25.7% agreed in the Indian Ocean (Table 120), while 51.2% in the Caribbean and 46.7% in the Pacific agreed.

G. Questions 21 to 25

Region had the strongest correlation for the open-ended questions of the survey. Some of the variables had significant levels less than 0.05 for age as well. Gender did not play a significant role in how these questions were answered. Tables 125 through 153 list the results. For a complete list of crosstabs and chi-square tests, contact the researcher.

1. Region as a Predictor

The regions had many different environmental concerns. When asked to list out their environmental concerns, over half the respondents in the Pacific considered deforestation to be one of their top three environmental concerns while only 26.7% in the Indian Ocean and 14% in the Caribbean listed it as an issue (Table 127). The Caribbean and the Pacific both considered beach and land pollution to be an issue (20.9% and

18.6%) while the Indian Ocean students did not (5.3%) (Table 125). Conversely, 44% in that region felt strongly about greenhouse gases (44.0%) while the other regions only mentioned it 7% of the time (Table 126).

Money and finance (30%) and water issues (33.3%) were favorite topics in the Pacific more so than in other regions (Tables 128 and 1313). The Indian Ocean respondents favored general environmental issues (49.3%) (Table 130).

When asked about the best and worst of the forum, the Pacific region liked the communication with other youths the best (70.0%) (Table 132). However, they listed technology issues as one of their biggest problem with the forum, along with communication about the program. And their idea for improving the forum was to increase internet access (Table 137). Interestingly, this group had the lowest connectivity ranking to the Internet than the other regions (Table 2).

The Caribbean and the Indian Ocean had additional suggestions to improve the forum. The Caribbean students requested better communication from the program and faster replies from the students the most (Table 134). They suggested improving the look and feel of the forum over the other regions as well. The Indian Ocean students mentioned topics and content as things they did not like about the forum (31.1%) (Table 133).

2. Age as a Predictor

The youngest age group listed litter and garbage as their top environmental concerns (91.7%) (Table 144). In addition, this group listed litter and garbage as one of their favorite topics on the forum (Table 150). Over half of this age group suggested

improving the look of the forum. Many requested pictures of the other students in the qualitative interviews.

Greenhouses gases ranked highest with the secondary students aged 13 to 16 (31.4%) over the other age groups (Table 143). Litter and pollution were among the highest concerns as well. The environment topped the list as favorite topic. And when asked ways to improve the forum, 45.9% suggested more youth on the forum (Table 151).

The oldest group (17 and older) was more concerned about deforestation and forest management (Table 145). Money and finance and was listed by the older students (22.9%) more than the other two groups as a favorite topic (Table 147). While they agreed with the other two age groups that the look of the forum could be improved and more youth should be involved, they also requested better internet access.

3. Gender as a Predictor

There were significant differences between males and females on several questions. More males selected greenhouse gases and endangered species as one of their environmental concerns (Tables 138 and 139). When asked what topic they liked best, 10 percent more women wrote down money and finance topics (Table 140). Twenty-three percent, 23%, of the women listed talking about environmental issues as what they liked most while only ten percent of the males responded similarly. Finally twenty percent more males stated better internet access would enhance the forum (Table 142).

H. Qualitative Findings

Five themes emerged from the interviews conducted. Funding issues, program maintenance, forum interfaces, training, and teacher participation were mentioned in most interviews conducted. Students, teachers, and coordinators expressed their opinions regarding the forum. As interviews were coded for key phrases, these five themes developed.

Funding. At each location or through phone interviews, funding issues were mentioned by the teachers and coordinators. Coordinators commented that regular visits to the schools participating were not possible on limited money. For example, in the Cook Islands, the coordinator was unable to fly to many schools on the different islands atolls. In addition, many of the schools received computers from UNESCO for the program but commented that maintenance funding was problematic. On the island of Abaco in the Bahamas, many students were unable to read posts due to the hurricane season breaking their Internet connectivity (Figure 10). Also, the only teachers who received a stipend (which was minimal) were in St. Kitts and Nevis where the coordinator compensated the teachers for travel expenses to meet with the students since their program was conducted on Saturdays outside of regular class time. On all the other islands, the teachers went on the forum without any payment. The forum was seen as over and above all their regular duties, but most commented that their interest was high enough to continue without any additional income.

Program Maintenance. There were many comments regarding how the program was maintained. While it benefited most of the schools to have the program flexible in

order to tailor it to their particular needs, there was some confusion on how the program worked. There were many questions on the length of the program, how often to review the forum and how best to use it in the classroom.

Forum Interfaces. When asked about the forum itself, most felt the forum needed updating. In areas where the Internet connectivity was not an issue, students found the flat format boring. Most requested photos, links for web pages to schools, live chat, and a look and feel similar to other web programs such as Yahoo! and MSN Messenger Forums. Those who had poor connectivity requested the forum remain streamlined as much as possible with links to photos so that when available they could retrieve more of the advanced user interface information.

Training. Continuity in training and best methods for use was requested throughout the interviews. Teachers wanted ways to incorporate it more into their curricula. A teacher forum was mentioned in several of the interviews as a way to share ideas. Interviewees requested regular visits and training material from the coordinators. The coordinators, in turn, wanted additional support from UNESCO. Many of the countries were interested in advertising the forum and SIV activities through the local media, but wanted more guidance from UNESCO on the best ways to achieve that objective.

Teacher Participation. Last, of all the components of the forum, teacher involvement was the most critical variable for the success of the program. For example, teachers at Bequia Community High School in St. Vincent and the Grenadines worked together to integrate the forum in several subjects (Figure 11). The teachers were

interested in the program and took the additional time to make it a success and their students were enthusiastic regardless of Internet connectivity or the look and feel of the forum. When the teachers found great value in the forum, the students followed. This showed that the forum was driven primarily at the teacher level. When a teacher left a school, the forum discontinued. This happened at several locations. The students remembered the forum and enjoyed it, but no longer participated.

V. DISCUSSION

The preceding results prove there is value in maintaining the forum. The information can be used to enhance the forum and improve the experience for the users. The analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, provides insight into the current workings of the forum and issues that need to be addressed. Survey results and the evaluative themes generated from the interviews offer important conclusions regarding the objectives of this research.

A. Local Behavior

Did the forum encourage the students to modify their local behavior and utilize suggestions derived from the Internet discussions?

The forum promoted action. Overall, student survey responses indicated participants tried ideas that were discussed on the forum (Table 19). In addition, 73% commented they changed the way they cared for the environment at home (Table 20). Regionally, the Pacific Islands modified their behavior (86.7%) over the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean (Table 80). However, 70.3% in the Indian Ocean and 52.3% in the Caribbean agreed their behavior had changed. All regions showed the forum was a positive influence on their behavior about their environment. When questions were correlated with age, the oldest participants utilized the suggestions more than the youngest. Young individuals answered questions pertaining to this topic “Don’t Know” the most (54.5%) (Table 81).

Interviews confirmed the survey answers. In St. Kitts, students started a newsletter in 2004 entitled, “Small Islands Voice: Back Chat Newsletter.” Published once a quarter, the newsletter expanded on issues related to the SIV YIF and encouraged

youth to get involved in activities around St. Kitts. Content included a “Dear Sita” column, poems written by youth, and relevant topics that faced the youth of the island. Local ground activities on St. Kitts and Nevis also included a candlelight vigil for tsunami victims in the Indian Ocean. Having conversed with many students on the SIV YIF, the students in St. Kitts decided to hold a public prayer for the countries affected by the tsunami in December of 2004. In addition, students in St. Kitts met with students in Nevis and for field trips and discussions regarding SIV actions.

Several other islands shared examples. The Bahamas, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Cook Islands had schools involved in another UNESCO SIV initiative named the Sandwatch Program. Through Sandwatch, students and teachers scientifically evaluated beach environments. In each of these locations, students learned skills in science, math, art, and other subjects to enhance the program (UNESCO 2005a). Many of these schools wrote about their findings on the SIV YIF and in turn read about field studies on other countries. In the Bahamas, the teacher received ideas about ways to improve her lesson plans. Students said that reading the forum and the activities conducted by others caused them to be more aware and tried to improve their environments.

Fiji’s Rivercare program similarly engaged students in field work monitoring water quality around the islands. They also wrote about their conclusions on the SIV YIF, and all students worldwide interviewed, expressed positive feedback regarding the dissemination of ideas and suggestions. The SIV YIF, when coupled with a classroom activity that engaged students in local “ground” activities, produced the strongest results

for behavior modification. While this was not required by UNESCO, schools combined these activities with positive outcomes.

Sixty-three percent of students polled talked to their parents about the forum (Table 24). Students agreed their parents were interested in topics facing other islands and suggestions for improving island living. As a result of family discussion, one student commented his family worked toward reducing daily trash. They now reuse many plastic containers once tossed in the garbage.

Students and teachers provided suggestions to increase positive behaviors at home. First, there needed to be more suggestions on the forum. If more students participated in the program, more articles would be discussed. Also, if each article had listed a problem solving technique, the forum would have been more solution oriented rather than just conversing. This would have resulted in attempts to solve more problems locally. Teachers recommended incentive programs for students that initiated change in their daily living. Students could write up responses or articles about their new activities. All of these ideas could increase knowledge, communication, and action on the islands.

B. Technology

Did the level of connectivity play a role in the students' opinions of the forum?

Regardless of connectivity, students had an overwhelmingly positive experience. Opinions of the forum were extremely favorable. High percentages wanted the forum to continue at their school (90.2%) and felt it was a good way to talk to others (93.5%)(Tables 25 and 27). Students in most countries complained about the speed of the internet connection and lack of adequate computers and equipment. In addition,

natural disasters such as hurricanes and cyclones disrupted internet services for many islands. Figure 12 depicts a once lush beachfront property reduced to a foundation and barren trees as a result of the 2005 cyclones that plagued the Cook Islands. Yet, despite these drawbacks, they did not show disdain for the program.

Technology rankings verified the interview findings. Tables 154 through 160 list all technology ranking statistics. As previously stated, a technology ranking was assigned to the schools visited in person based on the speed of the Internet connection (Table 2). A value of one meant a fast connection, 2 a medium, and 3 a slow connection. Islands not visited were excluded from these statistics. However, phones interviews qualitatively confirmed findings on those islands. Sixty percent of the islands visited, all in the Pacific, had a slow connection (Table 154). Yet, when asked if they checked the forum for new messages, 55.9% with a slow connection checked versus only 7.7% with a fast connection (Table 156). In addition, more respondents knew how to put messages on the forum with a slow connection (56.7%) than a fast one (33.3%) (Table 157).

Opinions regarding logging on to the forum produced interesting results. The students with the average connection speed logged on the most (48.1%) (Table 155). Students with an average ranking typically had computers and internet at home and were encouraged to read the forum there. However, only 15.4% of the fastest connections used the forum outside of class. This could be because the Bahamas program (with the highest speed) was also the youngest group, and many explained they do not use the computer at home often.

Response time was also discussed. In interviews, most students complained

response time was slow. Many stated disappointment that comments about their articles did not arrive in a timely manner. In Fiji, one class mentioned that a posted article did not receive comments from any island. They felt their hard work was not valued. Survey results were mixed. Fifty-five percent, 55%, with a slow connection agreed students responded fast, but 41.7% with a fast connection also agreed (Table 158). Interviews explained the discrepancy. In schools where the forum was checked frequently, most students commented the response time was slow. Consequently, programs that logged on once a week or less received timely messages.

Some results from the survey were expected. Those with the slowest connection suggested an increase in Internet access to make the forum better (24.6%) (Table 160). Average and fast connections did not request improved connectivity. However, the students with the best connection speed wanted enhancements such as pictures, .avi files, additional graphics, and live chat (58.3%) (Table 159). During interviews, students with the slowest connections thought photos would make the forum more interesting, but preferred pictures on a separate webpage via a hyperlink. Visual enhancements could then be downloaded if time permitted or at a location with a faster connection such as an Internet Café in the main town. The current straight text format enabled those with the worst connections to participate. Any future webpage modification from UNESCO needs to consider the technical challenges on these islands.

Students with technical difficulties enjoyed the forum. On the island of Mangaia in the Cook Islands, Mangaia College recently gained access to the Internet. Past participants (Figure 13) faxed articles and comments to Rarotonga. The coordinator for

the program posted the students' comments and faxed back any new postings from others. Now that they have a dial up Internet connection, students eagerly await logging on regardless of speed at school.

This study validated Spennemann's research (2004). Spennemann concluded the Pacific Islands' technical constraints exacerbate the digital divide between these culturally diverse nations and the rest of the world. While his study focused solely in the Pacific, many of the remarks apply to island nations as a whole. Telecommunication monopolies on many islands continue to drive Internet access fees beyond the reach of many inhabitants (Spennemann 2004, 60). This research agreed the Pacific Island nations have the greatest divide to overcome. However, all islands face many technology challenges. This study also found telco monopolies charging high fees in the Cook Islands and a few islands in the Caribbean.

