

SATISFACTION ACROSS A MULTI-DAY OUTDOOR RECREATION EVENT

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by

TIMOTHY M. MONTGOMERY

Dr. David R. Vaught, Thesis Supervisor

AUGUST 2007

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled.

SATISFACTION ACROSS A MULTI-DAY
OUTDOOR RECREATION EVENT

Presented by Timothy Montgomery

A candidate for the degree of Master of Science in Parks, Recreation and Tourism

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. David R. Vaught, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism

Dr. C. Randy Vessell, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism

Dr. William B. Kurtz, Department of Forestry

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following people, without whom completion of this thesis and graduate education would not have been possible.

Abbe, thank you for the inspiration and support throughout the process, your undying enthusiasm is contagious.

Little one on the way, thank you for providing a different light to view life in. Your presence in our lives is the greatest blessing a person could receive.

Mom and Dad, thank you for always believing in my choices.

Family and friends, thank you so much for the everlasting blessings and encouragement along the way. All of you made reaching this goal possible.

An enormous thanks to all my committee members. Dr. David Vaught for providing the motivation needed to finish after leaving to pursue full-time employment. Your guidance and knowledge was instrumental throughout this lengthy process.

Dr. C. Randy Vessell for providing your expertise of the park and recreation field throughout work on my thesis and education at the graduate level.

Dr. William Kurtz for sharing your passion of cycling. The dynamic of muscle and machine working together produces a beautiful outcome.

Paula Belyea, thank you for knowing what I needed, before I knew I needed it. Without your help I cannot begin to imagine how long it would have taken to get documents in order.

Dr. Jaelyn Card, thank you for the persistence. Believing that no matter how bad the first drafts were, I could straighten them out and produce something worthwhile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... | ii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | viii |
| ABSTRACT..... | ix |
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Purpose..... | 3 |
| Hypotheses..... | 3 |
| Limitations..... | 4 |
| Delimitations..... | 5 |
| Definitions..... | 5 |
| Need for Study..... | 6 |
| CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 9 |
| Recreation Experience Across Time..... | 9 |
| Performance Only Measures..... | 11 |
| Attributes Leading to Satisfaction..... | 11 |
| Katy Trail State Park..... | 12 |
| Summary..... | 13 |
| CHAPTER 3. METHODS..... | 14 |
| Research Design..... | 14 |
| Subject Selection..... | 14 |
| Questionnaire..... | 14 |
| Data Collection..... | 16 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Daily Route Description..... | 17 |
| Data Analysis..... | 17 |
| CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS..... | 19 |
| Surveys Collected..... | 19 |
| Descriptive Analysis..... | 20 |
| Gender..... | 20 |
| Age..... | 21 |
| Education..... | 21 |
| Income..... | 21 |
| Trail Use..... | 22 |
| Attribute Performance Mean..... | 22 |
| Domain-level Performance Mean..... | 24 |
| Regression Analysis..... | 25 |
| Relationship between Attributes..... | 25 |
| Monday..... | 25 |
| Tuesday..... | 26 |
| Wednesday..... | 28 |
| Thursday..... | 28 |
| Friday..... | 30 |
| Summary..... | 32 |
| Relationship between Domain-level Attributes..... | 33 |
| Monday..... | 33 |
| Tuesday..... | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Wednesday..... | 35 |
| Thursday..... | 36 |
| Friday..... | 37 |
| Summary..... | 38 |
| Inferential Analysis..... | 38 |
| Performance Rating by Demographic Profile..... | 38 |
| Age..... | 39 |
| Trail Use..... | 40 |
| Summary..... | 42 |
| Difference by Day of Week..... | 43 |
| Attribute..... | 43 |
| Domain-level..... | 45 |
| Summary..... | 45 |
| Demographic Profile Occurrence..... | 46 |
| Sample Proportion Occurrence..... | 46 |
| Sample Proportion v. DSP Survey Results..... | 47 |
| Sample Proportion v. DSP Population..... | 48 |
| Summary..... | 48 |
| Relationship between Day’s Experience and Overall Satisfaction..... | 49 |
| Monday..... | 49 |
| Tuesday..... | 49 |
| Wednesday..... | 50 |
| Thursday..... | 50 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Friday..... | 51 |
| Summary..... | 51 |
| CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS..... | 52 |
| Review of Literature..... | 52 |
| Attribute Satisfaction Rating..... | 53 |
| Demographic Group Rating..... | 56 |
| Attribute Correlation..... | 57 |
| Domain-level Correlation..... | 58 |
| Overall Day Satisfaction and Overall Event Satisfaction..... | 59 |
| Additional Comments Regarding Satisfaction..... | 60 |
| Discussion..... | 61 |
| Recommendations..... | 62 |
| Future Research..... | 63 |
| Conclusion..... | 64 |
| Specific Recommendations to the Agency..... | 65 |
| REFERENCES..... | 67 |
| APPENDIXES..... | 71 |
| A. Katy Trail Ride 2005 Map..... | 71 |
| B. Division of State Parks Survey Results..... | 72 |
| C. Questionnaire Review Panel..... | 98 |
| D. IRB Consent to Participate Form..... | 99 |
| E. Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride 2005 Features Questionnaire..... | 100 |
| F. Additional Comment List..... | 102 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| G. Attribute Correlation Matrix Tables..... | 111 |
| Monday..... | 111 |
| Tuesday..... | 112 |
| Wednesday..... | 113 |
| Thursday..... | 114 |
| Friday..... | 115 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Surveys Collected by Day of Week..... | 20 |
| Table 2. Demographic Age Statistics..... | 21 |
| Table 3. Trail Use Statistics..... | 22 |
| Table 4. Attribute Mean..... | 23 |
| Table 5. Domain-level Mean..... | 25 |
| Table 6. Monday Correlation Matrix Data..... | 26 |
| Table 7. Tuesday Correlation Matrix Data..... | 27 |
| Table 8. Wednesday Correlation Matrix Data..... | 28 |
| Table 9. Thursday Correlation Matrix Data..... | 29 |
| Table 10. Friday Correlation Matrix Data..... | 31 |
| Table 11. Monday Domain Correlation Matrix..... | 34 |
| Table 12. Tuesday Domain Correlation Matrix..... | 35 |
| Table 13. Wednesday Domain Correlation Matrix..... | 36 |
| Table 14. Thursday Domain Correlation Matrix..... | 37 |
| Table 15. Friday Domain Correlation Matrix..... | 38 |

ABSTRACT

While a number of studies have addressed satisfaction within recreation, only a few researchers have studied satisfaction across a multi-day outdoor recreation event. The purpose of this study was to determine significant relationship between overall satisfaction with the day's experience and overall event satisfaction. In addition, the study determined demographic characteristics of Katy Trail Ride 2005 participants and measured participant satisfaction with specific site attributes over the course of a multi-day outdoor recreation event . The survey method was used to collect data on-site from June 20 through June 24, 2005.

