

# Responsive Management™



## **GEORGIA SPRING TURKEY HARVEST SURVEY 2011**

**Conducted for the Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

**by Responsive Management**

**2011**

# **GEORGIA SPRING TURKEY HARVEST SURVEY 2011**

**2011**

## **Responsive Management National Office**

Mark Damian Duda, Executive Director  
Martin Jones, Senior Research Associate  
Tom Beppler, Research Associate  
Steven J. Bissell, Ph.D., Qualitative Research Associate  
Andrea Criscione, Research Associate  
Amanda Ritchie, Research Associate  
Carol L. Schilli, Research Associate  
Tim Winegord, Survey Center Manager  
Alison Lanier, Business Manager

130 Franklin Street  
Harrisonburg, VA 22801  
Phone: 540/432-1888 Fax: 540/432-1892  
E-mail: [mark@responsivemanagement.com](mailto:mark@responsivemanagement.com)  
[www.responsivemanagement.com](http://www.responsivemanagement.com)

## **Acknowledgements**

Responsive Management would like to thank Don McGowan and David Neyhart of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources for his input, support, and guidance on this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Methodology .....	1
Number of Hunters .....	4
Harvest Numbers and Success Rates .....	5
Spur Lengths of Turkeys Harvested .....	15
Days Hunting, Time of Day, Time of Season, and Type of Land .....	18
Ratings of Quality of Hunting.....	23
Reasons for Not Harvesting a Turkey.....	24
Self Identification as a Turkey Hunter and Turkey Hunting Avidity .....	25
Support for and Opposition to Youth Hunting Only on the First Weekend of Turkey Season....	27
Demographic Data and Membership in the National Wild Turkey Federation.....	28
About Responsive Management .....	31

### List of Figures

Figure 1. Sampling Error Equation (Dillman Method).....	2
---	---

### List of Tables

Table 1. Sampling Error.....	2
Table 2. Number of Eligible License Holders and Number Who Hunted Turkey in 2011 .....	3
Table 3. Turkeys Harvested in 2011 .....	5
Table 4. Jakes Harvested in 2011 .....	5
Table 5. Number of Turkeys Harvested During Last Turkey Hunting Trip on Private Land in 2011 .....	6
Table 6. Number of Turkeys Harvested in 2011, by Week .....	7
Table 7. Number of Turkeys Harvested in 2011, by Week and Region.....	8
Table 8. Turkey Harvest in 2011, by Number of Turkeys Harvested and by Region .....	12
Table 9. Jake Harvest in 2011, by Number of Jakes Harvested and by Region .....	13
Table 10. Number Who Hit a Turkey That Was Not Recovered in 2011 .....	14
Table 11. Spur Lengths of Turkeys Harvested in 2011 .....	15
Table 12. Spur Lengths of Turkeys Harvested in 2011, by Region.....	16
Table 13. Number of Days Hunted Turkey in 2011 .....	18
Table 14. Time of Day Hunted Turkeys in 2011 .....	18
Table 15. Percent of Turkey Hunting Done During the Afternoon in 2011 .....	19
Table 16. Weeks Hunted Turkey in 2011 .....	19
Table 17. Type of Land on Which Hunted Turkey in 2011.....	19
Table 18. Size of Tract of Private Land Last Time Hunted Turkey in 2011 (of Those Who Hunted Turkey on Private Land) .....	20
Table 19. Hunting Turkey on Georgia Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Management Areas in 2011 (of Those Who Hunted Turkey on Public Land) .....	20
Table 20. Estimated Days Hunted in 2011, by Region (of Those Who Harvested a Turkey).....	21
Table 21. Rating of the Quality of Georgia Turkey Hunting Experience in 2011.....	23
Table 22. Rating of Quality of Hunting on Private Land in 2011 .....	23
Table 23. Rating of Quality of Hunting on Public Land in 2011 .....	23

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### List of Tables (continued)

Table 24. Reason for Not Harvesting a Turkey (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011) .....	24
Table 25. Self Identification as a Turkey Hunter (of All Eligible License Holders Including Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011 and Those Who Did Not).....	25
Table 26. Self Identification as a Turkey Hunter (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011).....	25
Table 27. Number of Years Hunted Turkey in the Past 5 Years (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011) .....	26
Table 28. Number of Days Typically Hunt Turkey in a Year in Georgia (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011) .....	26
Table 29. Support for and Opposition to Youth Hunting Only on the First Weekend of Turkey Season (of All Eligible License Holders Including Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011 and Those Who Did Not) .....	27
Table 30. Support for and Opposition to Youth Hunting Only on the First Weekend of Turkey Season (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011) .....	27
Table 31. Demographic Characteristics of Georgia Turkey Hunters .....	28
Table 32. County of Residence.....	29
Table 33. Membership Status in National Wild Turkey Federation in 2011 .....	30

## **INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY**

This study was conducted for the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to determine spring turkey harvest numbers by county. The study entailed a telephone survey of Georgia resident licensed hunters. Specific aspects of the research methodology are discussed below.

### **USE OF TELEPHONES FOR THE SURVEY**

For the survey, telephones were selected as the preferred sampling medium because of the almost universal ownership of telephones (both landlines and cell phones were called). Additionally, telephone surveys, relative to mail or Internet surveys, allow for more scientific sampling and data collection, provide higher quality data, obtain higher response rates, are more timely, and are more cost-effective. Telephone surveys also have fewer negative effects on the environment than do mail surveys because of reduced use of paper and reduced energy consumption for delivering and returning the questionnaires.

### **QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN**

The telephone survey questionnaire was developed cooperatively by Responsive Management and the DNR, based on the research team's familiarity with natural resources and hunting. Responsive Management conducted pre-tests of the questionnaire to ensure proper wording, flow, and logic in the survey.

### **SURVEY SAMPLE**

The sample of licensed hunters was obtained from the DNR.