Efforts to address the digital divide are twofold. Physical access and information literacy continue to segregate these Small Island Developing Nations from others. Programs like the SIV YIF help offset the cost of the Internet through funding and equipment from UNESCO. In addition, students are educated on Internet usage, breaking the information illiteracy for younger generations. Continued support for programs that focus on lessening the divide is imperative for their ability to communicate globally.

C. Location

Did the students' locations affect their survey answers?

Region had a strong correlation with many survey answers. All regions valued the forum and wished for its continuation but at varying levels of enthusiasm. In

addition, technological differences between the regions affected how respondents answered questions. Several of the environmental concerns differed by region as well. While many island challenges are similar regardless of location, the students had unique responses by region regarding the topics and the content of the forum. Yet the themes from the qualitative interviews crossed all regions. All regions recognized the importance of the teacher in keeping the forum going. Program management suggestions were made at each location. In the Cook Islands, one coordinator preferred a more structured timeline. The flexibility and ongoing nature of the forum was not conducive to many lesson plans. While in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, the teachers dictated how the forum was best used in the classroom and set a timeline appropriate with their curricula.

The Pacific Islanders were the most positive regarding the forum. However, attitudes, related to ease of use and the ability to share problems, were lower. As mentioned earlier, the Pacific region suffered from slow connections and computer issues more so than the other two regions and their answers are a result of their limitations. Even though the Indian Ocean percentages were the lowest of the three regions, the responses were still positive. The Caribbean region expressed interest in maintaining the forum as well. When asked in interviews about what they liked most, participants talked about connecting with other students around the world.

There were a wide range of environmental concerns and topics. Each region listed environmental topics of interest but there were some differences. In the Indian Ocean, students were most concerned about greenhouse gases. The Caribbean

participants thought garbage and beach pollution were key problems. Deforestation and water issues topped the list for the Pacific Islanders. Non environmental topics such as money and finance were also mentioned. Island life and culture were a favorite in the Caribbean, but all regions mentioned the importance of native dance, language, and heritage. Many were interested in the traditional knowledge found on other islands.

Students wanted more interaction with others. One suggestion was to have opportunities to meet others in the program. Unique to the Caribbean, the different nations are in close proximity. A thirty minute plane ride takes a person to another country while in Fiji, and Cook Islands, that same distance merely takes you to another island in the country. It would be easier to arrange meetings in the Caribbean as a result of their location. However, in the Indian Ocean, groups have organized because interest was so high. Students in the Seychelles arranged an exchange with others in the Maldives in 2004. They raised funds for airfare and shared a joint project on reducing litter. More projects, similar in nature, were requested.

D. Student Feedback

What were the students' opinions on global communication, the forum, the internet, and the effectiveness of the forum on sharing environmental issues and solutions?

Opinions were positive on the key forum agenda items. When asked what they liked most about the forum, each region listed communicating and learning from other youth (Table 132). In fact 93% thought more students should use the forum (Table 26). Interviews confirmed the results. All participants were excited learning about life in the other regions. They also wanted more islands in their locale to join. Students from Fiji

wanted to see if life was similar in Tonga. St. Kitts and Nevis wondered if St. Lucia shared their views. Respondents seemed genuinely intrigued by life outside their island homes. In Fiji, this researcher explained driving in the snow after receiving numerous questions. The forum broadened the youths' perspectives and inspired them to learn more about global issues.

Several examples showed the interest the students had in the forum. St. Vincent and the Grenadines went to an Internet Café to log on to the forum and read postings. Even through the schools difficult technical issues, the students found value in the forum. In the Cook Islands, one teacher allowed students to log on at her house so that they could use the Internet. And in Fiji, when the teacher could not access the Internet, she faxed articles and responses to the SIV YIF forum coordinator so that her class could contribute.

Students liked the forum for sharing environmental issues. When asked about the topics they enjoyed the best, respondents listed the environment as well as many specific environmental problems. Water pollution, litter, beach erosion, greenhouse gases, and the effects of tourism were a few of the topics listed. Students on Abaco Island in the Bahamas talked about their beaches and historic lighthouse which attract many tourists to their island (Figure 14). Recognizing tourism as important to the economy, solutions to lessen their impact were important to all regions.

E. Limitations

Data collection for the island nations not being visited in person was conducted through the mail and telephone. Surveys from three countries were not returned and

therefore were not included in the analyses. In addition, phone interviews were at the discretion of the interviewee. Phone interviews were not completed on each island that participated.

The results of this study pertained to the SIV Youth Internet Forum and its associated activities only. The sample of students and schools was not random due to the nature of the program and the size of the study population. Some conclusions about Internet forums on particular small island nations may be possible, but this research was focused on one particular Internet program on specific small island nations, and it may not be expanded to either the entire population of one island nation or to other internet forum environmental education programs. It did add to the literature on internet forums as environmental education tools, but it did not draw conclusions on other programs of this nature. Several of the countries that participated were interested in expanding the internet forum to additional schools, and this research could aid them in getting started with recommendations for success, but only for suggestions. The findings from the analyses would not expand to other schools in any particular country.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Next Steps

What are the next steps for the Small Island Voice Youth Internet Forum?

Each phase of the forum is built on the previous. From a few interested countries to twelve with more interested in joining, the forum continues to gain momentum. The overall positive feedback from students, teachers, and coordinators helps drive participation. Suggestions from this assessment may further enhance the program. This research makes recommendations in the areas of communication, age groupings, web enhancements, local activities, and advertising to improve the forum. Users may benefit from several of these ideas.

Separate forum by age. Some of the content is not fitting for the youngest participants according to teachers. At primary schools, teachers review forum messages prior to sharing them in class. Topics such as murder and teen pregnancy are out of the scope of learning for primary students, and teachers are uncomfortable taking class time to answer questions related to inappropriate responses. In addition, a few messages on the forum are difficult to read. While teachers like using the forum as a lesson in vocabulary, at times, the extra amount of work to convey forum responses is too time consuming.

Primary school is structured differently than secondary school. At many schools, young students have one teacher educating all subjects. In secondary education, teachers focus on one topic and the students attend classes by multiple teachers. This makes the forum more difficult to integrate for secondary teachers. In cases where the primary

school has more than one teacher per grade level, the curriculum is still more flexible than secondary schools. Examinations are based on strict curricula and there is little room left for extra activities. On the other hand, primary teachers can integrate the forum across the disciplines easier. For example, in the Bahamas, one teacher provides the students lessons about beach erosion by taking the students to the beach. She creates math problems related to erosion. For art, students draw pictures of what they witnessed on their field trip. Finally, students write an article on all their discoveries and post it on the web.

Modify the look. The flat text file format needs to be updated. Most students, especially in the Caribbean, want a forum similar to other programs they are familiar with such as Microsoft Network. Even in the Pacific with the slowest connections, many participants know about compressed file sizes. Photos and graphics can be optimized so that even those with the slowest connections can still enjoy richer content. Rules for posting photos would ensure large files are excluded. There are web development techniques, such as Cascading Style Sheets, CSS, that will improve the look and feel of the site without negatively impacting performance.

Other enhancements that require faster connections can be on a different website with links provided on the forum. Currently SIV has videos, pictures, and audios located on <http://www.unesco.org/csi/smis/siv/about.htm>. Each region has web pages and youth have their own section as well. This is a great way for teachers to gain access to happenings on other islands. However, there are no links from the SIV YIF forum to these sites. Students that wish to include a video or something bandwidth intensive with

their article should be allowed to expand their input. A link could be provided to take users with faster connections to the additional information.

Improve communication. There are many areas of communication that can be improved. UNESCO's SIV directors have many programs to maintain. In addition SIV YIF coordinators on the islands promote many educational programs and initiatives. Additional communication and regular updates would create a more structured program that coordinators could sustain. Some island coordinators are confused regarding program specifics. An additional dedicated UNESCO representative would provide continuity to the program. Funding and time are issues all islands and UNESCO face. The UNESCO coordinator would have time to ensure the forum is being utilized as a moderator, respond to questions, send emails, and pose questions to youth when responses from other islands is delayed. Having a forum moderator aids in continuity while allowing flexibility in the island programs. Part of the responsibilities would include public relations to expand the program and highlight outstanding articles in the media.

Communicating what happened with previously obtained feedback is also imperative. Many island coordinators, teachers, and students want to know when suggestions are used. When they are not implemented, reasons and rationale for decisions needs to be disseminated. If improvements are integrated into the program, giving credit to the individual(s) with the proposal is a good way to keep people interested in the program.

Teachers have a lot of questions regarding how others use the forum. They also

need additional training from the coordinators. A teacher forum would enable coordinators to post training materials for teachers and communicate what other schools on the island are doing. Internationally, a teacher forum has many of the same benefits as the student forum. Collaboration, information sharing, idea swapping, and creating joint projects, could all be on a teacher forum. In Bequia, ten teachers work on the forum together. The SIV YIF is completely integrated into the curricula. They can be a model for how other schools can expand the program. A teacher forum would be the logical place for dispersing tips.

Students want more information regarding the program as well. There is a desire have more responsibility. Several pupils want a club dedicated to SIV YIF on campus. When teachers leave schools, students would still be able to participate rather than waiting for a new teacher to learn about the forum. In addition, students from many grades would participate in a club. Now, when students graduate, teachers and coordinators have to train a new group to the forum. Having multiple grades allows knowledge transfer to happen at the student level alleviating teachers.

What happens after graduation? Students want to know what is next, how to stay involved, and to keep in touch with their new contacts around the globe. Information can be propagated to graduating seniors about ways to stay involved. There is an adult forum SIV provides for example. In addition, there are many young adult initiatives as part of UNESCO's youth visioning for island living that would naturally flow from the SIV YIF. Most students have email accounts that can be shared with other students in the program with their consent. Last, as an added value, certificates for participation would validate

the new computer skills students gained using the forum and act as a reminder of their involvement.

Increase local activities. One purpose of the forum is to improve local behavior for the environment. While this research shows some improvement, a more proactive forum encouraging activities would further this goal. Future topics can link regions more efficiently. For example, students in the Indian Ocean list coral reefs as one of their environmental concerns. Coral reefs are critical in many other islands. Figure 15 depicts a coral reef that surrounds the island of Mauke in the Cook Islands. These reefs protect land and provide critical habitat. Local field trips documenting reefs and sharing problems and solutions is one way to bring islands together.

Many of the forums are being taught primarily in science courses. In order to expand the forum in schools and use it across subjects, forum topics could explore similarities in island history. Past colonization and independence are histories many islands share. In addition, islands in each region have UNESCO World Heritage Sites (Figure 16). St. Kitts Brimstone Hill Fortress is one example. As part of the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, these sites are recognized globally as important places to preserve (Kuijper 2003, 270). Sites are categorized as natural, cultural or cultural landscapes (both). Students could review the selection criteria and write articles surrounding their unique locations. Pictures would bring the topic alive for others reading the stories.

Island sustainability and preserving culture are two topics being discussed in the fifth phase. Living on an island and sharing its culture are favorite subjects for the

participants. Students want to learn about tribal customs and how knowledge is persevered. One example is found on Bequia, in St. Vincent and the Grenadines (Figure 17). Model ship making is an occupation that is passed down from father to son. There are many traditions and occupations on each island. From Cook Island dance to Dominican traditional language, today's youth balance time honored customs with modern day systems.

Increase interaction on the forum by having more groups engage in a similar environmental activity and share their experiences. As stated in the research, students retained knowledge when field trips and activities were combined with classroom learning. Joining the forum with a hands-on project and sharing experiences with other islands would improve students' environmental wisdom.

More advertising. Utilizing the media more on each island would benefit the forum. While some islands have been successful at educating the public about the SIV YIF, many have not taken advantage of this opportunity. St. Kitts, for example, broadcasts student opinions on the radio as well as on television via weekly youth programs. In addition, students write a newsletter about youth happenings. The Cook Islands News newspaper publishes a full page every Saturday for youth titled Small Islands Voice. The forum would be the logical place for these islands to share their ideas about gaining media support. Coordinators could discuss ideas with each other on their own section of the forum. Filho and Bandiera (1995, 59) recommend diversifying information through multiple media sources, providing time-relevant material, and selecting material cautiously to prevent misinformation.

B. Conclusions

This thesis was a formative evaluation. Its primary purpose was to strengthen the services the forum provides through constructive feedback. Several of the findings were expected. Overall positive remarks by students, teachers, and coordinators were anticipated by the researcher. Students enjoyed learning in a nontraditional format and liked the camaraderie with others in different countries. The vast majority wanted additional students and schools on the forum. Upon reviewing previous comments and reading the forum on the web, it was evident most participants valued their involvement.

Several findings were unexpected. While it was known that technical difficulties existed, it was surprising that connectivity did not play a part in participants' reaction to the forum. In fact, areas with the lowest connection speeds favored the forum the most. Upon examining reasons why this might be, another conclusion was drawn. The principle element for success is the role of the educator. One request in the interviews recognized the criticalness of the teacher and suggested the forum move toward a more student-motivated format. When students graduate, teachers can enlist new youth, but when a teacher left, the program discontinued. While increasing student ownership of the forum will assist in continuity, as long as the forum remains tied to classrooms, it will need enthusiastic teachers.