Data were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 12.0.1 (SPSS). Pearson r was used to determine significant relationship between site attributes and overall satisfaction on a daily basis. Inferential statistics were used to determine; if satisfaction differed within demographic profiles (Kruskal-Wallis), significant difference of attributes throughout the week (ANOVA), and significant differences between overall satisfaction with the day's experience and overall event satisfaction (chi square test of independence).

Results indicated a spike in participant satisfaction upon completion of the multi-day event. Attributes correlating significantly with overall day satisfaction were facility cleanliness, facility maintenance, SAG service, current and accurate information, safety and security information, and natural and historical information.

Results from this study provide information about managerial relevant concepts allowing recreation agencies to more efficiently facilitate programs and services within outdoor recreation settings.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Satisfaction, a multi-faceted concept, can be conceptualized through the expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm. Disconfirmation is a function of an individual's pre-experience expectations and his or her post-experience evaluation of performance (Petrick, 2004). The area existing between expectation and outcome has typically been the measure for disconfirmation (Burns, Graefe, & Absher, 2003). When expected outcome equals performance, confirmation results. Positive disconfirmation, which leads to satisfaction, results when outcome exceeds expected benefits. When performance fails to meet expectation it results in negative disconfirmation, leading to dissatisfaction.

While expectancy-disconfirmation has traditionally been the measure of satisfaction within the recreation field (Manning, 1999), recent research has shown performance only measures to be a more valid indicator of satisfaction (Crompton & Love, 1995; Burns et al., 2003). Results from these studies showed participants either didn't form expectations about an event, or didn't use formed expectations to judge event performance (Crompton & Love). Therefore, satisfaction, or fulfillment of a desire, was measured by a performance only measure. Measuring event performance can provide recreation agencies important information about customer satisfaction.

Providing customers with a satisfying experience is the central objective of park and recreation agencies. Implicit in this knowledge is the reality that satisfied customers are more likely to be repeat visitors, to be loyal users, to support the agency, and to disseminate positive word-of-mouth to others (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Tian-Cole,

Crompton, & Willson, 2002). Ensuring customer retention or expansion through overall satisfaction is the goal of park and recreation managers.

Park and recreation managers facilitating satisfaction over the course of a multi-day event face an additional obstacle. Research has shown attitude and mood change as the length of the event increases (Cashel, Lane, & Montgomery, 1996). These changes in attitude and mood, changes in landscape beauty and ability to cope with unexpected situations have been shown to influence participant satisfaction (Hull, Stewart, & Yi, 1992; Cashel et al.; Hultsman, 1998). Additionally, participant satisfaction has been shown to register a spike of extreme satisfaction at the conclusion of an experience (Hull, Stewart, & Yi, 1992). Measuring satisfaction of managerial relevant concepts such as facility cleanliness, trail maintenance, or roadway crossings, at the appropriate time is essential for recreation agencies to efficiently facilitate programs and services while ensuring participant satisfaction.

Identifying important management issues and concentrating resources to these areas has led to the development of Rails-to-Trails (rail-trails) throughout the U.S. beginning in the mid-1960s. The movement started in the Midwest as a simple solution to a localized opportunity. As rail corridors were abandoned, people recognized they had resources at their disposal and decided to utilize the opportunity for recreation (Nevel & Harnik, 1990). Currently, there are more than 1250 rail-trails within the United States (Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, 2005).

Katy Trail State Park, at 225 miles, is the nation's longest developed rail-trail (see Appendix A). Extending from Clinton, Missouri to St. Charles, Missouri, the crushed limestone trail is operated by Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of

State Parks (DSP). The National Trail System Act of 1968 provided the right-of-way for Katy Trail SP. This act allows interim recreational trail use of railroad corridors that are no longer needed for active service. It is a statutory median banking railroad rights-of-way for future transportation use if ever needed (DNR, 2002).

Katy Trail SP is home to the Katy Trail Ride. An event held annually since 2001, the ride provides supported bicycle travel over five days along the 225 mile route. Katy Trail Ride 2005, *Riding Missouri's Weinstrasse*, allowed riders to follow the "wine road" through scenic wine country from Clinton to St. Charles (DNR, 2005). Identifying visitor satisfaction with Katy Trail Ride 2005 attributes provides important information for management and resource allocation decisions.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine significant relationship between overall satisfaction with the day's experience and overall event satisfaction. Additionally, the study measured participant satisfaction with specific site attributes over the course of a multi-day recreation event and determined demographic characteristics of Katy Trail Ride 2005 participants. Visitor satisfaction of specific site attributes was measured over the course of the event. This study used a performance only measure to determine recreationists' satisfaction with DSP performance of facilities, services, information, and experience of Katy Trial Ride 2005.

Hypotheses

Ho₁. There is no significant correlation between day one domain-level satisfaction and day one overall satisfaction.

Ho₂. There is no significant correlation between day two domain-level satisfaction and day two overall satisfaction.

Ho₃. There is no significant correlation between day three domain-level satisfaction and day three overall satisfaction.

Ho₄. There is no significant correlation between day four domain-level satisfaction and day four overall satisfaction.

Ho₅. There is no significant correlation between day five domain-level satisfaction and day five overall satisfaction.

Ho₆. There is no significant correlation between day one overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Ho₇. There is no significant correlation between day two overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Ho₈. There is no significant correlation between day three overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Ho₉. There is no significant correlation between day four overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Ho₁₀. There is no significant correlation between day five overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Limitations

This study used purposive sampling, thus results reflect only visitor satisfaction of participants in the Katy Trail Ride 2005 held June 20 through June 24. Therefore, findings from this study may not be applicable to similar events.