### **TELEPHONE INTERVIEWING FACILITIES**

A central polling site at the Responsive Management office allowed for rigorous quality control over the interviews and data collection. Responsive Management maintains its own in-house telephone interviewing facilities. These facilities are staffed by interviewers with experience conducting computer-assisted telephone interviews on the subjects of outdoor recreation and natural resources.

To ensure the integrity of the telephone survey data, Responsive Management has interviewers who have been trained according to the standards established by the Council of American Survey Research Organizations. Methods of instruction included lecture and role-playing. The Survey Center Managers and other professional staff conducted a project briefing with the interviewers prior to the administration of this survey. Interviewers were instructed on type of study, study goals and objectives, handling of survey questions, interview length, termination points and qualifiers for participation, interviewer instructions within the survey questionnaire, reading of the survey questions, skip patterns, and probing and clarifying techniques necessary for specific questions on the survey questionnaire.

### **INTERVIEWING DATES AND TIMES**

Telephone surveying times are Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday from noon to 5:00 p.m., and Sunday from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., local time. A five-callback design was used to maintain the representativeness of the sample, to avoid bias toward people easy to reach by telephone, and to provide an equal opportunity for all to participate. When a respondent could not be reached on the first call, subsequent calls were placed on different days of the week and at different times of the day. The survey was conducted in July 2011.

### **TELEPHONE SURVEY DATA COLLECTION AND QUALITY CONTROL**

The software used for data collection was Questionnaire Programming Language (QPL). The survey data were entered into the computer as each interview was being conducted, eliminating manual data entry after the completion of the survey and the concomitant data entry errors that may occur with manual data entry. The survey questionnaire was programmed so that QPL branched, coded, and substituted phrases in the survey based on previous responses to ensure the integrity and consistency of the data collection.

The Survey Center Managers and statisticians monitored the data collection, including monitoring of the actual telephone interviews without the interviewers' knowledge, to evaluate the performance of each interviewer and ensure the integrity of the data. The survey questionnaire itself contains error checkers and computation statements to ensure quality and consistent data. After the surveys were obtained by the interviewers, the Survey Center

Managers and/or statisticians checked each completed survey to ensure clarity and completeness. Responsive Management obtained a total of 2,001 completed interviews.

## DATA ANALYSIS

The research team analyzed the data using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software as well as proprietary software developed by Responsive Management. Throughout this report, findings of the telephone survey are reported at a 95% confidence interval. The sampling error is shown in Table 1 below; the formula used to determine the sampling error is shown in Figure 1.

Number in Study (Eligible Respondents)	Proportion That Produces Maximum Sampling Error (p)	Proportion That Produces Maximum Sampling Error (q)	Standard Error of the Proportion	Confidence Interval = 1.96*se of Proportion	Sampling Error (Traditional Method)	Population (De-Duplicated Resident Big Game and Sportsmen)	Sampling Error (Dillman Method)
2,001	0.50	0.50	0.011178	0.021908	2.19	203,478	2.18

**Figure 1. Sampling Error Equation (Dillman Method):**

$B = \left( \sqrt{\frac{N_p(.25) - .25}{N_s}} \right) (1.96)$	<p>Where: B = maximum sampling error (as decimal)</p> <p><math>N_p</math> = pop. size (i.e., total number who could be surveyed)</p> <p><math>N_s</math> = sample size (i.e., total number of respondents surveyed)</p>
<p>Derived from formula: p. 206 in Dillman, D. A. 2000. <i>Mail and Internet Surveys</i>. John Wiley &amp; Sons, NY.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> This is a simplified version of the formula that calculates the <i>maximum</i> sampling error using a 50:50 split (the most conservative calculation because a 50:50 split would give maximum variation).</p>	

## NUMBER OF HUNTERS

The data analysis results in estimates of 44,013 spring turkey hunters and 159,465 hunters who had an eligible license but did not hunt spring turkey.

Total Number of Resident Big Game and Resident Sportsmen Licenses (De-Duplicated)	203,478
Percent of De-Duplicated Licenses That Allow and Were Used for Turkey Hunting	21.63
Total Number of Turkey Hunters (203,478*21.63%)	44,013

## HARVEST NUMBERS AND SUCCESS RATES

Based on the survey data, the spring harvest estimate is 26,516 turkeys, which is 0.60 turkeys per hunter. The estimated number of jakes harvested is 3,140, which is 0.07 per hunter.

A majority of those who hunted turkey on private land (61%) did not harvest any turkeys during their last turkey hunting trip on private land; otherwise, 25% harvested one turkey and 15% harvested more than one turkey.

The first week of the season produced the highest per-week harvest (about 8,400 turkeys), after which the harvest declined each week (to less than 1,000) in weeks 5 and 6, rebounding slightly in weeks 7 and 8 (to 1,100 and 2,700, respectively).

As was the case in 2010, the Piedmont and Upper Coastal Plain were the most productive regions.

Less than 2% of hunters hit a turkey that they did not recover.

**Table 3. Turkeys Harvested in 2011**

Number of Turkeys Harvested by Hunter	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
0	500	61.35	27,002	25,293	28,711							
1	185	22.70	9,991	8,282	11,700							
2	84	10.31	4,536	2,827	6,245							
3	46	5.64	2,484	775	4,193							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.60	0.56	0.64	491	26,516	24,807	28,225

**Table 4. Jakes Harvested in 2011**

Number of Jakes Harvested by Hunter	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Jakes Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Jakes Harvested	Estimated Jakes Harvested	Jakes Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Jakes Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
0	760	93.48	41,144	40,560	41,727							
1	46	5.66	2,490	1,906	3,074							
2	6	0.74	325	0	909							
3	1	0.12	54	1	638							
Total	813	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.07	0.06	0.08	58	3,140	2,556	3,724

Number of Turkeys Harvested by Hunter	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
0	444	60.74	23,977	22,465	25,490							
1	180	24.62	9,721	8,208	11,233							
2	65	8.89	3,510	1,998	5,022							
3	42	5.75	2,268	756	3,780							
Total	731	100	39,476	NA	NA	0.60	0.56	0.63	436	23,545	22,033	25,058