The forum is important to the schools, students, and teachers involved. While there are areas to be improved upon, UNESCO's program enhances learning, broadens viewpoints, and exposes youth to global issues. Recommendations based on the findings would further its usefulness and open learning and communication beyond normal land

barriers. Environmental problems and solutions on small island states benefit from the collaboration this forum brings.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1 Caribbean island states undertaking activities within the Small Island Voice Project (Reprinted from UNESCO, 2004a. Small Islands Voice).

Figure 2 Indian Ocean island states undertaking activities within the Small Island Voice Project (Reprinted from UNESCO, 2004a. Small Islands Voice).

Figure 3 Pacific Ocean island states undertaking activities within the Small Island Voice Project (Reprinted from UNESCO, 2004a. Small Islands Voice)

Figure 4. Muri Beach, Rarotonga Island, Cook Islands.

Figure 5. Rosalie Beach, Dominica. Habitat for leatherback sea turtles.

Figure 6. Riverside community, Viti Levu, Fiji

Figure 7. Students and teachers representing multiple schools, St. Kitts.

Figure 8. Author administering survey. Vanua Levu Island, Fiji

Figure 9. Mountainous island of Dominica

Figure 10. Hope Town School, Abaco Island, Bahamas.
Primary student posing with computer.

Figure 11. Teachers participating in SIV YIF at Bequia Community H.S.

Figure 12. Effects of Cyclone in 2005, Mangaia Island, Cook Islands.

Figure 13. Mangaia Island, Cook Islands.

Figure 14. Lighthouse, Abaco Island, Bahamas.

Figure 15. Mauke Island, Cook Islands.

Figure 16. Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park, St. Kitts
Added to UNESCO World Heritage List in 1999

Figure 17. Bequian model ship makers. St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

TABLES

Table 1. Participating Schools in the SIV YF Survey

Region	Country	School Name
Caribbean	Bahamas	Hope Town Primary
Caribbean	Dominica	Marigot Secondary School
Caribbean	San Andres Archipelago	Luis Amigo
Caribbean	San Andres Archipelago	Sagrada Familia
Caribbean	St Vincent and the Grenadines	Bequia Community High School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	Sandy Point High School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	Washington Archibald High School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	Basseterre High School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	St. Teresa's Convent High School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	Lyn Jeffers Secondary School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	Charlestown Secondary School
Caribbean	St. Kitts and Nevis	Gingerland Secondary School
Indian Ocean	Maldives	Baa. Atoll Education Centre, B.Eydhafushi
Indian Ocean	Maldives	GDh. Education Centre, GDh. Thinadhoo
Indian Ocean	Maldives	Madhurasathul Ahmadhiyya, Male
Indian Ocean	Seychelles	Praslin Secondary School
Pacific Ocean	Cook Islands	Avarua Primary School
Pacific Ocean	Cook Islands	Mangaia College
Pacific Ocean	Cook Islands	Nikao Maori School
Pacific Ocean	Cook Islands	Mauke School
Pacific Ocean	Cook Islands	Nukutere College
Pacific Ocean	Fiji	All Saints Secondary School
Pacific Ocean	Fiji	Assemblies of God High School
Pacific Ocean	Fiji	Drasa Secondary School
Pacific Ocean	Fiji	Nadi Muslim College
Pacific Ocean	Fiji	Rakiraki Public High School

Table 2. Countries and Technology Rankings

School/Town	Country	Ping (www.nerdsonice.org)	Tracert to www.nerdsonice.org	Tech Rank
Hopetown	Bahamas		29 ms 30 ms 30 ms to nearest substation	1
Hopetown	Bahamas		32 ms 31 ms 31 ms to nearest substation	1
Basseterre, Ministry of Education	St. Kitts and Nevis	201 ms 214 ms 206 ms	Last Hop #25 316ms 320ms 319ms 6	2
Nevis Distance Learning Center	St. Kitts and Nevis	209 ms 429 ms 319 ms	Last Hop #14 622 ms 450 ms 207 ms [66.175.39.248]	2
Nevis Distance Learning Center	St. Kitts and Nevis	227 ms 558 ms 424 ms	Last Hop #14 622 ms 450 ms 207 ms [66.175.39.248]	2
UNESCO office in Dominica (Roseau)	Dominica		Last Hop #25 444ms 432ms 427ms 206.48.61.202	2
ACS Internet Cafe (Bequia)	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	222 ms 240 ms 229 ms	Last Hop #13 181ms 181ms 205.214.205.4 -	2
ACS Internet Cafe (Bequia)	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	215 ms 221 ms 218 ms		2
ACS Internet Cafe (Bequia)	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	216 ms 220 ms 218 ms		2
ACS Internet Cafe (Bequia)	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	215 ms 225 ms 219 ms		2
Nikao-Maori School (Rarotonga)	Cook Islands	904 ms 3595 ms 2157 ms	Last Hop #14 1036 ms 1206 ms 1115 ms [66.175.39.248]	3
Nuketele College (Rarotonga)	Cook Islands	n/a		3
Avarua School	Cook Islands	n/a		3
Mangaia College	Cook Islands	n/a	Last Hop #16 1603 ms 2012 ms 1473	3
Mauke	Cook Islands	Request Timed out	Last Hop #19 *timed out *timed out 3020 ms [66.175.39.248]	3
All Saints Secondary	Fiji	328ms 465ms 393ms	Last Hop #17 530 ms 343 ms 1093 ms	3
All Saints Secondary	Fiji	n/a	n/a	3
Nandi Muslim College	Fiji	n/a	n/a	3
Drassa Secondary School	Fiji	388 ms 416 ms 403 ms	Last Hop #18 *timed out 429 ms 428 ms [66.175.39.248]	3
Rakiraki Public High School	Fiji	309 ms 941 ms 583 ms	Last Hop #18 725 ms 734 ms 319 ms [66.175.39.248]	3

Table 3. Frequency - By Region

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Caribbean	45	24.3	25.0	25.0
	Indian Ocean	75	40.5	41.7	66.7
	Pacific	60	32.4	33.3	100.0
	Total	180	97.3	100.0	
Missing	9	5	2.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 4. Frequency – By Country

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bahamas	13	7.0	7.2	7.2
	St.Kitts/Nevis	19	10.3	10.6	17.8
	Dominica	1	.5	.6	18.3
	St.Vincent	7	3.8	3.9	22.2
	San Andre	5	2.7	2.8	25.0
	Seychelles	1	.5	.6	25.6
	Maldives	74	40.0	41.1	66.7
	Cook Islands	13	7.0	7.2	73.9
	Fiji	47	25.4	26.1	100.0
	Total	180	97.3	100.0	
Missing	99	5	2.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 5. Frequency - Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10	4	2.2	2.2	2.2
	11	5	2.7	2.8	5.0
	12	3	1.6	1.7	6.7
	13	16	8.6	8.9	15.6
	14	29	15.7	16.2	31.8
	15	37	20.0	20.7	52.5
	16	37	20.0	20.7	73.2
	17	30	16.2	16.8	89.9
	18	17	9.2	9.5	99.4
	20	1	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	99	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 6. Frequency - Recoded Ages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	12 and Younger	12	6.5	6.7	6.7
	13 through 16	119	64.3	66.5	73.2
	17 and Older	48	25.9	26.8	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	99	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 7. Frequency - Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	113	61.1	63.1	63.1
	Male	66	35.7	36.9	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 8. Frequency – The forum is easy to use

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	130	70.3	71.0	71.0
	DK/NS	37	20.0	20.2	91.3
	Disagree	16	8.6	8.7	100.0
	Total	183	98.9	100.0	
Missing	9	2	1.1		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 9. Frequency – I log on the forum outside of school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	70	37.8	38.3	38.3
	DK/NS	28	15.1	15.3	53.6
	Disagree	85	45.9	46.4	100.0
	Total	183	98.9	100.0	
Missing	9	2	1.1		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 10. Frequency - I check the forum for new messages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	86	46.5	47.0	47.0
	DK/NS	31	16.8	16.9	63.9
	Disagree	66	35.7	36.1	100.0
	Total	183	98.9	100.0	
Missing	9	2	1.1		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 11. Frequency - I know how to put messages on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	79	42.7	43.6	43.6
	DK/NS	56	30.3	30.9	74.6
	Disagree	46	24.9	25.4	100.0
	Total	181	97.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	2.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 12. Frequency - Other students respond fast on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	76	41.1	41.8	41.8
	DK/NS	58	31.4	31.9	73.6
	Disagree	48	25.9	26.4	100.0
	Total	182	98.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	1.6		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 13. Frequency - I would use the forum if it were not part of school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	72	38.9	39.6	39.6
	DK/NS	43	23.2	23.6	63.2
	Disagree	67	36.2	36.8	100.0
	Total	182	98.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	1.6		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 14. Frequency - It is easy to share problems on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	142	76.8	78.0	78.0
	DK/NS	24	13.0	13.2	91.2
	Disagree	16	8.6	8.8	100.0
	Total	182	98.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	1.6		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 15. Frequency - The messages from older kids are hard to read on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	59	31.9	32.1	32.1
	DK/NS	28	15.1	15.2	47.3
	Disagree	97	52.4	52.7	100.0
	Total	184	99.5	100.0	
Missing	9	1	.5		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 16. Frequency - I have made new friends on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	69	37.3	37.3	37.3
	DK/NS	30	16.2	16.2	53.5
	Disagree	86	46.5	46.5	100.0
	Total	185	100.0	100.0	

Table 17. Frequency - I know more about other countries as a result of the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	139	75.1	75.5	75.5
	DK/NS	18	9.7	9.8	85.3
	Disagree	27	14.6	14.7	100.0
	Total	184	99.5	100.0	
Missing	9	1	.5		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 18. Frequency - Others have same the concerns I do on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	124	67.0	68.1	68.1
	DK/NS	35	18.9	19.2	87.4
	Disagree	23	12.4	12.6	100.0
	Total	182	98.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	1.6		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 19. Frequency – I have tried ideas on the forum for the environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	132	71.4	72.1	72.1
	DK/NS	17	9.2	9.3	81.4
	Disagree	34	18.4	18.6	100.0
	Total	183	98.9	100.0	
Missing	9	2	1.1		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 20. Frequency – I changed how I care for environment as a result of the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	135	73.0	73.0	73.0
	DK/NS	12	6.5	6.5	79.5
	Disagree	38	20.5	20.5	100.0
	Total	185	100.0	100.0	

Table 21. Frequency – I have NOT learned more about environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	33	17.8	18.1	18.1
	DK/NS	15	8.1	8.2	26.4
	Disagree	134	72.4	73.6	100.0
	Total	182	98.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	1.6		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 22. Frequency – The topics on the forum are interesting

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	148	80.0	81.3	81.3
	DK/NS	22	11.9	12.1	93.4
	Disagree	12	6.5	6.6	100.0
	Total	182	98.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	1.6		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 23. Frequency – I did NOT like the topics on the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	20	10.8	10.8	10.8
	DK/NS	53	28.6	28.6	39.5
	Disagree	112	60.5	60.5	100.0
	Total	185	100.0	100.0	

Table 24. Frequency – I talk to my parents about the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	113	61.1	62.8	62.8
	DK/NS	15	8.1	8.3	71.1
	Disagree	52	28.1	28.9	100.0
	Total	180	97.3	100.0	
Missing	9	5	2.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 25. Frequency – The forum should continue at my school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	166	89.7	90.2	90.2
	DK/NS	13	7.0	7.1	97.3
	Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	184	99.5	100.0	
Missing	9	1	.5		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 26. Frequency - More students should use the forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	172	93.0	93.0	93.0
	DK/NS	8	4.3	4.3	97.3
	Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	185	100.0	100.0	

Table 27. Frequency – The forum is a good way to talk to others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	173	93.5	93.5	93.5
	DK/NS	7	3.8	3.8	97.3
	Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	185	100.0	100.0	

Table 28. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Pollution, General, Air, Noise

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	93	50.3	52.0	52.0
	Selected	86	46.5	48.0	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 29. Frequency – Environmental Concern - Litter, Garbage,
Keeping the island clean and beautiful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	100	54.1	55.9	55.9
	Selected	79	42.7	44.1	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 30. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Water Pollution, Dirty
water

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	122	65.9	68.2	68.2
	Selected	57	30.8	31.8	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 31. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Deforestation, Forest management, cutting trees

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	123	66.5	68.7	68.7
	Selected	56	30.3	31.3	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 32. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Waste, Solid, Chemical, Industry waste, waste management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	129	69.7	72.1	72.1
	Selected	50	27.0	27.9	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 33. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Endangered species,
Over-fishing, coral reefs, poaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	137	74.1	76.5	76.5
	Selected	42	22.7	23.5	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 34. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone
layer, global warming, sea level rise