While the intent of this study was to use random sampling, the possibility exists that participants were inadvertently surveyed on more than one occasion throughout the week.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to all participants of Katy Trail Ride 2005 who were 18 years of age or older (adults). Additionally, the study was delimited to individuals participating between June 20, and June 24, 2005.

Definitions

The following terms are used throughout this study:

Attribute – Characteristic or quality belonging to a person, thing, or group. Properties of Katy Trail Ride 2005 were measured for this study. Attributes are sometimes referred to as variables throughout this study.

Domain-level – Specific attribute were coded into one of four groups; facilities, services, information, or experience. Ratings of satisfaction at the domain-level are sometimes referred to as simply attribute domain.

DSP (Division of State Parks) – Missouri State Parks and Historic Sites is administered by Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of State Parks (DNR, 2005).

Overall event satisfaction – Participant perception of satisfaction with the entire Katy Trail Ride 2005 event as measured by DSP mail-in survey handed out on completion of the ride. Survey results are located in Appendix B.

Overall satisfaction with day's experience – Participant perception of daily satisfaction measured with the Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride Features survey administered nightly by the researcher.

Quality of performance - "...visitors' perceptions of the attributes of a facility that are controlled by management" (Tian-Cole et al, 2002, p. 2). Attributes of facilities, services, information, and experience will be measured to determine achievement by DSP.

SAG service – DSP stops located every 10 to 15 miles along the route to provide water, fruit, and moral support. Though the exact origin of SAG isn't known, one definition of SAG is an abbreviation for 'Service and Gear' (Ferriell, 2007).

Satisfaction – Results from fulfillment of a desire. A measure of participants' satisfaction with specific attributes and domain-levels will be determined after analyzing the Katy Trail Ride questionnaire.

Need for Study

"When the activity stage lasts more than one day, a series of short travel from and recollection stages actually take place between involvement in each event" (Hultsman, 1998, p. 473). Over the course of a multi-day experience, attitude and mood change as the length of the event increases (Cashel, et al., 1996). DSP currently conducts a one-time measure of satisfaction at the conclusion of Katy Trail Ride. A study of satisfaction throughout the length of a multi-day event was used to measure significance and determine whether a 'spike' of extreme satisfaction occurs at the conclusion of an experience as was found by Hull et al. (1992).

Furthermore, real-time satisfaction measures evaluate the current state of a participant's mood, attitude, and feelings about an experience (Stewart & Hull, 1992). This provides a greater understanding about the effects situational variables have on the recreation experience (Stewart & Hull). They concluded post hoc satisfaction (PHS) assessments occurring directly after the experience were significantly related to real-time or on-site assessments. The overall satisfaction with the day's experience attribute was measured nightly directly after the experience has occurred.

The overall event satisfaction attribute was measured by a DSP post ride survey. Participants were encouraged to mail evaluation forms back to DSP after the on-site activity had occurred, resulting in a PHS measure. This allowed a time gap between the experience and introspection, or recall of past experiences. Substantial differences were found occurring between PHS assessments directly following the experience and PHS assessments occurring up to three months later (Stewart & Hull, 1992). This study utilized a PHS assessment directly after the experience to measure overall daily satisfaction, providing a measure significantly related to real-time assessment of attribute performance. Results showed whether significant difference exists between real-time assessment of overall daily satisfaction and post-hoc assessment of overall event satisfaction, as was found by Stewart and Hull (1992) and Lee, Dattilo and Howard (1994).

Evaluating user perception of managerial relevant concepts, service quality, facilities, information, and recreational experience, provided information for park and recreation agencies to more efficiently facilitate programs and services. Management should provide explicit attention to areas in which they can directly effect participants'

outdoor recreation experience (Manning, 1999). As a customer-oriented business, outdoor recreation providers and natural resource managers must address the wants and needs of their constituents. The practical suggestions this study provides may be applied to improve user satisfaction in outdoor recreation settings.

Because visitor satisfaction and preferences change across time, determining specific demographic characteristics will help agencies assess trends and satisfaction. Demographic information is "...fundamental to an eventual understanding of more sophisticated issues such as why people participate in outdoor recreation" (Manning, 1999, p. 25). This information may be used to plan and implement specific programs and services for demographic profile. Therefore, a better understanding of outdoor recreationists' demographic characteristics is needed to assess trends across time and identify preferences for specific outdoor recreation activities.

Several studies have researched satisfaction within travel and tourism, recreation centers, and marketing (Crompton & Love, 1995; Tarrant & Smith, 2002). While a few studies have addressed satisfaction within outdoor recreation, only a small number of these studies (Lee et al., 1994; Cashel et al., 1996) have studied satisfaction over the course of a multi-day experience.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Outdoor recreation research began with the development of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) in 1958 (Manning, 1999). Shortly after ORRRC was established to assess outdoor recreation in America, research began into the satisfaction of an outdoor recreation experience. While expectancy-disconfirmation has traditionally been the measure of satisfaction within the recreation field (Manning), performance only measures have been shown to be a more valid indicator of overall satisfaction as well as domain-level satisfaction (Crompton & Love, 1995; Burns et al., 2003). To understand the purpose and need for this study, this chapter reviews prior investigations and explains the implications of satisfaction research.

Recreation Experience across Time

Cashel, Lane and Montgomery (1996) studied outdoor recreation participants over the course of three years from eight expeditions at the Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico. They investigated mood states; anger, confusion, depression, fatigue, tension, and vigor across the nine day wilderness expeditions (Cashel et al.). Seventy-seven adult surveys were useable, 45 male and 32 female, with a median age of 24.4 years. Findings showed mood and attitude change as the length of the expedition increases with a distinct difference at day four of the expedition. The mood states anger, confusion, depression, fatigue, and tension registered higher on day four than any other day, while vigor received the lowest rating on the fourth day (Cashel et al.).