Week	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> turkey 2 <sup>nd</sup> turkey 3 <sup>rd</sup> turkey	Sample Mean Number Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Turkey Harvest Week 1 (Saturday March 26 - Friday April 1)	107	0.19	0.18	0.21	155	8,371	7,465	9,276
	21							
	2							
Turkey Harvest Week 2 (Saturday April 2 - Friday April 8)	70	0.12	0.11	0.14	100	5,400	4,667	6,134
	15							
	0							
Turkey Harvest Week 3 (Saturday April 9 - Friday April 15)	52	0.08	0.07	0.09	66	3,564	2,980	4,148
	7							
	0							
Turkey Harvest Week 4 (Saturday April 16 - Friday April 22)	39	0.06	0.05	0.07	49	2,646	2,140	3,152
	5							
	0							
Turkey Harvest Week 5 (Saturday April 23 - Friday April 29)	19	0.03	0.02	0.03	21	1,134	814	1,454
	1							
	0							
Turkey Harvest Week 6 (Saturday April 30 - Friday May 6)	16	0.02	0.02	0.03	18	972	673	1,271
	1							
	0							
Turkey Harvest Week 7 (Saturday May 7 - Friday May 13)	12	0.01	0.01	0.02	12	648	416	880
	0							
	0							
Turkey Harvest Week 8 (Saturday May 14 - Sunday May 15)	16	0.02	0.02	0.03	20	1,080	752	1,408
	2							
	0							
Turkey Harvest: Don't know Which Week	28	0.06	0.05	0.07	50	2,700	2,115	3,285
	8							
	2							
Total	491	0.60	0.56	0.64	491	26,516	24,807	28,225

Week	Region	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Turkey	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Turkey Harvest Week 1 (Saturday March 26 - Friday April 1)	Blue Ridge	2	1	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	45	279
	Lower Coastal Plain	24	8	1	0.04	0.03	0.05	33	1,782	1,306	2,258
	Piedmont	43	7	0	0.06	0.05	0.07	50	2,700	2,181	3,219
	Ridge and Valley	13	3	0	0.02	0.01	0.03	16	864	564	1,164
	Upper Coastal Plain	41	6	2	0.06	0.05	0.07	49	2,646	2,114	3,179
	Don't know	4	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	81	351
Turkey Harvest Week 2 (Saturday April 2 - Friday April 8)	Blue Ridge	2	1	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	11	313
	Lower Coastal Plain	16	6	1	0.03	0.02	0.04	23	1,242	882	1,602
	Piedmont	20	6	0	0.03	0.02	0.04	26	1,404	1,015	1,793
	Ridge and Valley	7	1	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	8	432	242	622
	Upper Coastal Plain	21	13	5	0.05	0.04	0.06	39	2,106	1,623	2,589
	Don't know	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	-14	122
Turkey Harvest Week 3 (Saturday April 9 - Friday April 15)	Blue Ridge	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
	Lower Coastal Plain	4	2	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	6	324	159	489
	Piedmont	19	6	2	0.03	0.02	0.04	27	1,458	1,100	1,816
	Ridge and Valley	2	4	1	0.01	0.00	0.01	7	378	154	602
	Upper Coastal Plain	12	9	1	0.03	0.02	0.04	22	1,188	834	1,542
	Don't know	3	1	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	51	381

**Table 7.2. Number of Turkeys Harvested in 2011, by Week and Region**

Week	Region	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Turkey	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Turkey Harvest Week 4 (Saturday April 16 - Friday April 22)	Blue Ridge	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
	Lower Coastal Plain	2	4	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	6	324	159	489
	Piedmont	8	10	6	0.03	0.02	0.04	24	1,296	918	1,674
	Ridge and Valley	1	2	1	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	81	351
	Upper Coastal Plain	6	8	1	0.02	0.01	0.02	15	810	534	1,086
	Don't know	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
Turkey Harvest Week 5 (Saturday April 23 - Friday April 29)	Blue Ridge	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
	Lower Coastal Plain	2	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	2	108	13	203
	Piedmont	5	5	1	0.01	0.01	0.02	11	594	352	836
	Ridge and Valley	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	-14	122
	Upper Coastal Plain	5	1	1	0.01	0.00	0.01	7	378	200	556
	Don't know	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
Turkey Harvest Week 6 (Saturday April 30 - Friday May 6)	Blue Ridge	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	-14	122
	Lower Coastal Plain	2	1	1	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	81	351
	Piedmont	4	1	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	5	270	119	421
	Ridge and Valley	1	1	2	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	51	381
	Upper Coastal Plain	2	1	1	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	81	351
	Don't know	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0

Week	Region	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Turkey	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Turkey Harvest Week 7 (Saturday May 7 - Friday May 13)	Blue Ridge	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	-14	122
	Lower Coastal Plain	2	0	2	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	81	351
	Piedmont	1	0	2	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	45	279
	Ridge and Valley	0	1	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	-14	122
	Upper Coastal Plain	1	0	2	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	45	279
	Don't know	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
Turkey Harvest Week 8 (Saturday May 14 - Sunday May 15)	Blue Ridge	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
	Lower Coastal Plain	1	2	3	0.01	0.00	0.01	6	324	133	515
	Piedmont	1	2	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	45	279
	Ridge and Valley	2	2	1	0.01	0.00	0.01	5	270	92	448
	Upper Coastal Plain	3	2	1	0.01	0.00	0.01	6	324	159	489
	Don't know	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
Turkey Harvest: Don't know Which Week	Blue Ridge	2	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	2	108	13	203
	Lower Coastal Plain	4	3	2	0.01	0.01	0.02	9	486	263	709
	Piedmont	9	3	2	0.02	0.01	0.02	14	756	441	1,071
	Ridge and Valley	3	2	2	0.01	0.00	0.01	7	378	135	621
	Upper Coastal Plain	9	5	2	0.02	0.01	0.03	16	864	549	1,179
	Don't know	2	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	2	108	13	203