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	138	74.6	77.1	77.1
	Selected	41	22.2	22.9	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 35. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Environmental Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	143	77.3	79.9	79.9
	Selected	36	19.5	20.1	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 36. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Beach/Land Pollution, Marine and Coastal Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	155	83.8	86.6	86.6
	Selected	24	13.0	13.4	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 37. Frequency - Environmental Concern - Non Environmental Answer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	155	83.8	86.6	86.6
	Selected	24	13.0	13.4	100.0
	Total	179	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	6	3.2		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 38. Frequency – The topic I like best - Island Life, Living, Culture

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	108	58.4	61.0	61.0
	Selected	69	37.3	39.0	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 39. Frequency – The topic I like best - Generic Environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	123	66.5	69.5	69.5
	Selected	54	29.2	30.5	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 40. Frequency – The topic I like best - Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	141	76.2	79.7	79.7
	Selected	36	19.5	20.3	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 41. Frequency – The topic I like best - Water, Water Pollution, Marine Life, Beaches

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	143	77.3	80.8	80.8
	Selected	34	18.4	19.2	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 42. Frequency – The topic I like best - Environmental (Other than Pollution, Garbage, and Water)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	144	77.8	81.4	81.4
	Selected	33	17.8	18.6	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 43. Frequency – The topic I like best - Pollution (General Pollution/Non Water Pollution)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	152	82.2	85.9	85.9
	Selected	25	13.5	14.1	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 44. Frequency - The topic I like best - Money/Finance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	158	85.4	89.3	89.3
	Selected	19	10.3	10.7	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 45. Frequency – The topic I like best - Garbage/Litter

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	162	87.6	91.5	91.5
	Selected	15	8.1	8.5	100.0
	Total	177	95.7	100.0	
Missing	9	8	4.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 46. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – Communicating and learning from other youth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	77	41.6	46.7	46.7
	Selected	88	47.6	53.3	100.0
	Total	165	89.2	100.0	
Missing	9	20	10.8		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 47. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – It is informative

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	121	65.4	73.3	73.3
	Selected	44	23.8	26.7	100.0
	Total	165	89.2	100.0	
Missing	9	20	10.8		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 48. Frequency - What I like most about the forum - Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	129	69.7	78.2	78.2
	Selected	36	19.5	21.8	100.0
	Total	165	89.2	100.0	
Missing	9	20	10.8		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 49. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – Environmental Issues

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	135	73.0	81.8	81.8
	Selected	30	16.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	165	89.2	100.0	
Missing	9	20	10.8		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 50. Frequency - What I like most about the forum – The topics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	148	80.0	89.7	89.7
	Selected	17	9.2	10.3	100.0
	Total	165	89.2	100.0	
Missing	9	20	10.8		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 51. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum – “Nothing”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	88	47.6	68.2	68.2
	Selected	41	22.2	31.8	100.0
	Total	129	69.7	100.0	
Missing	9	56	30.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 52. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - poor communication with coordinators, students do not respond quickly

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	95	51.4	73.6	73.6
	Selected	34	18.4	26.4	100.0
	Total	129	69.7	100.0	
Missing	9	56	30.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 53. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	105	56.8	81.4	81.4
	Selected	24	13.0	18.6	100.0
	Total	129	69.7	100.0	
Missing	9	56	30.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 54. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Content related concerns and topics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	108	58.4	83.7	83.7
	Selected	21	11.4	16.3	100.0
	Total	129	69.7	100.0	
Missing	9	56	30.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 55. Frequency - What I do not like about the forum - Technology related answers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	114	61.6	88.4	88.4
	Selected	15	8.1	11.6	100.0
	Total	129	69.7	100.0	
Missing	9	56	30.3		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 56. Frequency – My ideas to make forum better - Include more youth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	94	50.8	60.3	60.3
	Selected	62	33.5	39.7	100.0
	Total	156	84.3	100.0	
Missing	9	29	15.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 57. Frequency – My ideas to make forum better - Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	102	55.1	65.4	65.4
	Selected	54	29.2	34.6	100.0
	Total	156	84.3	100.0	
Missing	9	29	15.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 58. Frequency – My ideas to make forum better - Look of forum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	130	70.3	83.3	83.3
	Selected	26	14.1	16.7	100.0
	Total	156	84.3	100.0	
Missing	9	29	15.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 59. Frequency – My ideas to make forum better - better Internet access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	132	71.4	84.6	84.6
	Selected	24	13.0	15.4	100.0
	Total	156	84.3	100.0	
Missing	9	29	15.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 60. Frequency – My ideas to make forum better - more topics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	140	75.7	89.7	89.7
	Selected	16	8.6	10.3	100.0
	Total	156	84.3	100.0	
Missing	9	29	15.7		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 61. Factor Analysis - KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sampling Adequacy

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.755
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	829.132
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

Table 62. Factor Analysis – Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Forum is easy to use	1.000	.601
Log on outside of school	1.000	.638
Check forum for new msgs	1.000	.538
Know how to put msgs on	1.000	.482
Other students respond fast	1.000	.687
Use forum if not part of school	1.000	.490
Easy to share problems	1.000	.445
Msgs from older kids hard to read	1.000	.746
Made new friends on forum	1.000	.612
Know more about other countries	1.000	.698
Others have same concerns	1.000	.689
Tried ideas on the forum for env	1.000	.480
Changed how I care for env	1.000	.701
Have NOT learned more about env	1.000	.549
Topics on forum are interesting	1.000	.575
Did NOT like topic on forum	1.000	.632
Talk to my parents about forum	1.000	.510
Forum should continue at school	1.000	.630
More students should use forum	1.000	.634
Forum is a good way to talk	1.000	.694

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 63. Factor Analysis - Total Variance Explained

Comp.	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.446	22.229	22.229	4.446	22.229	22.229
2	2.552	12.758	34.987	2.552	12.758	34.987
3	1.612	8.059	43.047	1.612	8.059	43.047
4	1.280	6.398	49.445	1.280	6.398	49.445
5	1.138	5.690	55.135	1.138	5.690	55.135
6	1.004	5.022	60.157	1.004	5.022	60.157
7	.926	4.631	64.788			
8	.884	4.420	69.208			
9	.773	3.866	73.074			
10	.703	3.514	76.588			
11	.648	3.240	79.828			
12	.606	3.028	82.856			
13	.580	2.902	85.758			
14	.553	2.765	88.523			
15	.526	2.629	91.152			
16	.456	2.281	93.433			
17	.421	2.105	95.538			
18	.344	1.720	97.257			
19	.290	1.449	98.706			
20	.259	1.294	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 64. Factor Analysis - Component Matrix (a)

	Components in Bold Are Included in the Factor		
	Engagement	Ambivalence	Indifference
Forum is easy to use	.453	.229	.534
Log on outside of school	.475	.507	.314
Check forum for new msgs	.556	.314	-.152
Know how to put msgs on	.552	.226	.326
Other students respond fast	.218	.008	-.409
Use forum if not part of school	.350	.160	-.513
Easy to share problems	.357	.192	.373
Msgs from older kids hard to read	-.148	.626	.096
Made new friends on forum	.431	.509	-.100
Know more about other countries	.639	.079	-.042
Others have same concerns	.446	-.133	.192
Tried ideas on the forum for env	.459	-.074	-.431
Changed how I care for env	.690	-.199	-.308
Have NOT learned more about env	-.467	.281	.116
Topics on forum are interesting	.709	.042	.060
Did NOT like topic on forum	-.439	.441	-.151
Talk to my parents about forum	.589	.249	-.262
Forum should continue at school	.421	-.636	.128
More students should use forum	.341	-.575	.223
Forum is a good way to talk	.215	-.487	.126

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 6 components extracted.

Table 65. Correlation – Region and Check forum for new messages

(a) Crosstab

			Check forum for new msgs			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	18	11	16	45
		% within Region	40.0%	24.4%	35.6%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	30	15	29	74
		% within Region	40.5%	20.3%	39.2%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	33	5	21	59
		% within Region	55.9%	8.5%	35.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		81	31	66	178
	% within Region		45.5%	17.4%	37.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.593(a)	4	.159
Likelihood Ratio	7.002	4	.136
Linear-by-Linear Association	.918	1	.338
N of Valid Cases	178		

(a) 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.84.

Table 66. Correlation – Age and Check forum for new messages

(a) Crosstab

				Check forum for new msgs			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	1	8	3	12	
		% within Age	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	51	19	47	117	
		% within Age	43.6%	16.2%	40.2%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	29	3	16	48	
		% within Age	60.4%	6.3%	33.3%	100.0%	
Total	Count	81	30	66	177		
	% within Age	45.8%	16.9%	37.3%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.772(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	23.057	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.219	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.03.

Table 67. Correlation - Gender and Check forum for new messages

(a) Crosstab

			Check forum for new msgs			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	52	23	37	112
		% within Gender	46.4%	20.5%	33.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	29	7	29	65
		% within Gender	44.6%	10.8%	44.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	81	30	66	177
		% within Gender	45.8%	16.9%	37.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.823(a)	2	.148
Likelihood Ratio	3.955	2	.138
Linear-by-Linear Association	.891	1	.345
N of Valid Cases	177		

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

Table 68. Correlation – Region and I know how to put messages on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Know how to put msgs on			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	22	15	7	44
		% within Region	50.0%	34.1%	15.9%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	20	30	22	72
		% within Region	27.8%	41.7%	30.6%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	34	10	16	60
		% within Region	56.7%	16.7%	26.7%	100.0%
	Total	Count	76	55	45	176
		% within Region	43.2%	31.3%	25.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.988(a)	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	17.127	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.982
N of Valid Cases	176		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.25.

Table 69. Correlation – Age and I know how to put messages on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Know how to put msgs on			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	4	8	0	12
		% within Age	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	48	36	31	115
		% within Age	41.7%	31.3%	27.0%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	24	10	14	48
		% within Age	50.0%	20.8%	29.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		76	54	45	175
	% within Age		43.4%	30.9%	25.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.769(a)	4	.029
Likelihood Ratio	12.795	4	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	.226	1	.635
N of Valid Cases	175		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.09.

Table 70. Correlation – Gender and I know how to put messages on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Know how to put msgs on			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	44	40	25	109
		% within Gender	40.4%	36.7%	22.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	32	14	20	66
		% within Gender	48.5%	21.2%	30.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	76	54	45	175
		% within Gender	43.4%	30.9%	25.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.686(a)	2	.096
Likelihood Ratio	4.838	2	.089
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.953
N of Valid Cases	175		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.97.

Table 71. Correlation - Region and I know more about other countries

(a) Crosstab

			Know more about other countries			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	34	6	5	45
		% within Region	75.6%	13.3%	11.1%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	47	10	17	74
		% within Region	63.5%	13.5%	23.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	55	1	4	60
		% within Region	91.7%	1.7%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	136	17	26	179	
	% within Region	76.0%	9.5%	14.5%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.834(a)	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	17.749	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.970	1	.085
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.27.

Table 72. Correlation - Age and I know more about other countries

(a) Crosstab

			Know more about other countries			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	9	3	0	12
		% within Age	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	85	10	23	118
		% within Age	72.0%	8.5%	19.5%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	42	3	3	48
		% within Age	87.5%	6.3%	6.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		136	16	26	178
	% within Age		76.4%	9.0%	14.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.904(a)	4	.028
Likelihood Ratio	11.999	4	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	.071	1	.790
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.08.

Table 73. Correlation - Gender and I know more about other countries

(a) Crosstab

			Know more about other countries			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	84	12	16	112
		% within Gender	75.0%	10.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	51	5	10	66
		% within Gender	77.3%	7.6%	15.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	135	17	26	178
		% within Gender	75.8%	9.6%	14.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.478(a)	2	.787
Likelihood Ratio	.492	2	.782
Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.901
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.30.

Table 74. Correlation - Region and Others have same concerns that I do

(a) Crosstab

			Others have same concerns			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	37	6	2	45
		% within Region	82.2%	13.3%	4.4%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	37	27	9	73
		% within Region	50.7%	37.0%	12.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	46	2	11	59
		% within Region	78.0%	3.4%	18.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		120	35	22	177
	% within Region		67.8%	19.8%	12.4%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.467(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.299	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.171	1	.279
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.59.

Table 75. Correlation - Age and Others have same concerns that I do

(a) Crosstab

				Others have same concerns			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	8	2	2	12	
		% within Age	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	77	29	12	118	
		% within Age	65.3%	24.6%	10.2%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	35	3	8	46	
		% within Age	76.1%	6.5%	17.4%	100.0%	
Total	Count	120	34	22	176		
	% within Age	68.2%	19.3%	12.5%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.765(a)	4	.101
Likelihood Ratio	8.900	4	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	.142	1	.706
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.50.

Table 76. Correlation - Gender and Others have same concerns that I do

(a) Crosstab

			Others have same concerns			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	77	19	15	111
		% within Gender	69.4%	17.1%	13.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	42	16	7	65
		% within Gender	64.6%	24.6%	10.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	119	35	22	176
		% within Gender	67.6%	19.9%	12.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.543(a)	2	.462
Likelihood Ratio	1.519	2	.468
Linear-by-Linear Association	.033	1	.856
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.13.