Hultsman (1998) studied the 1997 National Dog Agility Championships to determine factors affecting participant satisfaction across a multi-day event. Assessments

of participant satisfaction with preparation, performance, and overall experience were measured (Hultsman). Data were collected across all five stages of Clawson's (1963) leisure experience: anticipation and planning, travel to the site, on-site activity, travel from the site, and recollection of the experience. Results found individuals that met expected goals of performance while simultaneously dealing with stressful, adverse conditions found the overall experience satisfying (Hultsman). This suggests an effective ability to cope with unexpected situations contributed to greater participant satisfaction.

In 1992, Hull, Stewart and Yi studied experience patterns of 90 hikers participating in a short, strenuous hike of the Maroon Bells Wilderness in Colorado. Mood, satisfaction, and landscape scenic beauty were assessed at 12 points along the trail. Twenty items were rated at each survey marker. Findings showed participant satisfaction was influenced by changes in landscape beauty and mood experience patterns. While ratings of satisfaction fluctuated throughout the hike, ratings of being extremely satisfied were registered at the conclusion of the experience (Hull et al.). Further, data showed activity-goal (i.e., reaching one's destination) explained a considerable portion with peaks in satisfaction as well as changes with other experience patterns (Hull et al.).

Lee, Dattilo, and Howard (1994) studied 16 participants using self administered tape recordings to document real-time experience measures while interviews captured post-hoc perspectives to determine the dynamics of a leisure experience. Findings showed real-time assessments included both pleasant and stressful experiences, while PHS retrospective descriptions did not indicate any stressful experiences. They concluded

a leisure experience is multi-dimensional, transitory, and multi-phased, as participant's interpretations change over time (Lee et al., 1994).

Performance Only Measures

In a comparison of seven alternative quality and satisfaction measurements, Crompton and Love (1995) measured 22 attributes of the annual Dickens of the Strand Festival in Galveston, Texas, surveying 586 individuals. Results indicated performance only measures to be the most valid predictor of satisfaction, while disconfirmation-based models were least accurate (Crompton & Love). Crompton and Love concluded participants didn't form expectations about the event, or if expectations were formed, didn't use their expectations as criteria when judging event performance.

Burns et al. (2003) tested satisfaction-only versus gap score to determine the best measure of outdoor recreation satisfaction. A gap score is achieved by computing the difference or 'gap' between participant rating of importance with an attribute and their rating of satisfaction with the attribute. Nineteen attributes of water based recreation within four domains were identified and tested. Results found satisfaction-only measures were better indicators of overall satisfaction as well as domain-level satisfaction.

Attributes Leading to Satisfaction

While studying attribute importance of 1,210 commercial and 111 private whitewater boaters on the Cheat River of West Virginia, Whisman and Hollenhorst (1998) concluded both groups perceived opportunity to experience challenge, excitement, and test skills as the most important variables affecting satisfaction. Additionally, commercial boaters rated social interaction and escape from the demands of everyday life

as the attributes most likely to affect participant satisfaction, while private boaters rated environmental conditions as the greatest predictor (Whisman & Hollenhorst).

Conducting a study of 8,608 Florida Department of State Park visitors across four consecutive seasons, Fletcher and Fletcher (2003) concluded visitor satisfaction was strongly related to maintenance of the park, behavior of park personnel, and park cleanliness. These results are consistent with the findings of Novatorov, Seong-Seop, Wall and Crompton (1998) regarding the extreme importance of park cleanliness and maintenance. Hammitt et al. (1996) found litter, though observed less than other conditions, had the greatest effect on satisfaction. These findings are consistent with results from Lee (1975) and West (1982) showing absence of litter was positively correlated with visitor satisfaction within Yosemite National Park.

Katy Trail State Park

Ceasing operation in 1986, the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad (Katy) provided a recreation opportunity for a flat, long distance hiking and bicycling trail across the state (DNR, 2002). A donation by Edward D. Jones allowed DNR the right-of-way to the former rail bed (DNR). Before developing the entire length of the Missouri River State Trail, now Katy Trail State Park, the state of Missouri first developed two pilot sections to determine beneficial and detrimental impacts of such a trail (Bhullar, Braschler, Gillespie, Kaylen, & Vaught, 1991). The western pilot section extended from Rocheport to McBaine at a length of 9.4 miles, opening in April 1990, while the eastern section extended from Highway 40 to Marthasville opening during the Fall of 1990 at 26.9 miles long (Bhullar et al.). In 1991, an additional 33 miles of trail was acquired through a donation from Union Pacific Railroad (DNR). The Katy Trail, set for completion by

1994, suffered damage to over 55 percent of the original 126 miles by the flood of 1993 (Dufur, 1999). In September 1996, after additional donations and purchases, the east section was connected to the west section completing the trail's current length. As the trail meanders through countryside, wetlands, prairies, wine country, and historic small towns, recreationist are able to enjoy 225 miles of trail (DNR).

Summary

A recreation experience changes across the length of the event. Findings show mood, attitude, and level of satisfaction with an outdoor recreation experience is dynamic. Hultsman (1998) showed satisfied participants were ones which modified their behavior to adjust to changes in the experience.

The level to which these concerns are met will have a large impact on the behavioral intentions of recreation participants. This area has garnered substantial attention in recent years (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Howat, Murray, & Crilley, 1999; Petrick, 2004; Tian-Cole & Crompton, 2003; Tian-Cole et al., 2002). These studies found perceptions of high satisfaction directly influence participants' behavioral intentions. Findings may be used to predict participant loyalty, future visitation, and positive word of mouth communication about a service.

Satisfaction is a multidimensional construct that has been studied from many angles. The performance only measure has been shown to be the best indicator of customer satisfaction at both the overall and domain-level in recreation research (Crompton & Love, 1995; Burns et al., 2003). This thesis focused on a satisfaction only measure of DSP performance of attributes to determine significant relationship between satisfaction with the day's experience and overall event satisfaction.

CHAPTER 3

Methods

Research design, selection of subjects, questionnaire, data collection, and statistics that the researcher used for data analysis are discussed in this chapter.

Research Design

This study was a quantitative assessment using a non-experimental, cross-sectional, relationship design. The survey method was used to collect data.

Subject Selection

The subjects were individuals who participated in the Katy Trail Ride between June 20, and June 24, 2005. The questionnaire was distributed randomly to participants 18 years of age and older. Division of State Parks limited the ride to 300 participants. Katy Trail Ride 2005 was composed of 285 individuals with an average age of 52.