	Region	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Turkey	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Total	Blue Ridge	8	2	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	10	540	288	792
	Lower Coastal Plain	57	26	10	0.11	0.09	0.13	93	5,022	4,150	5,894
	Piedmont	110	40	13	0.20	0.18	0.22	163	8,803	7,737	9,868
	Ridge and Valley	30	16	7	0.07	0.05	0.08	53	2,862	2,188	3,537
	Upper Coastal Plain	100	45	16	0.20	0.17	0.22	161	8,695	7,594	9,795
	Don't know	10	1	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	11	594	352	836
Total	Total All Regions	315	130	46	0.60	0.56	0.64	491	26,516	24,807	28,225

**Table 8. Turkey Harvest in 2011, by Number of Turkeys Harvested and by Region**

Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Population Lower Bound (95% CI)	Population Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean of Turkeys/Hunter	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Number of Turkeys	Estimated Number of Turkeys	Number of Turkeys Lower Bound (95% CI)	Number of Turkeys Upper Bound (95% CI)
<b>Blue Ridge Region</b>												
0	807	99.0	43,581	43,329	43,833							
1	6	0.7	324	72	576							
2	2	0.2	108	0	360							
3	0	0.0	0	0	0							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.01	0.01	0.02	10	540	288	792
<b>Lower Coastal Plain Region</b>												
0	755	92.6	40,773	39,901	41,644							
1	36	4.4	1,944	1,072	2,816							
2	15	1.8	810	0	1,682							
3	9	1.1	486	0	1,358							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.11	0.09	0.13	93	5,022	4,150	5,894
<b>Piedmont Region</b>												
0	699	85.8	37,748	36,683	38,814							
1	81	9.9	4,374	3,309	5,440							
2	23	2.8	1,242	177	2,307							
3	12	1.5	648	0	1,713							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.20	0.18	0.22	163	8,803	7,737	9,868
<b>Ridge and Valley Region</b>												
0	781	95.8	42,177	41,502	42,851							
1	21	2.6	1,134	460	1,808							
2	7	0.9	378	0	1,052							
3	6	0.7	324	0	998							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.07	0.05	0.08	53	2,862	2,188	3,537
<b>Upper Coastal Plain Region</b>												
0	710	87.1	38,342	37,242	39,443							
1	61	7.5	3,294	2,193	4,395							
2	32	3.9	1,728	627	2,829							
3	12	1.5	648	0	1,749							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.20	0.17	0.22	161	8,695	7,594	9,795
<b>All Regions</b>												
0	500	61.3	27,002	25,293	28,711							
1	185	22.7	9,991	8,282	11,700							
2	84	10.3	4,536	2,827	6,245							
3	46	5.6	2,484	775	4,193							
Total	815	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.60	0.60	0.60	491	26,516	24,807	28,225

(Note: Not shown in table are 11 hunters who did not know their county of harvest, although they are reflected in the total.)

**Table 9. Jake Harvest in 2011, by Number of Jakes Harvested and by Region**

Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Population Lower Bound (95% CI)	Population Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean of Jakes/Hunter	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Jakes Harvested	Estimated Jakes Harvested	Jakes Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Jakes Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
<b>Blue Ridge Region</b>												
0	808	99.5	43,796	43544	44048							
1	2	0.2	108	0	360							
2	1	0	54	0	0							
3	1	0	54	0	0							
Total	812	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.01	0.00	0.01	7	379	128	631
<b>Lower Coastal Plain Region</b>												
0	805	99.1	43,633	42,761	44,505							
1	6	0.7	325	0	1,197							
2	1	0	54	0	0							
3	0	0	0	0	0							
Total	812	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.01	0.00	0.03	8	434	0	1,306
<b>Piedmont Region</b>												
0	793	97.7	42,983	41,918	44,048							
1	16	2.0	867	0	1,933							
2	3	0.4	163	0	1,228							
3	0	0	0	0	0							
Total	812	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.03	0.00	0.05	22	1,192	127	2,258
<b>Ridge and Valley Region</b>												
0	805	99.1	43,633	42,959	44,308							
1	7	0.9	379	0	1,054							
2	0	0.0	0	0	0							
3	0	0	0	0	0							
Total	812	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.01	0.00	0.02	7	379	0	1,054
<b>Upper Coastal Plain Region</b>												
0	797	98.2	43,200	42,099	44,300							
1	13	1.6	705	0	1,805							
2	1	0.1	54	0	1154.9							
3	1	0.123	54	0	0							
Total	812	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.02	0.00	0.05	18	976	0	2,076
<b>All Regions</b>												
0	759	93.5	41,140	39,431	42,849							
1	46	5.7	2,493	784	4,202							
2	6	0.7	325	0	2,034							
3	1	0.123	54	0	1763.1							
Total	812	100	44,013	NA	NA	0.08	0.08	0.08	61	3,294	2,710	3,878

(Note: Not shown in table are 3 hunters who did not know their county of harvest, although they are reflected in the total.)

Shooting Status	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Hit a Turkey That Was Not Recovered	12	1.5	648	416	880
Did Not Hit a Turkey That Was Not Recovered	799	98.0	43,149	42,881	43,416
Don't know	4	0.5	216	81	351
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

## SPUR LENGTHS OF TURKEYS HARVESTED

The majority of turkeys harvested (60%) had a spur length of one inch or more, followed by 29% with a spur length of a half inch or more but less than one inch.