Table 77. Correlation - Region and I have tried ideas on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Tried ideas on the forum for env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	23	9	12	44
		% within Region	52.3%	20.5%	27.3%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	52	6	16	74
		% within Region	70.3%	8.1%	21.6%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	52	2	6	60
		% within Region	86.7%	3.3%	10.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	127	17	34	178
		% within Region	71.3%	9.6%	19.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.683(a)	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	16.615	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.896	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.20.

Table 78. Correlation - Age and I have tried ideas on the forum

(a) Crosstab

				Tried ideas on the forum for env			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	5	6	0	11	
		% within Age	45.5%	54.5%	.0%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	83	9	26	118	
		% within Age	70.3%	7.6%	22.0%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	39	1	8	48	
		% within Age	81.3%	2.1%	16.7%	100.0%	
Total	Count	127	16	34	177		
	% within Age	71.8%	9.0%	19.2%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.490(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.271	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.555	1	.456
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .99.

Table 79. Correlation - Gender and I have tried ideas on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Tried ideas on the forum for env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	86	12	15	113
		% within Gender	76.1%	10.6%	13.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	41	4	19	64
		% within Gender	64.1%	6.3%	29.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	127	16	34	177
		% within Gender	71.8%	9.0%	19.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.419(a)	2	.024
Likelihood Ratio	7.210	2	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.193	1	.023
N of Valid Cases	177		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.79.

Table 80. Correlation - Region and I have changed how I care for the environment

(a) Crosstab

			Changed how I care for env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	32	5	8	45
		% within Region	71.1%	11.1%	17.8%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	47	4	24	75
		% within Region	62.7%	5.3%	32.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	51	3	6	60
		% within Region	85.0%	5.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		130	12	38	180
	% within Region		72.2%	6.7%	21.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.054(a)	4	.017
Likelihood Ratio	12.129	4	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.535	1	.111
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.00.

Table 81. Correlation - Age and I have changed how I care for the environment

(a) Crosstab

			Changed how I care for env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	7	5	0	12
		% within Age	58.3%	41.7%	.0%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	82	5	32	119
		% within Age	68.9%	4.2%	26.9%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	40	2	6	48
		% within Age	83.3%	4.2%	12.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		129	12	38	179
	% within Age		72.1%	6.7%	21.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.845(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.778	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.221	1	.638
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

Table 82. Correlation - Gender and I have changed how I care for the environment

(a) Crosstab

			Changed how I care for env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	86	7	20	113
		% within Gender	76.1%	6.2%	17.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	44	4	18	66
		% within Gender	66.7%	6.1%	27.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	130	11	38	179
		% within Gender	72.6%	6.1%	21.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.311(a)	2	.315
Likelihood Ratio	2.263	2	.323
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.221	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.06.

Table 83. Correlation - Region and I have NOT learned more about the environment

(a) Crosstab

			Have NOT learned more about env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	6	9	28	43
		% within Region	14.0%	20.9%	65.1%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	19	5	50	74
		% within Region	25.7%	6.8%	67.6%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	8	1	51	60
		% within Region	13.3%	1.7%	85.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	33	15	129	177	
	% within Region	18.6%	8.5%	72.9%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.640(a)	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	15.885	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.192	1	.139
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.64.

Table 84. Correlation - Age and I have NOT learned more about the environment

(a) Crosstab

			Have NOT learned more about env			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	1	4	6	11
		% within Age	9.1%	36.4%	54.5%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	28	10	79	117
		% within Age	23.9%	8.5%	67.5%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	4	0	44	48
		% within Age	8.3%	.0%	91.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	33	14	129	176
		% within Age	18.8%	8.0%	73.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.301(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.496	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.263	1	.132
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .88.

Table 85. Correlation - Gender and I have NOT learned more about the environment

(a) Crosstab

			Have NOT learned more about env			
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	Total
Gender	Female	Count	21	9	81	111
		% within Gender	18.9%	8.1%	73.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	12	5	48	65
		% within Gender	18.5%	7.7%	73.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	33	14	129	176
		% within Gender	18.8%	8.0%	73.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.018(a)	2	.991
Likelihood Ratio	.018	2	.991
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.914
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.

Table 86. Correlation - Region and Topics on the forum are interesting

(a) Crosstab

			Topics on forum are interesting			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	31	10	3	44
		% within Region	70.5%	22.7%	6.8%	100.0%
		Count	54	12	7	73
	Indian Ocean	% within Region	74.0%	16.4%	9.6%	100.0%
		Count	59	0	1	60
		% within Region	98.3%	.0%	1.7%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	144	22	11	177
		% within Region	81.4%	12.4%	6.2%	100.0%
		Total				

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.773(a)	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.945	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.073	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.73.

Table 87. Correlation - Age and Topics on the forum are interesting

(a) Crosstab

			Topics on forum are interesting			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	4	6	1	11
		% within Age	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	94	14	9	117
		% within Age	80.3%	12.0%	7.7%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	46	1	1	48
		% within Age	95.8%	2.1%	2.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		144	21	11	176
	% within Age		81.8%	11.9%	6.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.469(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.752	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.888	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .69.

Table 88. Correlation - Gender and Topics on the forum are interesting

(a) Crosstab

			Topics on forum are interesting			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	89	17	6	112
		% within Gender	79.5%	15.2%	5.4%	100.0%
	Male	Count	55	4	5	64
		% within Gender	85.9%	6.3%	7.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	144	21	11	176
		% within Gender	81.8%	11.9%	6.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.323(a)	2	.190
Likelihood Ratio	3.599	2	.165
Linear-by-Linear Association	.211	1	.646
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.00.

Table 89. Correlation - Region and I talk to my parents about the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Talk to my parents about forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	20	11	13	44
		% within Region	45.5%	25.0%	29.5%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	47	2	24	73
		% within Region	64.4%	2.7%	32.9%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	43	2	14	59
		% within Region	72.9%	3.4%	23.7%	100.0%
	Total	Count	110	15	51	176
		% within Region	62.5%	8.5%	29.0%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.758(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.686	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.509	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.75.

Table 90. Correlation - Age and I talk to my parents about the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Talk to my parents about forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	4	6	2	12
		% within Age	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	77	7	32	116
		% within Age	66.4%	6.0%	27.6%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	29	1	17	47
		% within Age	61.7%	2.1%	36.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	110	14	51	175
		% within Age	62.9%	8.0%	29.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.483(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.237	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.097	1	.755
N of Valid Cases	175		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .96.

Table 91. Correlation - Gender and I talk to my parents about the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Talk to my parents about forum			
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	Total
Gender	Female	Count	72	9	32	113
		% within Gender	63.7%	8.0%	28.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	38	5	19	62
		% within Gender	61.3%	8.1%	30.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	110	14	51	175
		% within Gender	62.9%	8.0%	29.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.112(a)	2	.945
Likelihood Ratio	.112	2	.946
Linear-by-Linear Association	.112	1	.738
N of Valid Cases	175		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.96.

Table 92. Correlation - Region and I log on outside of school

(a) Crosstab

			Log on outside of school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	19	5	21	45
		% within Region	42.2%	11.1%	46.7%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	30	20	23	73
		% within Region	41.1%	27.4%	31.5%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	17	2	41	60
		% within Region	28.3%	3.3%	68.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	66	27	85	178
		% within Region	37.1%	15.2%	47.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.470(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	25.728	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.766	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.83.

Table 93. Correlation - Age and I log on outside of school

(a) Crosstab

				Log on outside of school			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	2	2	8	12	
		% within Age	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	51	21	45	117	
		% within Age	43.6%	17.9%	38.5%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	13	3	32	48	
		% within Age	27.1%	6.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Total	Count	66	26	85	177		
	% within Age	37.3%	14.7%	48.0%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.731(a)	4	.008
Likelihood Ratio	14.449	4	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	.123	1	.726
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.76.

Table 94. Correlation - Gender and I log on outside of school

(a) Crosstab

			Log on outside of school			
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	Total
Gender	Female	Count	43	19	50	112
		% within Gender	38.4%	17.0%	44.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	23	8	34	65
		% within Gender	35.4%	12.3%	52.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	66	27	84	177
		% within Gender	37.3%	15.3%	47.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.194(a)	2	.551
Likelihood Ratio	1.207	2	.547
Linear-by-Linear Association	.557	1	.456
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.92.

Table 95. Correlation - Region and Messages from older kids are hard to read

(a) Crosstab

			Messages from older kids hard to read			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	3	16	26	45
		% within Region	6.7%	35.6%	57.8%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	37	12	25	74
		% within Region	50.0%	16.2%	33.8%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	15	0	45	60
		% within Region	25.0%	.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	55	28	96	179
		% within Region	30.7%	15.6%	53.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.561(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	58.763	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.154	1	.695
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.04.

Table 96. Correlation - Age and Messages from older kids are hard to read

(a) Crosstab

				Messages from older kids hard to read			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	2	6	4	12	
		% within Age	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	43	19	56	118	
		% within Age	36.4%	16.1%	47.5%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	10	2	36	48	
		% within Age	20.8%	4.2%	75.0%	100.0%	
Total	Count	55	27	96	178		
	% within Age	30.9%	15.2%	53.9%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.841(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.817	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.688	1	.194
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.82.

Table 97. Correlation - Gender and Messages from older kids are hard to read

(a) Crosstab

			Messages from older kids hard to read			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	31	19	62	112
		% within Gender	27.7%	17.0%	55.4%	100.0%
	Male	Count	24	8	34	66
		% within Gender	36.4%	12.1%	51.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	55	27	96	178
		% within Gender	30.9%	15.2%	53.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.770(a)	2	.413
Likelihood Ratio	1.771	2	.413
Linear-by-Linear Association	.815	1	.367
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.01.

Table 98. Correlation - Region and I made new friends on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Made new friends on forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	9	17	19	45
		% within Region	20.0%	37.8%	42.2%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	33	9	33	75
		% within Region	44.0%	12.0%	44.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	24	4	32	60
		% within Region	40.0%	6.7%	53.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	66	30	84	180
		% within Region	36.7%	16.7%	46.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.180(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.738	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.143	1	.706
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.50.

Table 99. Correlation - Age and I made new friends on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Made new friends on forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	0	8	4	12
		% within Age	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	49	16	54	119
		% within Age	41.2%	13.4%	45.4%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	17	5	26	48
		% within Age	35.4%	10.4%	54.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		66	29	84	179
	% within Age		36.9%	16.2%	46.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.533(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.802	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.245	1	.620
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.94.

Table 100. Correlation - Gender and I made new friends on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Made new friends on forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	41	18	54	113
		% within Gender	36.3%	15.9%	47.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	25	11	30	66
		% within Gender	37.9%	16.7%	45.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	66	29	84	179
		% within Gender	36.9%	16.2%	46.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.091(a)	2	.955
Likelihood Ratio	.091	2	.955
Linear-by-Linear Association	.077	1	.781
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.69.

Table 101. Correlation - Region and I did NOT like the topics on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Did NOT like topic on forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	2	17	26	45
		% within Region	4.4%	37.8%	57.8%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	13	28	34	75
		% within Region	17.3%	37.3%	45.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	3	7	50	60
		% within Region	5.0%	11.7%	83.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	18	52	110	180	
	% within Region	10.0%	28.9%	61.1%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.150(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	25.476	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.009	1	.025
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.50.

Table 102. Correlation - Age and I did NOT like the topics on the forum

(a) Crosstab

				Did NOT like topic on forum			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	0	8	4	12	
		% within Age	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	16	37	66	119	
		% within Age	13.4%	31.1%	55.5%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	2	6	40	48	
		% within Age	4.2%	12.5%	83.3%	100.0%	
Total	Count	18	51	110	179		
	% within Age	10.1%	28.5%	61.5%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.929(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.885	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.447	1	.035
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.21.

Table 103. Correlation - Gender and I did NOT like the topics on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Did NOT like topic on forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	11	33	69	113
		% within Gender	9.7%	29.2%	61.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	7	18	41	66
		% within Gender	10.6%	27.3%	62.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	18	51	110	179
		% within Gender	10.1%	28.5%	61.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.094(a)	2	.954
Likelihood Ratio	.094	2	.954
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.986
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.64.

Table 104. Correlation - Region and The forum should continue at my school

(a) Crosstab

			Forum should continue at school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	43	1	0	44
		% within Region	97.7%	2.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	59	11	5	75
		% within Region	78.7%	14.7%	6.7%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	59	1	0	60
		% within Region	98.3%	1.7%	.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	161	13	5	179
		% within Region	89.9%	7.3%	2.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.516(a)	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.746	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.244	1	.621
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.23.