Questionnaire

Identifying attributes to be measured was accomplished through review of various published satisfaction study questionnaires and survey instruments. Items determined to be appropriate were selected based on findings from studies listed in the literature review of this study (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2003; Hammitt et al., 1996; Lee, 1975; Lee et al., 2002; Novatorov et al., 1998; West, 1982; Whisman & Hollenhorst, 1998). These items were modified to meet the specific needs of the study. Questions for this study addressed specific attribute assessment of an outdoor recreation experience. Additional items were created by the researcher and the questionnaire review panel for inclusion in the study which did not previously exist in the literature. This list was then refined by the

researcher and questionnaire review panel to the most relevant and important features to assure items measured the correct attributes of the Katy Trail Ride 2005.

The questionnaire was closely examined by a panel of experts for content validity to assure accuracy and precision. The panel consisted of: Dr. David Vaught, Faculty Advisor; Mr. David Kelly, Program Director for Market Development, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of State Parks; and Ms. Melanie Robinson, Special Events Coordinator, MDNR, DSP. Professors in the Parks, Recreation and Tourism Department at the University of Missouri provided recommendations on question selection and wording. Recommendations by these experts were used to make appropriate changes in the wording or content of the questionnaire. Contact information for questionnaire review panel experts is located in Appendix C.

The questionnaire, consent to participate letter, and an application detailing proposed research methods were then submitted to the Institutional Review Board. The application to conduct research for this study was approved (# 1050537). The consent to participate letter, which outlined the voluntary nature to participate and description of this study, is located in Appendix D.

The questionnaire was pre-tested by asking Katy Trail State Park bicycle riders to complete the questionnaire and give any appropriate feedback. Bicycle riders using the Katy Trail State Park at the McBaine Trailhead on May 7, 2005 were sampled. Riders were informed about the study by the researcher and asked if they would complete a questionnaire of Katy Trail attributes. Once the individual agreed, they were provided a questionnaire and a pencil and told to circle one number for each feature. The researcher was present to answer any questions. After completing the questionnaire, subjects were

asked to comment on any problems with understanding or completion of the questionnaire. Information from the pre-test was used to make certain accuracy of measurement and to revise wording, ensuring readability.

Participants were asked to score their satisfaction with the performance of each attribute on a scale of one to five. Satisfaction was measured on a scale of one to five with one being poor and five being very good.

Data Collection

Data was collected on site during the 2005 Katy Trail Ride. Feature performance was measured by the 'Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride Features' questionnaire listed in Appendix E. The questionnaire was administered nightly, June 20 through June 23, prior to the mandatory rider meeting hosted by DSP. Participants were asked to complete the final, day five, survey as they arrived at the Katy Trail Ride finish, located at the St. Charles Trailhead on June 24.

Participants 18 years of age and older were randomly asked on a nightly basis and again after finishing the ride on Friday to complete the questionnaire. If the subject agreed, they were handed a pen and a questionnaire and informed to circle one number for each feature listed as well as to check or fill in the appropriate information about demographic information. The researcher remained available for questions concerning the instrument and to collect completed surveys.

Questionnaires were examined for improper markings and unusable surveys. The collected data was then converted to a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 12.0.1 data file for analysis (SPSS, 2003).

Daily Route Description

Monday's ride departed from Clinton and finished in Pilot Grove, covering 61.3 miles. Skies were clear, with a 72 degree mean temperature, highs reaching 86 degrees and an ESE wind at 2 mph (Weather Underground, 2007).

Riders departed Pilot Grove Tuesday morning, covering 49.7 miles on the way to Hartsburg. The mean temperature was 75 degrees with an 87 degree high and a SW wind at 5 mph (Weather Underground).

On Wednesday, participants covered 56 miles riding between Hartsburg and Hermann. Day three's mean temperature was 78 degrees with a 91 degree high. A slight breeze came from the ESE direction with gusts at 7 mph (Weather Underground).

Thursday's ride went from Hermann to Augusta, covering 37.7 miles. The day's mean temperature was 81 degrees with a 97 degree high and no wind recorded (Weather Underground).

Participants finished off the week by riding 26.8 miles from Augusta to St. Charles. An 82 degree mean temperature with 95 degree high and a SE wind at 3 mph was recorded (Weather Underground).

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 12.0.1 (SPSS, 2003). A correlation matrix using Pearson product moment correlation was used to determine if a relationship exists between each attribute and overall day satisfaction. Attributes that were correlated for this study consisted of facility cleanliness, hot showers at campsite, variability of food, natural/historical information about the area, trail maintenance, quantity of food, length of ride, facility maintenance, safety and security

information about the area, quality of food, staff and volunteer courtesy, aesthetics of surroundings, availability of food, staff and volunteer knowledge, social interaction with participants, level of challenge, restroom availability, weather conditions, SAG service, ease of obtaining information, level of personal fatigue, roadway crossings, and current and accurate information.

A second correlation matrix was developed to determine relationship between each domain-level and overall day satisfaction. Domain-levels that were correlated were facilities, services, information, and experience.

Inferential statistics were run to determine; if ratings of satisfaction differed within demographic profile groups (Kruskal-Wallis H test), attribute satisfaction differed by day of the week (ANOVA), domain-level differed by day of the week (ANOVA), demographic profile groups occurred an equal number of times (chi square goodness of fit), sample proportions matched DSP survey results (chi square goodness of fit), sample proportions matched DSP population (chi square goodness of fit), and if significant difference exists between overall day satisfaction and overall event satisfaction (chi square test of independence).

An Alpha level of .05 is generally accepted for statistical research (Waigandt, 2003). An Alpha level of .05 was used for this study to avoid making a type one error.

Participants were described using collected demographic information. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe age of participants. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe gender, education, income, and park visitation experience.

CHAPTER 4

Data Analysis

This chapter presents the results of the Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride 2005 Features questionnaire. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the sample by gender, age, level of education, income, and trail use. Additionally, specific attribute means and domain-level means are listed. The second section is regression analysis. This section presents the results of specific attribute correlations by day of week as well as domain-level correlations by day of week. The third section presents results from inferential analysis. A blank section was provided below demographic profile questions on the survey for participants to write in additional comments concerning their satisfaction with the day's experience. Comments from this section are located in Appendix F; Additional Comment List.