Spur Length	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Less than half an inch	37	7.5	2,006	1,691	2,305
A half inch or more, but less than one inch	142	28.9	7,697	7,142	8,195
One inch or more	296	60.3	16,044	15,417	16,553
Don't know	16	3.3	867	658	1,070
Total	491	100	26,614	26,516	26,516

Spur Length	Region	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Turkey	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Less Than Half an Inch	Blue Ridge	1	1	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	2	108	0	369
	Lower Coastal Plain	5	2	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	7	378	165	591
	Piedmont	9	3	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	12	648	415	881
	Ridge and Valley	5	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	5	270	91	449
	Upper Coastal Plain	7	2	1	0.01	0.01	0.02	10	540	389	691
	Don't know	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	0	122
A Half Inch or More, but Less Than One Inch	Blue Ridge	3	1	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	0	440
	Lower Coastal Plain	16	4	1	0.03	0.01	0.04	21	1,134	578	1,690
	Piedmont	33	11	6	0.06	0.05	0.07	50	2,700	2,171	3,230
	Ridge and Valley	10	8	4	0.03	0.02	0.03	22	1,188	839	1,537
	Upper Coastal Plain	20	18	2	0.05	0.03	0.06	40	2,160	1,480	2,841
	Don't know	4	1	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	5	270	27	513
Once Inch or More	Blue Ridge	3	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	0	423
	Lower Coastal Plain	34	20	9	0.08	0.06	0.09	63	3,402	2,749	4,056
	Piedmont	62	26	7	0.12	0.09	0.14	95	5,130	4,108	6,153
	Ridge and Valley	13	8	2	0.03	0.02	0.04	23	1,242	690	1,794
	Upper Coastal Plain	71	23	13	0.13	0.11	0.15	107	5,778	4,746	6,810
	Don't know	5	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	5	270	0	557

Spur Length	Region	Sample Size (n) 1 <sup>st</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Turkey	Sample Size (n) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Turkey	Sample Mean Number of Turkeys Harvested	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Turkeys Harvested	Estimated Turkeys Harvested	Turkeys Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkeys Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)
Don't Know	Blue Ridge	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	54	0	122
	Lower Coastal Plain	2	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	2	108	0	243
	Piedmont	6	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	6	324	207	441
	Ridge and Valley	2	0	1	0.00	0.00	0.01	3	162	27	297
	Upper Coastal Plain	2	2	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	4	216	37	395
	Don't know	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
Total	Blue Ridge	8	2	0	0.01	0.00	0.02	10	540	172	908
	Lower Coastal Plain	57	26	10	0.11	0.09	0.14	93	5,022	4,070	5,975
	Piedmont	110	40	13	0.20	0.17	0.23	163	8,803	7,556	10,049
	Ridge and Valley	30	16	7	0.07	0.05	0.08	53	2,862	2,116	3,608
	Upper Coastal Plain	100	45	16	0.20	0.17	0.23	161	8,695	7,385	10,004
	Don't know	10	1	0	0.01	0.00	0.02	11	594	158	1,030
Total	Total All Regions	315	130	46	0.60	0.56	0.65	491	26,516	24,548	28,483

## DAYS HUNTING, TIME OF DAY, TIME OF SEASON, AND TYPE OF LAND

The majority of turkey hunters (53%) hunted for one week or less. They typically hunted mornings only, or they hunted mornings into the afternoons; very few hunted afternoons only.

There were more hunters in the first fortnightly period (i.e., two weeks) of the season than in the next three fortnights, with that last fortnight having the fewest hunters.

Most turkey hunting was on private land.

The majority of those who hunted turkey on public land (71%) hunted on Georgia DNR Wildlife Management Areas.

Hunting avidity among those who harvested a turkey, as measured by the mean number of days per hunter, ranged throughout the regions from 9.88 to 15.29 days in the season.

Days Hunted	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Days Hunted	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)
22 or more days	71	8.7	3,834	3,290	4,378			
15-21 days	130	16.0	7,020	6,314	7,727			
8-14 days	174	21.3	9,397	8,606	10,187			
1-7 days	431	52.9	23,275	22,313	24,238			
Don't know	9	1.1	486	284	688			
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013	9.83	9.43	10.24

Time of Day of Hunting	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Mornings Only	479	58.8	25,868	24,918	26,817
Afternoons Only	14	1.7	756	505	1,007
Both Mornings and Afternoons	319	39.1	17,227	16,286	18,168
Don't know	3	0.4	162	45	279
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

**Table 15. Percent of Turkey Hunting Done During the Afternoon in 2011**

Percent of Turkey Hunting in Afternoon	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean of Percent of Hunting Done in Afternoon	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)
100 percent	14	1.7	756	505	1,007			
76-99 percent	5	0.6	270	119	421			
51-75 percent	17	2.1	918	642	1,194			
26-50 percent	199	24.4	10,747	9,918	11,575			
1-25 percent	97	11.9	5,238	4,614	5,863			
0 percent	479	58.8	25,868	24,918	26,817			
Don't know	4	0.5	216	81	351			
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013	16.72	15.67	17.77

**Table 16. Weeks Hunted Turkey in 2011**

Weeks Hunted Turkey in 2011	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
The first 2 weeks of the turkey season	35,210	34,439	35,982
The second 2 weeks of the turkey season	24,896	23,940	25,851
The third 2 weeks of the turkey season	18,199	17,249	19,149
The last 2 weeks of the turkey season	16,741	15,805	17,677
Don't know	3,834	3,290	4,378

**Table 17. Type of Land on Which Hunted Turkey in 2011**

Type of Land	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Private lands	585	71.8	31,592	30,724	32,460
Public lands	77	9.4	4,158	3,594	4,722
Both private and public lands	149	18.3	8,047	7,301	8,792
Don't know	4	0.5	216	81	351
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

**Table 18. Size of Tract of Private Land Last Time Hunted Turkey in 2011 (of Those Who Hunted Turkey on Private Land)**

Size of Tract of Land	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Size of Tract of Land	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)
More than 1,000 acres	131	17.8	7,074	6,409	7,739			
751-1,000 acres	78	10.6	4,212	3,677	4,748			
501-750 acres	58	7.9	3,132	2,664	3,601			
251-500 acres	146	19.9	7,884	7,191	8,578			
250 acres or less	296	40.3	15,985	15,133	16,837			
Don't know	25	3.4	1,350	1,035	1,665			
Total	734	100	39,638	39,638	39,638	934.38	841.04	1,027.72

**Table 19. Hunting Turkey on Any Georgia Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Management Areas in 2011 (of Those Who Hunted Turkey on Public Land)**