Table 105. Correlation - Age and The forum should continue at my school

(a) Crosstab

			Forum should continue at school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	12	0	0	12
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	100	13	5	118
		% within Age	84.7%	11.0%	4.2%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	48	0	0	48
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	160	13	5	178
		% within Age	89.9%	7.3%	2.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.182(a)	4	.037
Likelihood Ratio	15.812	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

Table 106. Correlation - Gender and The forum should continue at my school

(a) Crosstab

			Forum should continue at school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	102	9	2	113
		% within Gender	90.3%	8.0%	1.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	58	4	3	65
		% within Gender	89.2%	6.2%	4.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	160	13	5	178
		% within Gender	89.9%	7.3%	2.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
0			
Pearson Chi-Square	1.380(a)	2	.502
Likelihood Ratio	1.327	2	.515
Linear-by-Linear Association	.366	1	.545
N of Valid Cases	178		

a 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.83.

Table 107. Correlation - Region and More students should use the forum

(a) Crosstab

			More students should use forum			
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	Total
Region	Caribbean	Count	45	0	0	45
		% within Region	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	63	7	5	75
		% within Region	84.0%	9.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	59	1	0	60
		% within Region	98.3%	1.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	167	8	5	180	
	% within Region	92.8%	4.4%	2.8%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.150(a)	4	.004
Likelihood Ratio	18.266	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.016	1	.898
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.25.

Table 108. Correlation - Age and More students should use the forum

(a) Crosstab

				More students should use forum			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	12	0	0	12	
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	107	7	5	119	
		% within Age	89.9%	5.9%	4.2%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	47	1	0	48	
		% within Age	97.9%	2.1%	.0%	100.0%	
Total	Count	166	8	5	179		
	% within Age	92.7%	4.5%	2.8%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.510(a)	4	.341
Likelihood Ratio	6.708	4	.152
Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.866
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

Table 109. Correlation - Gender and More students should use the forum

(a) Crosstab

			More students should use forum			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	107	6	0	113
		% within Gender	94.7%	5.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	59	2	5	66
		% within Gender	89.4%	3.0%	7.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	166	8	5	179
		% within Gender	92.7%	4.5%	2.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.171(a)	2	.010
Likelihood Ratio	10.618	2	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.692	1	.030
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.84.

Table 110. Correlation - Region and The forum is a good way to talk

(a) Crosstab

			Forum is a good way to talk			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	44	1	0	45
		% within Region	97.8%	2.2%	.0%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	67	4	4	75
		% within Region	89.3%	5.3%	5.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	58	2	0	60
		% within Region	96.7%	3.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	169	7	4	180
		% within Region	93.9%	3.9%	2.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.659(a)	4	.155
Likelihood Ratio	8.084	4	.089
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.944
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.00.

Table 111. Correlation - Age and The forum is a good way to talk

(a) Crosstab

				Forum is a good way to talk			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	12	0	0	12	
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	110	5	4	119	
		% within Age	92.4%	4.2%	3.4%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	46	2	0	48	
		% within Age	95.8%	4.2%	.0%	100.0%	
Total	Count	168	7	4	179		
	% within Age	93.9%	3.9%	2.2%	100.0%		

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.614(a)	4	.624
Likelihood Ratio	4.330	4	.363
Linear-by-Linear Association	.136	1	.712
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

Table 112. Correlation - Gender and The forum is a good way to talk

(a) Crosstab

			Forum is a good way to talk			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	109	2	2	113
		% within Gender	96.5%	1.8%	1.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	59	5	2	66
		% within Gender	89.4%	7.6%	3.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	168	7	4	179
		% within Gender	93.9%	3.9%	2.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.109(a)	2	.128
Likelihood Ratio	3.950	2	.139
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.365	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.47.

Table 113. Correlation - Region and The forum is easy to use

(a) Crosstab

			Forum is easy to use			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	34	8	3	45
		% within Region	75.6%	17.8%	6.7%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	55	18	2	75
		% within Region	73.3%	24.0%	2.7%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	37	11	10	58
		% within Region	63.8%	19.0%	17.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	126	37	15	178
		% within Region	70.8%	20.8%	8.4%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.741(a)	4	.045
Likelihood Ratio	9.589	4	.048
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.542	1	.060
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.79.

Table 114. Correlation - Age and The forum is easy to use

(a) Crosstab

			Forum is easy to use			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	11	1	0	12
		% within Age	91.7%	8.3%	.0%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	88	26	4	118
		% within Age	74.6%	22.0%	3.4%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	27	10	10	47
		% within Age	57.4%	21.3%	21.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	126	37	14	177
		% within Age	71.2%	20.9%	7.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.740(a)	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	16.434	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.406	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .95.

Table 115. Correlation - Gender and The forum is easy to use

(a) Crosstab

			Forum is easy to use			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	80	23	10	113
		% within Gender	70.8%	20.4%	8.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	45	14	5	64
		% within Gender	70.3%	21.9%	7.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	125	37	15	177
		% within Gender	70.6%	20.9%	8.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.098(a)	2	.952
Likelihood Ratio	.099	2	.952
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.956
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.42.

Table 116. Correlation - Region and Other students respond fast

(a) Crosstab

			Other students respond fast			
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	Total
Region	Caribbean	Count	15	19	9	43
		% within Region	34.9%	44.2%	20.9%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	25	29	21	75
		% within Region	33.3%	38.7%	28.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	33	9	17	59
		% within Region	55.9%	15.3%	28.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	73	57	47	177	
	% within Region	41.2%	32.2%	26.6%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.484(a)	4	.009
Likelihood Ratio	14.338	4	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	.882	1	.348
N of Valid Cases	177		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

Table 117. Correlation - Age and Other students respond fast

(a) Crosstab

				Other students respond fast			
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	Total
Age	12 and Under	Count	5	6	0	11	
		% within Age	45.5%	54.5%	.0%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	44	39	35	118	
		% within Age	37.3%	33.1%	29.7%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	24	11	12	47	
		% within Age	51.1%	23.4%	25.5%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	73	56	47	176	
		% within Age	41.5%	31.8%	26.7%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.818(a)	4	.098
Likelihood Ratio	10.475	4	.033
Linear-by-Linear Association	.482	1	.488
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.94.

Table 118. Correlation Gender and Other students respond fast

(a) Crosstab

			Other students respond fast			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	45	38	29	112
		% within Gender	40.2%	33.9%	25.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	28	18	18	64
		% within Gender	43.8%	28.1%	28.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	73	56	47	176
		% within Gender	41.5%	31.8%	26.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.632(a)	2	.729
Likelihood Ratio	.639	2	.727
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.916
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.09.

Table 119. Correlation – Gender and I would use the forum if it was not part of school

(a) Crosstab

			Use forum if not part of school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	50	33	29	112
		% within Gender	44.6%	29.5%	25.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	18	10	36	64
		% within Gender	28.1%	15.6%	56.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	68	43	65	176
		% within Gender	38.6%	24.4%	36.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.231(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	16.136	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.779	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.64.

Table 120. Correlation – Region and I would use the forum if it was not part of school

(a) Crosstab

			Use forum if not part of school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	22	8	13	43
		% within Region	51.2%	18.6%	30.2%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	19	19	36	74
		% within Region	25.7%	25.7%	48.6%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	28	16	16	60
		% within Region	46.7%	26.7%	26.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		69	43	65	177
	% within Region		39.0%	24.3%	36.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.688(a)	4	.020
Likelihood Ratio	11.936	4	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	.089	1	.766
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.45.

Table 121. Correlation – Age and I would use the forum if it were not part of school

(a) Crosstab

			Use forum if not part of school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	7	2	1	10
		% within Age	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	13 to 16	Count	38	31	49	118
		% within Age	32.2%	26.3%	41.5%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	23	10	15	48
		% within Age	47.9%	20.8%	31.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		68	43	65	176
	% within Age		38.6%	24.4%	36.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.436(a)	4	.077
Likelihood Ratio	8.759	4	.067
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.651	1	.199
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.44.

Table 122. Correlation - Region and It is easy to share problems

(a) Crosstab

			Easy to share problems			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Region	Caribbean	Count	29	11	2	42
		% within Region	69.0%	26.2%	4.8%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	61	12	2	75
		% within Region	81.3%	16.0%	2.7%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	47	1	12	60
		% within Region	78.3%	1.7%	20.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	137	24	16	177
		% within Region	77.4%	13.6%	9.0%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.259(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	26.422	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.463	1	.496
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.80.

Table 123. Correlation - Age and It is easy to share problems

(a) Crosstab

				Easy to share problems			Total
				Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Age	12 and Under	Count	5	5	0	10	
		% within Age	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	13 to 16	Count	94	17	7	118	
		% within Age	79.7%	14.4%	5.9%	100.0%	
	17 and Older	Count	38	1	9	48	
		% within Age	79.2%	2.1%	18.8%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	137	23	16	176	
		% within Age	77.8%	13.1%	9.1%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.218(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.318	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.148	1	.701
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .91.

Table 124. Correlation - Gender and It is easy to share problems

(a) Crosstab

			Easy to share problems			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Gender	Female	Count	86	16	10	112
		% within Gender	76.8%	14.3%	8.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	51	7	6	64
		% within Gender	79.7%	10.9%	9.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	137	23	16	176
		% within Gender	77.8%	13.1%	9.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.402(a)	2	.818
Likelihood Ratio	.412	2	.814
Linear-by-Linear Association	.062	1	.804
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.82.

Table 125. Correlation - Region and Environmental Concern - Beach/Land Pollution, Marine and Coastal Areas

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Beach/Land Pollution, Marine and Coastal Areas		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	34	9	43
		% within Region	79.1%	20.9%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	71	4	75
		% within Region	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	48	11	59
		% within Region	81.4%	18.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	153	24	177
		% within Region	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.625(a)	2	.022
Likelihood Ratio	8.383	2	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.961
N of Valid Cases	177		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.83.

Table 126. Correlation - Region and Environmental Concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	40	3	43
		% within Region	93.0%	7.0%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	42	33	75
		% within Region	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	55	4	59
		% within Region	93.2%	6.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	137	40	177
		% within Region	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.079(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.269	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.387	1	.534
N of Valid Cases	177		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.72.

Table 127. Correlation - Region and Environmental Concern -
Deforestation, Forest management, cutting trees

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Deforestation, Forest management, cutting trees		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	37	6	43
		% within Region	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	55	20	75
		% within Region	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	29	30	59
		% within Region	49.2%	50.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	121	56	177	
	% within Region	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.141(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	17.420	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.397	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	177		

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

Table 128. Correlation - Region and Topics I like best - Money/Finance

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Money/Finance		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	40	1	41
		% within Region	97.6%	2.4%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	75	0	75
		% within Region	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	42	18	60
		% within Region	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		157	19	176
	% within Region		89.2%	10.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.028(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.754	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.319	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.43.

Table 129. Correlation - Region and Topics I like best - Environmental
(Other than Pollution, Garbage, and Water)

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Environmental (Other than Pol, Garbage, and Water)		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	40	1	41
		% within Region	97.6%	2.4%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	54	21	75
		% within Region	72.0%	28.0%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	50	10	60
		% within Region	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	144	32	176
		% within Region	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.783(a)	2	.003
Likelihood Ratio	14.484	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.077	1	.150
N of Valid Cases	176		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.45.

Table 130. Correlation - Region and Topics I like best - Generic Environment

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Generic Environment		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	33	8	41
		% within Region	80.5%	19.5%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	38	37	75
		% within Region	50.7%	49.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	51	9	60
		% within Region	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	122	54	176	
	% within Region	69.3%	30.7%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.610(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.863	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.102	1	.294
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.58.

Table 131. Correlation - Region and Topics I like best - Water, Water Pollution, Marine Life, Beaches

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Water, Water Pol, Marine Life, Beaches		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	38	3	41
		% within Region	92.7%	7.3%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	65	10	75
		% within Region	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	40	20	60
		% within Region	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	143	33	176
		% within Region	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.338(a)	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	13.120	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.910	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.69.

Table 132. Correlation - Region and What I like most about the forum – Communicating and Learning from other youth

(a) Crosstab

			What I like most about the forum - Communicating/Learning Youth		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	19	18	37
		% within Region	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	40	28	68
		% within Region	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	18	42	60
		% within Region	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	77	88	165	
	% within Region	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.060(a)	2	.004
Likelihood Ratio	11.296	2	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.862	1	.015
N of Valid Cases	165		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.27.

Table 133. Correlation - Region and What I do not like about the forum – Content related concerns and topics

(a) Crosstab

		What I do not like about the forum - Content related concerns/topics		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	29	31
		% within Region	93.5%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	14	45
		% within Region	31.1%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	5	53
		% within Region	9.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	21	129
		% within Region	16.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.282(a)	2	.004
Likelihood Ratio	10.870	2	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	.031	1	.861
N of Valid Cases	129		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.05.

Table 134. Correlation - Region and What I do not like about the forum – Better communication with program and faster responses from students

(a) Crosstab

			What I do not like about the forum - better communication with program/students		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	19	12	31
		% within Region	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	38	7	45
		% within Region	84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	38	15	53
		% within Region	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	95	34	129
		% within Region	73.6%	26.4%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.245(a)	2	.073
Likelihood Ratio	5.368	2	.068
Linear-by-Linear Association	.499	1	.480
N of Valid Cases	129		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.17.