Surveys Collected

A total of 225 surveys were collected from Katy Trail Ride 2005, June 20 through June 24. Table 1 shows frequency and percentage by day of week.

Table 1

Surveys Collected by Day of Week

| Day | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Monday | 53 | 23.6% |
| Tuesday | 49 | 21.8% |
| Wednesday | 43 | 19.0% |
| Thursday | 44 | 19.6% |
| Friday | 36 | 16.0% |
| Total | 225 | 100.0% |

Descriptive Analysis

Demographic information were obtained by asking participants to fill in the blank or circle the appropriate choice of questions regarding gender, age, highest level of education completed, annual gross household income, and frequency of Katy Trail use the previous year.

For demographic statistic descriptions, duplicated participant surveys were not included. Of the 225 surveys collected, 50 were repeat participant surveys, leaving 175 usable surveys for demographic analysis.

Gender

Participants of Katy Trail Ride 2005 were 52.6% male (n=81) and 47.4% female (n=73). Of the 175 non-duplicated surveys collected, 154 (88.0%) had usable gender demographic information.

Age

The average age of Katy Trail Ride 2005 participants was 51.96 years with a range of 20 to 83. The median age was 52 with a mode of 46 (Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown). Table 2 shows frequency and percent of participant age when grouped in U.S. Census Bureau categories (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

Table 2

Demographic Age Statistics

| Age (Years) | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 0-4 | 0 | 0.0% |
| 5-19 | 0 | 0.0% |
| 20-44 | 36 | 23.5% |
| 45-64 | 99 | 64.7% |
| 65-84 | 18 | 11.8% |
| 85 + | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 153 | 100.0% |

Education

The largest percentage (35.9%) of Katy Trail Ride 2005 participants indicated they had a graduate degree. The second largest percentages (30.1%) of participants had an undergraduate degree. Participants with some college were 24.8%, those with high school/GED degrees were 7.8%, and participants with some high school were 1.3%.

Income

The majority (45.9%) of participants indicated they had an annual gross household income over \$75,000; 26.3% had an annual income in the range of \$50,000-74,999;

17.3% are in the \$35,000-49,999 income range; 6.0% had an annual income between \$25,000-34,999; 2.3% had an annual income in the range \$15,000-24,999; and 2.3% had an annual income less than \$15,000.

Trail Use

Participants were asked to identify approximately how many times they had ridden the Katy Trail the previous year. The mean trail use was 11.68 days with a range of 0 to 365. Table 3 shows frequency and percent of trail use days.

Table 3

Trail Use Statistics

| Number of Days | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Never | 66 | 43.7% |
| 1-10 | 59 | 39.1% |
| 11-20 | 7 | 4.6% |
| More than 20 | 19 | 12.6% |
| Total | 151 | 100.0% |

Attribute Performance Mean

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with DSP performance on each of 24 different attributes as well as overall satisfaction with the day’s experience. Attributes were rated on a Likert scale of one to five, with one being ‘very dissatisfied’ and five being ‘very satisfied’. Table 4 lists specific attributes with mean and grand mean by day of the week. The attribute accessibility for individuals with disabilities was excluded due to low response. Attributes are listed by domain categories.

Table 4

Attribute Mean

| Attribute | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Grand Mean |
|--|--------|---------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|
| 1. Facility Cleanliness | 4.58 | 4.61 | 4.74 | 4.43 | 4.69 | 4.61 |
| 2. Hot Showers at Campsite | 4.82 | 4.78 | 4.95 | 4.89 | 4.80 | 4.85 |
| 3. Trail Maintenance | 4.77 | 4.38 | 3.74 | 4.11 | 4.53 | 4.31 |
| 4. Facility Maintenance | 4.58 | 4.35 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.72 | 4.50 |
| 5. Restroom Availability | 4.57 | 4.34 | 4.48 | 3.89 | 4.51 | 4.36 |
| 6. Roadway Crossings | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 4.26 | 4.37 | 4.21 |
| 7. Quantity of Food | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.44 | 4.32 |
| 8. Variability of Food | 3.92 | 4.26 | 4.10 | 4.24 | 4.28 | 4.16 |
| 9. Quality of Food | 4.15 | 4.54 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.36 | 4.38 |
| 10. Availability of Food | 4.45 | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.02 | 4.47 | 4.28 |
| 11. SAG Service | 4.76 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.38 | 4.65 | 4.63 |
| 12. Natural/historical Information about the Area | 4.54 | 4.21 | 4.42 | 4.54 | 4.66 | 4.47 |
| 13. Safety and Security Information about the Area | 4.55 | 4.46 | 4.52 | 4.39 | 4.62 | 4.51 |
| 14. Staff and Volunteer Courtesy | 4.94 | 4.86 | 4.93 | 4.82 | 4.86 | 4.88 |
| 15. Staff and Volunteer Knowledge | 4.58 | 4.63 | 4.53 | 4.40 | 4.69 | 4.57 |
| 16. Ease of Obtaining Information | 4.55 | 4.38 | 4.62 | 4.43 | 4.69 | 4.53 |
| 17. Current and Accurate Information | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.65 | 4.44 | 4.75 | 4.55 |
| 18. Length of Ride | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.43 | 4.63 | 4.83 | 4.48 |
| 19. Social Interaction with Participants | 4.57 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.61 | 4.72 | 4.65 |
| 20. Level of Challenge | 4.57 | 4.30 | 4.46 | 4.51 | 4.42 | 4.45 |
| 21. Aesthetics of Surroundings | 4.70 | 4.46 | 4.70 | 4.63 | 4.72 | 4.64 |
| 22. Weather Conditions | 4.38 | 4.38 | 3.80 | 3.15 | 3.85 | 3.91 |
| 23. Level of Personal Fatigue | 3.90 | 4.05 | 4.10 | 3.95 | 4.67 | 4.13 |

Domain-level Performance Mean

Specific attributes were coded into one of four attribute domain-levels; facilities, services, information, or experience. The facilities, information, and experience domain-levels are represented by six variables from the Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride Features questionnaire. Since the attribute accessibility for individuals with disabilities was excluded due to low response rates, the services domain-level is composed of five attributes.