Wildlife Management Area Hunting Status	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Hunted on a state Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Management Area	161	71.2	8,695	8,452	8,937
Did not hunt on a state Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Management Area	62	27.4	3,348	3,110	3,587
Don't know if hunted on a state Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Management Area	3	1.3	162	101	223
Total	226	100	12,205	12,205	12,205

Region in Which Harvested Turkey	Number of Days Hunted	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters Who Harvested a Turkey	Turkey Hunters Who Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Who Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Days Hunted	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Estimated Days Hunted	Days Hunted Lower Bound (95% CI)	Days Hunted Upper Bound (95% CI)
Blue Ridge	22 +	0	0.0	0	0	0						
	15 - 21	2	25.0	108	100	116						
	8 - 14	3	37.5	162	153	171						
	1 - 7	3	37.5	162	153	171						
	Don't know	0	0.0	0	0	0						
	Total	8	100.0	432	432	432	9.88	9.66	10.09	4,266	4,171	4,361
Lower Coastal	22 +	13	21.7	702	644	760						
	15 - 21	18	30.0	972	907	1,037						
	8 - 14	9	15.0	486	435	537						
	1 - 7	19	31.7	1,026	960	1,092						
	Don't know	1	1.7	54	36	72						
	Total	60	100.0	3,240	3,240	3,240	15.14	14.67	15.60	49,039	47,533	50,546
Piedmont	22 +	25	21.6	1,350	1,237	1,463						
	15 - 21	26	22.4	1,404	1,290	1,518						
	8 - 14	29	25.0	1,566	1,447	1,685						
	1 - 7	33	28.4	1,782	1,658	1,906						
	Don't know	3	2.6	162	118	206						
	Total	116	100.0	6,264	6,264	6,264	15.29	14.79	15.80	95,789	92,633	98,945
Ridge and Valley	22 +	6	17.6	324	293	355						
	15 - 21	7	20.6	378	345	411						
	8 - 14	9	26.5	486	451	521						
	1 - 7	11	32.4	594	556	632						
	Don't know	1	2.9	54	40	68						
	Total	34	100.0	1,836	1,836	1,836	13.64	13.19	14.08	25,036	24,221	25,852

Region in Which Harvested Turkey	Number of Days Hunted	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters Who Harvested a Turkey	Turkey Hunters Who Harvested Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Who Harvested Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Days Hunted	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)	Estimated Days Hunted	Days Hunted Lower Bound (95% CI)	Days Hunted Upper Bound (95% CI)
Upper Coastal	22 +	19	18.1	1,026	930	1,122						
	15 - 21	25	23.8	1,350	1,244	1,456						
	8 - 14	32	30.5	1,728	1,614	1,842						
	1 - 7	26	24.8	1,404	1,297	1,511						
	Don't know	3	2.9	162	121	203						
	Total	105	100.0	5,670	5,670	5,670	14.45	13.97	14.93	81,937	79,201	84,673
All Regions	22 +	56	17.8	3,024	2,739	3,309						
	15 - 21	75	23.8	4,050	3,733	4,368						
	8 - 14	81	25.7	4,374	4,048	4,700						
	1 - 7	97	30.8	5,238	4,894	5,582						
	Don't know	6	1.9	324	222	426						
	Total	315	100.0	17,011	17,011	17,011	14.11	13.64	14.57	239,971	232,025	247,916

(Note: Not shown in table are 10 hunters who did not know their county of harvest, although they are reflected in the total.)

## RATINGS OF QUALITY OF HUNTING

Overall ratings of spring turkey hunting were more positive than negative: 70% rated it excellent or good; only 9% rated it poor. Ratings of hunting on private land were better than ratings on public land.

Rating	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Excellent	198	24.3	10,693	9,866	11,520
Good	375	46.0	20,251	19,290	21,212
Fair	161	19.8	8,695	7,927	9,462
Poor	72	8.8	3,888	3,341	4,436
Don't know	9	1.1	486	284	688
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

Rating	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Excellent	223	30.4	12,043	11,244	12,842
Good	327	44.6	17,659	16,796	18,522
Fair	129	17.6	6,966	6,305	7,627
Poor	48	6.5	2,592	2,163	3,022
Don't know	7	1.0	378	209	547
Total	734	100	39,638	39,638	39,638

Rating	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Excellent	26	11.5	1,404	1,233	1,575
Good	106	46.9	5,724	5,457	5,991
Fair	61	27.0	3,294	3,057	3,532
Poor	31	13.7	1,674	1,490	1,858
Don't know	2	0.9	108	58	158
Total	226	100	12,205	12,205	12,205

## REASONS FOR NOT HARVESTING A TURKEY

The two most common reasons turkey hunters did not harvest a turkey in 2011 were that they did not see a turkey (38%) and they saw a turkey but did not have a good clean shot on it (25%).

**Table 24. Reason for Not Harvesting a Turkey in 2011 (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011)**

Reason	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
I did not see a turkey.	190	38.0	10,299	9,686	10,835
I took a shot at a turkey, but I missed.	39	7.8	2,114	1,789	2,423
I am pretty sure that I hit a turkey, but I was not able to recover it.	2	0.4	108	33	183
I saw a turkey, but I did not have a good clean shot on it.	127	25.4	6,884	6,343	7,373
I saw a turkey, but I did not want to harvest it.	83	16.6	4,499	4,042	4,922
None of these	54	10.8	2,927	2,549	3,283
Total	500	100	27,101	27,002	27,002

## SELF IDENTIFICATION AS A TURKEY HUNTER AND TURKEY HUNTING AVIDITY

Half of all licensed hunters eligible to hunt turkey (50%), whether they hunted turkey in 2011 or not, consider themselves to be a turkey hunter. Not surprisingly, a large majority of those who hunted turkey in 2011 (84%) consider themselves to be a turkey hunter.

A majority of those who hunted turkey in 2011 (55%) have hunted turkey only 1 of the past 5 years; that is, 2011 is the *only* year they have hunted turkey in the past 5 years.