Table 135. Correlation - Region and What I do not like about the forum – Technology related answers

(a) Crosstab

			What I do not like about the forum - Technology related answers		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	30	1	31
		% within Region	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	43	2	45
		% within Region	95.6%	4.4%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	41	12	53
		% within Region	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	114	15	129
		% within Region	88.4%	11.6%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.646(a)	2	.005
Likelihood Ratio	10.837	2	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.575	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	129		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.60.

Table 136. Correlation - Region and Ideas to make forum better - Look of forum

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - Look of forum		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	26	11	37
		% within Region	70.3%	29.7%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	55	7	62
		% within Region	88.7%	11.3%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	49	8	57
		% within Region	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	130	26	156	
	% within Region	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.120(a)	2	.047
Likelihood Ratio	5.588	2	.061
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.138	1	.076
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.17.

Table 137. Correlation - Region and Ideas to make forum better - better Internet access

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - better internet access		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Region	Caribbean	Count	37	0	37
		% within Region	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Indian Ocean	Count	52	10	62
		% within Region	83.9%	16.1%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	43	14	57
		% within Region	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	132	24	156
		% within Region	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.441(a)	2	.005
Likelihood Ratio	15.614	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.960	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.69.

Table 138. Correlation - Gender and Environmental Concern –
Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender	Female	Count	96	15	111
		% within Gender	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	40	25	65
		% within Gender	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	136	40	176
		% within Gender	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.529(b)	1	.000		
Continuity Correction(a)	13.143	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	14.122	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.446	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	176				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.77.

Table 139. Correlation - Gender and Environmental Concern –
Endangered species, over fishing, coral reefs, poaching

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Endangered species, overfishing, coral reefs, poaching		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender	Female	Count	91	20	111
		% within Gender	82.0%	18.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	44	21	65
		% within Gender	67.7%	32.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	135	41	176
		% within Gender	76.7%	23.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.685(b)	1	.030		
Continuity Correction(a)	3.919	1	.048		
Likelihood Ratio	4.572	1	.033		
Fisher's Exact Test				.042	.025
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.658	1	.031		
N of Valid Cases	176				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.14.

Table 140. Correlation - Gender and Topics I like best - Money/Finance

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Money/Finance		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender	Female	Count	94	16	110
		% within Gender	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	62	3	65
		% within Gender	95.4%	4.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	156	19	175
		% within Gender	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.163(b)	1	.041		
Continuity Correction(a)	3.200	1	.074		
Likelihood Ratio	4.674	1	.031		
Fisher's Exact Test				.046	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.139	1	.042		
N of Valid Cases	175				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.06.

Table 141. Correlation - Gender and What I like most about the forum – Environmental Issues

(a) Crosstab

			What I like most about the forum - Environmental Issues		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender	Female	Count	80	24	104
		% within Gender	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	54	6	60
		% within Gender	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	134	30	164
		% within Gender	81.7%	18.3%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.353(b)	1	.037		
Continuity Correction(a)	3.522	1	.061		
Likelihood Ratio	4.691	1	.030		
Fisher's Exact Test				.039	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.327	1	.038		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.98.

Table 142. Correlation - Gender and Ideas to make forum better – better Internet access

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - better internet access		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender	Female	Count	91	8	99
		% within Gender	91.9%	8.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	40	16	56
		% within Gender	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	131	24	155
		% within Gender	84.5%	15.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.476(b)	1	.001		
Continuity Correction(a)	9.963	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	11.021	1	.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.001	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.402	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	155				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.67.

Table 143. Correlation - Age and Environmental Concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Greenhouse gas, ozone layer, global warming, sea level rise		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age	12 and Under	Count	12	0	12
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	81	37	118
		% within Age	68.6%	31.4%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	43	3	46
		% within Age	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	136	40	176
		% within Age	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.411(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.705	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.284	1	.594
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.73.

Table 144. Correlation - Age and Environmental Concern - Litter, Garbage, Keeping the island clean and beautiful

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Litter, Garbage, Keeping the island clean and beautiful		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	1	11	12
		% within Age	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	65	53	118
		% within Age	55.1%	44.9%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	33	13	46
		% within Age	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	99	77	176
		% within Age	56.3%	43.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.745(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	17.209	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.408	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	176		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.25.

Table 145. Correlation - Age and Environmental Concern - Deforestation, Forest management, cutting trees

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Deforestation, Forest management, cutting trees		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	11	1	12
		% within Age	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	84	34	118
		% within Age	71.2%	28.8%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	25	21	46
		% within Age	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	120	56	176
		% within Age	68.2%	31.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.600(a)	2	.022
Likelihood Ratio	8.156	2	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.991	1	.014
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.82.

Table 146. Correlation - Age and Environmental Concern - Pollution, General, Air, Noise

(a) Crosstab

			Env Concern - Pollution, General, Air, Noise		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	10	2	12
		% within Age	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	61	57	118
		% within Age	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	21	25	46
		% within Age	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	92	84	176
		% within Age	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%

(a) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.464(a)	2	.065
Likelihood Ratio	5.942	2	.051
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.399	1	.020
N of Valid Cases	176		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.73.

Table 147. Correlation - Age and Topics I like best - Money/Finance

(a) Crosstab

				Topic I like Best - Money/Finance		Total
				Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count		12	0	12
		% within Age		100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count		108	8	116
		% within Age		93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count		37	11	48
		% within Age		77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
Total		Count		157	19	176
		% within Age		89.2%	10.8%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.607(a)	2	.005
Likelihood Ratio	10.565	2	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.206	1	.023
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

Table 148. Correlation - Age and Topics I like best - Environmental
(Other than Pollution, Garbage, and Water)

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Environmental (Other than Pol, Garbage, and Water)		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	12	0	12
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	87	29	116
		% within Age	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	45	3	48
		% within Age	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	144	32	176
		% within Age	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.885(a)	2	.004
Likelihood Ratio	13.991	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.251	1	.617
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.18.

Table 149. Correlation - Age and Topics I like best - Generic Environment

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Generic Environment		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	11	1	12
		% within Age	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	70	46	116
		% within Age	60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	41	7	48
		% within Age	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	122	54	176
		% within Age	69.3%	30.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.059(a)	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	14.447	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.175	1	.675
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.68.

Table 150. Correlation - Age and Topics I like best - Garbage/Litter

(a) Crosstab

			Topic I like Best - Garbage/Litter		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	7	5	12
		% within Age	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	116	0	116
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	38	10	48
		% within Age	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	161	15	176
		% within Age	91.5%	8.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.046(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.129	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.314	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	176		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.02.

Table 151. Correlation - Age and Ideas to make forum better - Include more youth

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - Include more youth		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	11	0	11
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	53	45	98
		% within Age	54.1%	45.9%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	29	17	46
		% within Age	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	93	62	155
		% within Age	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.941(a)	2	.011
Likelihood Ratio	12.828	2	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.894	1	.027
N of Valid Cases	155		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.40.

Table 152. Correlation - Age and Ideas to make forum better - Look of forum

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - Look of forum		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	5	6	11
		% within Age	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	89	9	98
		% within Age	90.8%	9.2%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	36	10	46
		% within Age	78.3%	21.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	130	25	155
		% within Age	83.9%	16.1%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.566(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	13.505	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.787	1	.009
N of Valid Cases	155		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.77.

Table 153. Correlation - Age and Ideas to make forum better - better Internet access

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - better Internet access		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age	12 and Under	Count	11	0	11
		% within Age	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	13 through 16	Count	86	12	98
		% within Age	87.8%	12.2%	100.0%
	17 and Older	Count	34	12	46
		% within Age	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	131	24	155
		% within Age	84.5%	15.5%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.753(a)	2	.034
Likelihood Ratio	7.941	2	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.674	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	155		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.70.

Table 154. Frequency - Technology Ranking

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fast Connection	13	7.0	13.0	13.0
	Average Connection	27	14.6	27.0	40.0
	Slow Connection	60	32.4	60.0	100.0
	Total	100	54.1	100.0	
Missing	9	85	45.9		
Total		185	100.0		

Table 155. Correlation - Technology Ranking and I log on outside of school

(a) Crosstab

			Log on outside of school			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Technology Ranking	Fast Connection	Count	2	4	7	13
		% within Technology Ranking	15.4%	30.8%	53.8%	100.0%
	Average Connection	Count	13	1	13	27
		% within Technology Ranking	48.1%	3.7%	48.1%	100.0%
	Slow Connection	Count	17	2	41	60
		% within Technology Ranking	28.3%	3.3%	68.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	32	7	61	100
		% within Technology Ranking	32.0%	7.0%	61.0%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.007(a)	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	12.570	4	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	.663	1	.416
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .91.

Table 156. Correlation - Technology Ranking and I check the forum for new messages

(a) Crosstab

			Check forum for new msgs			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Technology Ranking	Fast Connection	Count	1	10	2	13
		% within Technology Ranking	7.7%	76.9%	15.4%	100.0%
	Average Connection	Count	12	1	14	27
		% within Technology Ranking	44.4%	3.7%	51.9%	100.0%
	Slow Connection	Count	33	5	21	59
		% within Technology Ranking	55.9%	8.5%	35.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		46	16	37	99
	% within Technology Ranking		46.5%	16.2%	37.4%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.061(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.944	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.832	1	.176
N of Valid Cases	99		

a 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.10.

Table 157. Correlation - Technology Ranking and I know how to put messages on the forum

(a) Crosstab

			Know how to put msgs on			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Technology Ranking	Fast Connection	Count	4	8	0	12
		% within Technology Ranking	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
	Average Connection	Count	13	7	7	27
		% within Technology Ranking	48.1%	25.9%	25.9%	100.0%
	Slow Connection	Count	34	10	16	60
		% within Technology Ranking	56.7%	16.7%	26.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		51	25	23	99
	% within Technology Ranking		51.5%	25.3%	23.2%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.222(a)	4	.007
Likelihood Ratio	14.779	4	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.941
N of Valid Cases	99		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.79.

Table 158. Correlation - Technology Ranking and Other students respond fast

(a) Crosstab

			Other students respond fast			Total
			Agree	DK/NS	Disagree	
Technology Ranking	Fast Connection	Count	5	7	0	12
		% within Technology Ranking	41.7%	58.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Average Connection	Count	6	12	8	26
		% within Technology Ranking	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	100.0%
	Slow Connection	Count	33	9	17	59
		% within Technology Ranking	55.9%	15.3%	28.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	44	28	25	97	
	% within Technology Ranking	45.4%	28.9%	25.8%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.981(a)	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	21.126	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.098	1	.754
N of Valid Cases	97		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.09.

Table 159. Correlation - Technology Ranking and My ideas to make the forum better - Look of forum

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - Look of forum		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Technology Ranking	Fast Connection	Count	5	7	12
		% within Technology Ranking	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
	Average Connection	Count	16	4	20
		% within Technology Ranking	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Slow Connection	Count	49	8	57
		% within Technology Ranking	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	70	19	89	
	% within Technology Ranking	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%	

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.613(a)	2	.003
Likelihood Ratio	9.744	2	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.432	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	89		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.56.

Table 160. Correlation - Technology Ranking and My ideas to make forum better - better Internet access

(a) Crosstab

			Ideas to make forum better - better internet access		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Technology Ranking	Fast Connection	Count	12	0	12
		% within Technology Ranking	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Average Connection	Count	20	0	20
		% within Technology Ranking	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Slow Connection	Count	43	14	57
		% within Technology Ranking	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		75	14	89
	% within Technology Ranking		84.3%	15.7%	100.0%

(b) Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.327(a)	2	.009
Likelihood Ratio	13.909	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.726	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	89		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.89.