Facilities attribute domain consisted of the variables; facility cleanliness, hot showers at campsite, trail maintenance, facility maintenance, restroom availability, and roadway crossings. The variables quantity of food, variability of food, quality of food, availability of food, and SAG service comprise the services attribute domain. The information attribute domain consisted of the variables; natural/historical information about the area, safety and security information about the area, staff and volunteer courtesy, staff and volunteer knowledge, ease of obtaining information, and current and accurate information. Lastly, the variables length of ride, social interaction with participants, level of challenge, aesthetics of surroundings, weather conditions, and level of personal fatigue constitute the experience attribute domain.

Table 5 shows mean and grand mean score for each domain-level as well as overall satisfaction with the day's experience by day of the week.

Table 5

Domain-level Mean

| Domain | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Grand Mean |
|---------------------|--------|---------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|
| 1. Facilities | 4.57 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.58 | 4.46 |
| 2. Services | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.44 | 4.35 |
| 3. Information | 4.61 | 4.50 | 4.61 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.58 |
| 4. Experience | 4.39 | 4.37 | 4.38 | 4.26 | 4.54 | 4.38 |
| 5. Day Satisfaction | 4.64 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.50 | 4.79 | 4.67 |

Regression Analysis

Relationship between Attributes

A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was calculated and output into a matrix to determine significant relationship between each attribute and overall satisfaction with the day's experience. Results from Pearson r correlations reflect the degree of linear relationship between two variables. A value of +1 indicates a perfect positive linear relationship (Cronk, 1999). Correlations were computed for each day of the week. Only relationships with a moderate degree of correlation .600 and greater were reported due to space limitations. Because correlation matrix outputs were too large to provide in text, outputs for each data set can be found in Appendix G.

Monday.

Overall day satisfaction did not correlate significantly at a moderate or strong degree with any attribute. Table 6 shows the variables quantity of food and availability of

food ($r(50) = .707, p < .01$) had the strongest significant relationship. In addition, variability of food and quantity of food ($r(46) = .671, p < .01$) produced the second strongest significant relationship between day one's attributes. Length of ride and weather conditions ($r(44) = .624, p < .01$) were the last set of variables reporting a moderate degree of correlation of at least .600.

Table 6

Monday Correlation Matrix Data

| Relationship | N | Pearson Correlation |
|--|----|---------------------|
| 1. Quantity of food/Availability of food | 52 | .707** |
| 2. Variability of food/Quantity of food | 48 | .671** |
| 3. Length of ride/Weather conditions | 46 | .624** |

** $p < .01$.

Tuesday.

Table 7 shows significant relationship between attributes for day two of Katy Trail Ride 2005. Overall satisfaction with the day's experience showed a moderate degree of correlation with two variables; facility cleanliness ($r(38) = .681, p < .01$), and aesthetics of surroundings ($r(40) = .668, p < .01$). The variable level of personal fatigue correlated significantly with several variables; natural/historical information about the area ($r(40) = .709, p < .01$) for the strongest significant relationship, variability of food ($r(36) = .670, p < .01$), roadway crossings ($r(38) = .632, p < .01$), and length of ride ($r(38) = .602, p < .01$). The variable SAG service correlated with the variables, quality of food ($r(45) = .669, p < .01$), availability of food ($r(45) = .655, p < .01$), and ease of obtaining information ($r(44) = .655, p < .01$). Staff and volunteer knowledge and level of

challenge ($r(45) = .682, p < .01$) possess a moderate degree of correlation showing participants perception of challenge with the day's ride is related to staff and volunteer knowledge about the day's ride.

Table 7

Tuesday Correlation Matrix Data

| Relationship | N | Pearson Correlation |
|--|----|---------------------|
| 1. Natural/historical info about the area/ Level of personal fatigue | 42 | .709** |
| 2. Staff and volunteer knowledge/ Level of challenge | 47 | .682** |
| 3. Facility cleanliness/Overall day satisfaction | 40 | .681** |
| 4. Variability of food/ Level of personal fatigue | 38 | .670** |
| 5. Quality of food/SAG service | 47 | .669** |
| 6. Aesthetics of surroundings/ Overall day satisfaction | 42 | .668** |
| 7. Hot showers at campsite/ Current and accurate info about the area | 46 | .659** |
| 8. Natural/historical info about the area/ Current and accurate info about the area | 47 | .659** |
| 9. Availability of food/SAG service | 47 | .655** |
| 10. SAG service/Ease of obtaining info | 46 | .655** |
| 11. Level of personal fatigue/ Roadway crossings | 40 | .632** |
| 12. Variability of food/Quality of food | 42 | .626** |
| 13. Length of ride/ Level of personal fatigue | 40 | .602** |

** $p < .01$.

Wednesday.

All variables showing significant relationship for day three of Katy Trail Ride 2005 were in the service or information domain. Table 8 shows all food variable relationships were significant except variability of food and quantity of food. All other day three variables showing a moderate or strong degree of correlation were from the information domain.

Table 8

Wednesday Correlation Matrix Data

| Relationship | N | Pearson Correlation |
|---|----|---------------------|
| 1. Variability of food/Quality of food | 40 | .793** |
| 2. Staff and volunteer knowledge/ Ease of obtaining information | 42 | .729** |
| 3. Variability of food/Availability of food | 39 | .687** |
| 4. Quantity of food/Availability of food | 42 | .683** |
| 5. Quality of food/Availability of food | 42 | .678** |
| 6. Quantity of food/Quality of food | 43 | .675** |
| 7. Safety and security info about the area/ Current and accurate information | 42 | .627** |
| 8. Natural/historical info about the area/ Safety and security info about the area | 42 | .614** |

** $p < .01$.

Thursday.