About a third of turkey hunters (34%) say that they typically hunt for one week or less; meanwhile, 14% turkey hunt for 22 or more days.

**Table 25. Self Identification as a Turkey Hunter (of All Eligible License Holders Including Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011 and Those Who Did Not)**

Self Identification	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Considers himself/herself a turkey hunter	996	49.8	101,281	96,824	105,739
Does not consider himself/herself a turkey hunter	970	48.5	98,638	94,182	103,093
Does not know if he/she considers himself/herself a turkey hunter	35	1.7	3,559	2,390	4,728
Total	2,001	100	203,478	203,478	203,478

**Table 26. Self Identification as a Turkey Hunter (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011)**

Self Identification	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Considers himself/herself a turkey hunter	683	83.8	36,884	36,174	37,595
Does not consider himself/herself a turkey hunter	129	15.8	6,966	6,263	7,670
Does not know if he/she considers himself/herself a turkey hunter	3	0.4	162	45	279
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

**Table 27. Number of Years Hunted Turkey in the Past 5 Years (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011)**

Number of Years Turkey Hunted	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Years Hunted in the Past 5 Years	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)
5 years	111	13.6	5,994	5,333	6,656			
4 years	79	9.7	4,266	3,696	4,837			
3 years	105	12.9	5,670	5,024	6,316			
2 years	72	8.8	3,888	3,341	4,436			
1 year	445	54.6	24,031	23,071	24,992			
Don't Know	3	0.4	162	45	279			
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013	3.81	3.75	3.88

**Table 28. Number of Days Typically Hunt Turkey in a Year in Georgia (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011)**

Days Typically Hunted	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Number of Days Hunted	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)
22 or more days	117	14.4	6,318	5,642	6,995			
15 - 21 days	186	22.8	10,045	9,235	10,854			
8 - 14 days	194	23.8	10,477	9,655	11,298			
1 - 7 days	278	34.1	15,013	14,099	15,927			
Don't Know	40	4.9	2,160	1,744	2,577			
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013	13.34	12.82	13.87

## SUPPORT FOR AND OPPOSITION TO YOUTH HUNTING ONLY ON THE FIRST WEEKEND OF TURKEY SEASON

A majority of all licensed hunters (72%) as well as a majority of only those who hunted turkey in 2011 (also 72%) support creating a special youth hunting opportunity by making the first Saturday and Sunday of turkey season youth hunting only, with most of the support being strong support.

**Table 29. Support for and Opposition to Youth Hunting Only on the First Weekend of Turkey Season (of All Eligible License Holders Including Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011 and Those Who Did Not)**

Support or Oppose	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Strongly support	927	46.3	94,265	89,819	98,711
Moderately support	510	25.5	51,861	47,976	55,746
Neither support nor oppose	183	9.1	18,609	16,039	21,179
Moderately oppose	135	6.7	13,728	11,492	15,964
Strongly oppose	127	6.3	12,914	10,741	15,088
Don't know	119	5.9	12,101	9,992	14,209
Total	2,001	100	203,478	203,478	203,478

**Table 30. Support for and Opposition to Youth Hunting Only on the First Weekend of Turkey Season (of Those Who Hunted Turkey in 2011)**

Support or Oppose	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Strongly support	369	45.3	19,927	18,967	20,887
Moderately support	215	26.4	11,611	10,761	12,461
Neither support nor oppose	57	7.0	3,078	2,586	3,570
Moderately oppose	91	11.2	4,914	4,307	5,522
Strongly oppose	73	9.0	3,942	3,392	4,493
Don't know	10	1.2	540	328	752
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA AND MEMBERSHIP IN THE NATIONAL WILD TURKEY FEDERATION

The demographic data are shown below. Approximately 1 in 6 (16%) hunters are members of the National Wild Turkey Federation.

		Sample Size	Sample Percent	Estimated Population Size	Population Lower Bound (95% CI)	Population Upper Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean	Sample Mean Lower Bound (95% CI)	Sample Mean Upper Bound (95% CI)
Gender	Male	788	96.7	42,555	42,210	42,900			
	Female	27	3.3	1,458	1,113	1,803			
	Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013			
Age	More than 55 years old	130	16.0	7,020	6,314	7,727			
	46 - 55 years old	185	22.7	9,991	9,183	10,798			
	36 - 45 years old	187	22.9	10,099	9,288	10,910			
	26 - 35 years old	181	22.2	9,775	8,973	10,576			
	25 years old or younger	122	15.0	6,588	5,900	7,276			
	Refused	10	1.2	540	328	752			
	Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013	40.70	40.13	41.27
Years Hunting Turkey	Over 10 years	376	46.1	20,305	19,344	21,267			
	5 - 9 years	180	22.1	9,721	8,921	10,521			
	0 - 4 years	255	31.3	13,771	12,877	14,665			
	Don't know / Refused	4	0.5	216	81	351			
	Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013	10.72	10.29	11.14