REFERENCE LIST

- Belmar, Herman. 2002. *Youth Concerns in Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.unesco.org/csi/smis/siv/Caribbean/svg-youth.htm>
- Burton-James, Alexandra, UNESCO National Commission for the Commonwealth of Dominica. 2005. Interview by author, 9 March, Roseau, Dominica.
- Cambers, Gillian, director of SIV YIF. 2004. Interview by author, 13 September, telephone conversation, Sunnyvale, California. UNESCO, Puerto Rico.
- Fien, John, David Yencken and Helen Sykes. 2002. *Young People and the Environment, An Asia-Pacific Perspective*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Filho, Walter Leal, Cristina A.R. de Carvalho, and William H.G. Hale. 1998. *Environmental Education in Protected Areas, International Perspectives and Experiences*. New York: The Parthenon Publishing Group Inc.
- Filho, Walter Leal and Monica Villa Bandeira. 1995. Media and Environmental Education. *Convergence* 28, no 4: 55-61.
- Garrison, D. Randy, Terry Anderson, and Walter Archer. 2000. Critical Inquiry in a Text-based Environment: Computer Conferencing in Higher Education. *The Internet and Higher Education* 2, no 2-3: 87-105.
- GLOBE. 2004. *What is the Globe Program?* Database on-line. Available from <http://www.globe.gov/fsl/html/aboutglobe.cgi?intro&lang=en&nav=1>
- IEARN. 2004. *Project Book: Connecting Youth, Making a Difference in the World*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.iearn.org/>
- Kuijper, Marriten W.M. 2003. Marine and coastal environmental awareness building within the context of UNESCO's activities in Asia and the Pacific. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 47: 265-272.
- Macchia, Peter Jr. and Joseph S. Freedman. 2004. From Isolation to Communication: The Use of Internet Forums to Build a Learning Community Among Library Interns. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 45, no 3: 200-209.
- Malone, Karen. 2002. *Cook Islands, Small Island Voice Children, Youth and Community Views on Environment, Development and Tourism*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.unesco.org/csi/smis/siv/Pacific/CookIslandssurveyreport.rtf>

- Maynard, Antonio, St. Kitts and Nevis National Commission for UNESCO. 2005. Interview by author, February 28, Basseterre, St. Kitts.
- McCormick, Kes et al. 2005. Education for sustainable development and the Young Masters Program. *Journal of Cleaner Production* no 13: 1107-1112.
- Moore, Christopher J. and Richard A. Huber. 2001. Support for EE from the National Science Education Standards and the Internet. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 32, no 3: 21-25.
- Morse, Ken. 2003. Does one size fit all? Exploring asynchronous learning in a multicultural environment. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* 7. no 1: 37-55.
- Mrazek, Rick. 1993. *Alternative Paradigms in Environmental Education Research*. Troy, Ohio: The North American Association for Environmental Education.
- Northover, Mark. 2002. *Online Discussion Boards – Friend or Foe?* Database online. Available from <https://secure.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland02/proceedings/papers/193.pdf>
- Posavac, Emil J., and Raymond G. Carey. 1997. *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Redfern, Sam and Niall Naughton. 2002. Collaborative Virtual Environments to Support Communication and Community in Internet-based Distance Education. *Journal of Information Technology Education* 1, no 3: 201-211.
- Smith, Gregory A., and Dilafruz R. Williams. 1999. *Ecological Education in Action, On Weaving Education, Culture, and the Environment*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Spennemann, Dirk HR. 2004. Digital Divides in the Pacific Islands. *IT&Society* 1, 7: 46-55.
- TakingItGlobal. 2005. *Taking It Global. Inspire. Inform. Involve*. Database on- line. Available from <http://www.takingitglobal.org/>
- UNDESA. 1994. *Report of the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of small island developing states*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf167/aconf167-9.htm>

- UNESCO. 2002a. *Small Islands Voice – Young Islanders*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.unesco.org/csi/smis/siv/YoungIslanders/young.htm>
- UNESCO. 2002b. *Small Islands Voice – Young Islanders, Internet-based Youth Forum*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.unesco.org/csi/smis/siv/YoungIslanders/ph2assess.htm>
- UNESCO. 2002c. *Small Islands Voice – Young Islanders, Internet-based Youth Forum*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.unesco.org/csi/smis/siv/YoungIslanders/youthforum.htm>
- UNESCO. 2003. *Small Islands Voice – Laying the Foundation*. Coastal region and small island papers 13, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO. 2004a. *Island Agenda 2004+: Coping with change and sustaining diversities in small islands*. UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO. 2004b. *Small Islands Voice – Voices in a changing world*. Coastal region and small island papers 16, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO. 2005a. *Introduction to Sandwatch: An educational tool for sustainable development*. Coastal region and small island papers 19, UNESCO, Paris, 91 pp.
- UNESCO. 2005b. *Youth Visioning for Island Living*. Database on-line. Available from <http://www.unesco.org/csi/YV/index.htm>
- Vaughan, Christopher et al. 2003. The effect of environmental education on schoolchildren, their parents, and community members: a study of intergenerational and intercommunity learning. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 34. no 3: 12-22.
- Volk, Trudi L. and Marie J. Cheak. 2003. The effects of an environmental education program on students, parents, and the community. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 34. no 4: 12-26.
- Wheeler, Keith A., and Anne Perraca Bijur. 2000. *Education for a Sustainable Future, A Paradigm of Hope for the 21st Century*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH DESIGN

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY

Small Island Voice Internet-based Youth Forum Survey

You are being asked to take a survey about the SIV and the Internet-based Youth Forum. The survey is completely anonymous which means no one will know the information is coming from you.

Filling out this survey is your choice and does not affect you at school in any way. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Darcy Nugent at darcy.nugent@gmail.com.

Please circle your feeling for each sentence. There are no right or wrong answers. It is your honest opinion that counts. Thank you.

		<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Don't Know, Not Sure</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
	I like to eat dirt	SA	A	?	D	SD
	Chocolate is one of my favorite foods	SA	A	?	D	SD
		<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Don't Know, Not Sure</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1	The youth internet forum is easy to use.	SA	A	?	D	SD
2	I log on to the forum outside of school.	SA	A	?	D	SD
3	I check the forum for new messages often.	SA	A	?	D	SD
4	I know how to put messages on the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
5	Students from other schools respond back quickly.	SA	A	?	D	SD
6	I would use the forum if it were not part of school.	SA	A	?	D	SD
7	It is easy to share problems and solutions with other students on the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD

		<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Don't Know, Not Sure</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
8	Some of the messages from the older students are too hard for me to read.	SA	A	?	D	SD
9	I have made new friends in other countries on the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
10	I know more about other countries now from reading messages on the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
11	Other students in the forum have the same concerns for their country that I do about mine.	SA	A	?	D	SD
12	I have tried ideas on the forum to improve the environment.	SA	A	?	D	SD
13	I have changed the way I care for the environment at home because of the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
14	I have not learned more about the environment from the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
15	I found the topics for the articles interesting on the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
16	I did not like the topics on the message board.	SA	A	?	D	SD
17	I talk to my parents about what I have read on the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
18	The SIV Youth Forum should continue at my school.	SA	A	?	D	SD
19	More students and schools should get involved in the forum.	SA	A	?	D	SD
20	The internet and the forum are a good way to talk to other students.	SA	A	?	D	SD
21	My top three environmental concerns are:					

22 The topics on the forum I like best are about:

.
22a. I like these topics because:

23 What I like most about the forum is:

24 What I don't like about the forum is:

25 My ideas to make the forum better are:

Now a few questions about you

26 What is your age?

27 Check One () Female () Male

28 What is your country's name?

29 What is your school's name?

30 What is your teacher's name?

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Possible Questions For SIV coordinators and teachers

What is your role in this program?

What is the emphasis of the program here in your country?

What are the interests of the participants?

How is the program maintained here?

Can you tell me about what you think is working well with the program?

What are some of the areas that you feel need improvement?

How is the equipment working for the forum? Any suggestions for improvement?

What is the bulk of the work for you?

Why should the forum continue or not continue in your opinion?

Possible questions for students and teachers

What is your favorite part of the SIV Youth Internet Forum?

What is your least favorite part?

What have you learned from the others participating in the program? Anything specific to the environment?

How have you changed the way you treat your environment as a result of the forum?

How do you use the skills learned from the program?

How has your opinion of your environment changed?

What are your ideas for making the forum better?

Why should the forum continue or not continue in your opinion?

APPENDIX D

HUMAN SUBJECTS IRB APPROVAL

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Office of the Academic
Vice President**
Academic Vice President
Graduate Studies and Research
400 Washington Building
San José, CA 95008-1400
Phone: (408) 924-2480
Fax: (408) 924-2480
Email: pam@stacks.sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

To: Darcy Nugent
1125 Virginia Avenue
Campbell, CA 95008

From: Pam Stacks,
Interim AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: February 16, 2005

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Program Evaluation of Environmental Education Youth Internet Forums for Small Island Developing Nations."

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to all data that may be collected from the subjects. The approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information. This approval for the human subjects portion of your project is in effect for one year, and data collection beyond February 16, 2006 requires an extension request.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

The California State University:
San José
400 Washington Building
San José, CA 95008-1400
Phone: (408) 924-2480
Fax: (408) 924-2480
Email: pam@stacks.sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

cc: David Asquith, Sociology
cc: Gary Klee, Environmental Studies

APPENDIX E

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH LETTERS

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Department of
Environmental Studies**

One Washington Blvd., Suite 100
San Jose, CA 95128-1000
Phone: (408) 924-4444
Fax: (408) 924-4444

Agreement to Participate in Research

Responsible Investigator: Darcy Nugent

Title of Protocol: Program Evaluation of Environmental Education Youth Internet Forums for Small Island Developing Nations

You have been asked to participate in a research study investigating the SIV Youth Internet Forum. The research is an evaluation of the forum for UNESCO

You will be asked to answer questions about how the forum is maintained in your country, your opinion of its success and areas for improvement. This study is being conducted on the twelve islands participating in the SIV Youth Internet Forums. The research is being collected February 2005 through July 2005

Your interview will be scheduled and conducted over the telephone. With your consent, a tape recorder along with notes taken by the investigator will document your answers.

There are no risks anticipated by participating in this evaluation. Upon completion of this research, recommendations for improvement to SIV Youth Internet Forum could indirectly benefit you by enhancing the program. Although the results of this study may be published, no information that could identify you will be included. There is no compensation for participation.

Questions about this research may be addressed to Darcy Nugent, (408)378-2912. Complaints about the research may be presented to Dr. Lynne Trulio, Chair, Environmental Studies Department, College of Social Sciences, (408) 924-5450. Questions about research subjects' rights or research-related injury may be presented to Pamela Stacks, Ph. D., Interim Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, at (408) 924-2480.

No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to "not participate" in the study.

Your consent is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to participate in the entire study or in any part of the study. If you decide to participate in the study, you are free to withdraw at any time without negative effect on your relations with San Jose State University or with any other participating institutions or agencies such as UNESCO

You will receive a copy of this consent form for your records, signed and dated by the investigator. Your signature indicates agreement to participate in the study. The signature of the researcher on this document indicates agreement to include the above named subject in the research and attestation that the subject has been fully informed of his or her rights

The California State University
Education Center
P.O. Box 10000
Fresno, CA 93741-1000
Phone: (559) 437-4444
Fax: (559) 437-4444
Web: www.sjsu.edu
The California State University
Fresno Education Center
P.O. Box 10000
Fresno, CA 93741-1000
Phone: (559) 437-4444
Fax: (559) 437-4444
Web: www.sjsu.edu

Signature

Date

Investigator's Signature

Date

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Department of
Environmental Studies**

The Washburn Center
San Jose, CA 95193-0114
Voice: (408) 924-5450
Fax: (408) 924-5450

Agreement to Participate in Research

Responsible Investigator: Darcy Nugent

Title of Protocol: Program Evaluation of Environmental Education Youth Internet Forums for Small Island Developing Nations

Your child or ward has been asked to participate in a research study investigating the SIV Youth Internet Forum. The research is an evaluation of the forum for UNESCO.

Your child or ward will be asked to fill out a survey about his or her opinion of the forum and comment on its success and areas for improvement. This study is being conducted at the schools on the twelve islands participating in the SIV Youth Internet Forums. The research is being collected February 2005 through July 2005.

There are no risks anticipated by participating in this evaluation. Upon completion of this research, recommendations for improvement to SIV Youth Internet Forum could indirectly benefit your child or ward by enhancing the program. Although the results of this study may be published, no information that could identify your child or ward will be included. There is no compensation for participation.

Questions about this research may be addressed to Darcy Nugent, (408)378-2912. Complaints about the research may be presented to Dr. Lynne Trulio, Chair, Environmental Studies Department, College of Social Sciences, (408) 924-5450. Questions about research subjects' rights or research-related injury may be presented to Pamela Stacks, Ph.D., Interim Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, at (408) 924-2480.

No service of any kind, to which you and/or your child or ward is otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to "not participate" in the study.

Your consent for your child or ward to participate is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to allow his or her participation in the entire study or in any part of the study. If you allow his or her participation in the study, you are free to withdraw your child or ward at any time without negative effect on your relations with San Jose State University or with any other participating institutions or agencies such as UNESCO.

Parent or Guardian Initial _____
Child Initial _____

The California State University,
Office of the President
San Jose State University
San Jose, CA 95193-0114
Voice: (408) 924-5450
Fax: (408) 924-5450
Web: www.sjsu.edu

You will receive a copy of this consent form for your records, signed and dated by the investigator.

The signature of a parent or legal guardian indicates:

- a) approval for the child or ward to participate in the study.
- b) that the child is freely willing to participate, and
- c) that the child is permitted to decline to participate, in all or part of the study, at any point.

The signature of the researcher on this document indicates agreement to include the above named subject in the research and attestation that the subject's parent or guardian has been fully informed of the subject's rights.

Name of Child or Ward

Parent or Guardian Signature

Date

Relationship to Child or Ward

Full Mailing Address

Name of Child Participant

Child Signature

Date

Investigator's Signature

Date