County	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	County	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	County	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent
Appling	1	0.12	Evans	2	0.25	Pickens	4	0.49
Bacon	9	1.10	Fannin	7	0.86	Pierce	3	0.37
Baldwin	8	0.98	Fayette	3	0.37	Pike	8	0.98
Banks	5	0.61	Floyd	17	2.09	Polk	8	0.98
Barrow	5	0.61	Forsyth	8	0.98	Pulaski	3	0.37
Bartow	12	1.47	Franklin	2	0.25	Putnam	5	0.61
Ben Hill	1	0.12	Fulton	21	2.58	Quitman	1	0.12
Berrien	3	0.37	Gilmer	3	0.37	Rabun	2	0.25
Bibb	8	0.98	Glascock	2	0.25	Randolph	1	0.12
Bleckley	6	0.74	Glynn	11	1.35	Richmond	6	0.74
Brantley	3	0.37	Gordon	9	1.10	Rockdale	5	0.61
Brooks	3	0.37	Greene	5	0.61	Schley	2	0.25
Bryan	6	0.74	Gwinnett	24	2.94	Screven	3	0.37
Bulloch	18	2.21	Habersham	10	1.23	Seminole	1	0.12
Burke	2	0.25	Hall	16	1.96	Spalding	3	0.37
Butts	4	0.49	Haralson	6	0.74	Stephens	4	0.49
Calhoun	2	0.25	Harris	8	0.98	Stewart	2	0.25
Camden	2	0.25	Hart	5	0.61	Sumter	3	0.37
Candler	7	0.86	Heard	4	0.49	Talbot	3	0.37
Carroll	18	2.21	Henry	18	2.21	Tattnall	4	0.49
Catoosa	8	0.98	Houston	19	2.33	Taylor	2	0.25
Charlton	1	0.12	Jackson	8	0.98	Telfair	4	0.49
Chatham	8	0.98	Jeff Davis	2	0.25	Terrell	2	0.25
Chattahoochee	2	0.25	Jefferson	2	0.25	Thomas	3	0.37
Chattooga	2	0.25	Jenkins	3	0.37	Tift	5	0.61
Cherokee	14	1.72	Lamar	1	0.12	Toombs	3	0.37
Clay	1	0.12	Laurens	11	1.35	Treutlen	2	0.25
Clayton	3	0.37	Lee	4	0.49	Troup	9	1.10
Clinch	1	0.12	Liberty	8	0.98	Turner	1	0.12
Cobb	27	3.31	Lincoln	1	0.12	Twiggs	3	0.37
Coffee	8	0.98	Long	4	0.49	Union	1	0.12
Colquitt	6	0.74	Lowndes	14	1.72	Upson	5	0.61
Columbia	8	0.98	Lumpkin	1	0.12	Walker	11	1.35
Cook	2	0.25	McDuffie	3	0.37	Walton	7	0.86
Coweta	14	1.72	Macon	1	0.12	Ware	1	0.12
Crawford	4	0.49	Madison	6	0.74	Warren	1	0.12
Crisp	5	0.61	Marion	2	0.25	Washington	1	0.12
Dade	4	0.49	Meriwether	7	0.86	Wayne	5	0.61
Dawson	5	0.61	Miller	1	0.12	Webster	1	0.12
Decatur	7	0.86	Mitchell	2	0.25	Wheeler	1	0.12
DeKalb	3	0.37	Monroe	4	0.49	White	4	0.49
Dodge	2	0.25	Morgan	3	0.37	Whitfield	6	0.74
Dooly	2	0.25	Murray	2	0.25	Wilcox	9	1.10
Dougherty	4	0.49	Muscogee	16	1.96	Wilkes	3	0.37
Douglas	10	1.23	Newton	8	0.98	Worth	5	0.61
Echols	2	0.25	Oconee	1	0.12	Nonresident	1	0.12
Effingham	13	1.60	Oglethorpe	2	0.25	Don't know	10	1.23
Elbert	1	0.12	Paulding	24	2.94			
Emanuel	4	0.49	Peach	3	0.37	Total	815	100.00

Membership Status	Sample Size (n)	Sample Percent	Estimated Number of Turkey Hunters	Turkey Hunters Lower Bound (95% CI)	Turkey Hunters Upper Bound (95% CI)
Is a Member	127	15.6	6,858	6,159	7,558
Is Not a Member	672	82.5	36,290	35,557	37,024
Don't Know	16	2.0	864	597	1,132
Total	815	100	44,013	44,013	44,013

## **ABOUT RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT**

Responsive Management is a nationally recognized public opinion and attitude survey research firm specializing in natural resource and outdoor recreation issues. Its mission is to help natural resource and outdoor recreation agencies and organizations better understand and work with their constituents, customers, and the public.

Utilizing its in-house, full-service, computer-assisted telephone and mail survey center with 45 professional interviewers, Responsive Management has conducted more than 1,000 telephone surveys, mail surveys, personal interviews, and focus groups, as well as numerous marketing and communications plans, need assessments, and program evaluations on natural resource and outdoor recreation issues.

Clients include most of the federal and state natural resource, outdoor recreation, and environmental agencies, and most of the top conservation organizations. Responsive Management also collects attitude and opinion data for many of the nation's top universities, including the University of Southern California, Virginia Tech, Colorado State University, Auburn, Texas Tech, the University of California—Davis, Michigan State University, the University of Florida, North Carolina State University, Penn State, West Virginia University, and others.

Among the wide range of work Responsive Management has completed during the past 25 years are studies on how the general population values natural resources and outdoor recreation, and their opinions on and attitudes toward an array of natural resource-related issues. Responsive Management has conducted dozens of studies of selected groups of outdoor recreationists, including anglers, boaters, hunters, wildlife watchers, birdwatchers, park visitors, historic site visitors, hikers, and campers, as well as selected groups within the general population, such as landowners, farmers, urban and rural residents, women, senior citizens, children, Hispanics, Asians, and African-Americans. Responsive Management has conducted studies on environmental education, endangered species, waterfowl, wetlands, water quality, and the reintroduction of numerous species such as wolves, grizzly bears, the California condor, and the Florida panther.

Responsive Management has conducted research on numerous natural resource ballot initiatives and referenda and helped agencies and organizations find alternative funding and increase their memberships and donations. Responsive Management has conducted major agency and organizational program needs assessments and helped develop more effective programs based upon a solid foundation of fact. Responsive Management has developed websites for natural resource organizations, conducted training workshops on the human dimensions of natural resources, and presented numerous studies each year in presentations and as keynote speakers at major natural resource, outdoor recreation, conservation, and environmental conferences and meetings.

Responsive Management has conducted research on public attitudes toward natural resources and outdoor recreation in almost every state in the United States, as well as in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan. Responsive Management routinely conducts surveys in Spanish and has also conducted surveys and focus groups in Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese.

Responsive Management's research has been featured in most of the nation's major media, including CNN, ESPN, *The Washington Times*, *The New York Times*, *Newsweek*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and on the front pages of *The Washington Post* and *USA Today*.

Visit the Responsive Management website at:  
**[www.responsivemanagement.com](http://www.responsivemanagement.com)**