Table 9 shows overall satisfaction with the day's experience correlated significantly with SAG service ($r(33) = .682, p < .01$) and current and accurate information ($r(37) = .600, p < .01$). The attribute ease of obtaining information showed

significant relationship with the variables, safety and security information about the area ($r(42) = .810, p < .01$), staff and volunteer courtesy ($r(42) = .647, p < .01$), and SAG service ($r(37) = .761, p < .01$). Also in the information domain, the variable staff and volunteer knowledge correlated with availability of food ($r(40) = .616, p < .01$) as well as current and accurate information ($r(40) = .696, p < .01$). The variability of food/quality of food ($r(39) = .705, p < .01$) relationship was reported for the third straight day, showing continued participant importance for a wide selection of first-rate food.

Table 9

Thursday Correlation Matrix Data

| Relationship | N | Pearson Correlation |
|--|----|---------------------|
| 1. Safety and security info about the area/ Ease of obtaining information | 44 | .810** |
| 2. SAG service/Ease of obtaining info | 39 | .761** |
| 3. Variability of food/Quality of food | 41 | .705** |
| 4. Staff and volunteer knowledge/ Current and accurate information | 42 | .696** |
| 5. SAG service/Overall day satisfaction | 35 | .682** |
| 6. Staff and volunteer courtesy/ Ease of obtaining information | 44 | .647** |
| 7. Availability of food/ Staff and volunteer knowledge | 42 | .616** |
| 8. Current and accurate information/ Overall day satisfaction | 39 | .600** |

** $p < .01$.

Friday.

Table 10 shows significant variable relationship from day five. Due to space limitations, only correlations showing a strong significant relationship were reported. Overall satisfaction with the day's experience correlated significantly with four variables; facility maintenance ($r(28) = .779, p < .01$), safety and security information about the area ($r(31) = .734, p < .01$), natural/historical information about the area ($r(31) = .727, p < .01$), and current and accurate information ($r(32) = .726, p < .01$). Current and accurate information showed significant relationship with four variables as well; quantity of food ($r(34) = .701, p < .01$), length of ride ($r(33) = .702, p < .01$), facility maintenance ($r(30) = .832, p < .01$), and roadway crossings ($r(33) = .768, p < .01$). Facility maintenance correlated with roadway crossings ($r(29) = .731, p < .01$), and safety and security information about the area ($r(29) = .854, p < .01$). While the variability of food/quality of food ($r(34) = .765, p < .01$) relationship showed significant correlation for the fourth straight day, availability of food correlated with both the variables quality ($r(34) = .733, p < .01$) and variability of food ($r(34) = .708, p < .01$). Lastly, the variables quantity of food and length of ride ($r(33) = .727, p < .01$) have a strong significant relationship.

Table 10

Friday Correlation Matrix Data

| Relationship | N | Pearson Correlation |
|---|----|---------------------|
| 1. Facility maintenance/ Safety and security info about the area | 31 | .854** |
| 2. Facility maintenance/ Current and accurate information | 32 | .832** |
| 3. Facility maintenance/ Overall day satisfaction | 30 | .779** |
| 4. Roadway crossings/ Current and accurate information | 35 | .768** |
| 5. Variability of food/Quality of food | 36 | .765** |
| 6. Safety and security info about the area/ Overall day satisfaction | 33 | .734** |
| 7. Quality of food/Availability of food | 36 | .733** |
| 8. Facility maintenance/Roadway crossings | 31 | .731** |
| 9. Natural/historical info about the area/ Overall day satisfaction | 33 | .727** |
| 10. Quantity of food/Length of ride | 35 | .727** |
| 11. Current and accurate information/ Overall day satisfaction | 34 | .726** |
| 12. Variability of food/Availability of food | 36 | .708** |
| 13. Length of ride/ Current and accurate information | 35 | .702** |
| 14. Quantity of food/ Current and accurate information | 36 | .701** |

** $p < .01$.

Summary.

Many attribute relationships correlated at a strong or moderate degree throughout the week. The attributes variability of food and quantity of food correlated at a significant level every day but Monday. Other significant attribute correlations were the relationships; length of ride/weather conditions, facility cleanliness/overall day satisfaction, aesthetics of surroundings/overall day satisfaction, level of personal fatigue/roadway crossings, length of ride/level of personal fatigue, SAG service/overall day satisfaction, facility cleanliness/overall satisfaction, and quantity of food/length of ride.

While several significantly strong and moderate relationships were found, the results only explain some of the variance between variables. The coefficient of determination or r^2 , explains the proportion of variance in Y that is contained in X (Cronk, 1999). The strongest correlation registered throughout the week was the facility maintenance/safety and security information about the area relationship on Friday. Results from this relationship produced a .854 coefficient, meaning about 73% of Y's variance can be accounted for by changes in X. More simply, changes to facility maintenance satisfaction only accounted for changes to satisfaction with safety/security information three-quarters of the time. Twenty-seven percent of the time, some other unaccounted factor affected this relationship.

Additionally, only attribute relationships of .600 and up were reported due to space limitations. The r^2 for a .600 coefficient is a mere 36%. This means 64% of the time; an unaccounted variable or variables influenced those relationships.

Relationship between Domain-level Attributes

All six attributes constituting a domain-level were averaged to arrive at a grand mean for each participant attribute domain. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was run and output into a correlation matrix to show significant relationship with satisfaction of each domain-level and overall satisfaction with the day's experience. Correlations were computed for each day of the week.

Monday.

Hypothesis 1.

Ho₁: There is no significant correlation between day one domain-level satisfaction and day one overall satisfaction.

Table 11 shows significant relationship between satisfaction of domain-levels and overall day satisfaction. The services domain was the only domain-level to show a moderate degree of correlation with overall day satisfaction. The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was accepted as a whole with exception of the services domain. There is no significant correlation between day one domain-levels facilities, experience, or information and day one overall satisfaction. Additionally, all domain-levels showed a moderate degree of correlation with each other.

Table 11

Monday Domain Correlation Matrix

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------------------------------------|---|------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Overall Day Satisfaction (n = 47) | 1 | .107 | .431** | .258 | .194 |
| 2. Facilities (n = 53) | | 1 | .357** | .555** | .605** |
| 3. Services (n = 53) | | | 1 | .405** | .412** |
| 4. Experience (n = 53) | | | | 1 | .477** |
| 5. Information (n = 53) | | | | | 1 |

** $p < .01$.

Tuesday.

Hypothesis 2.

Ho₂. There is no significant correlation between day two domain-level satisfaction and day two overall satisfaction.

Table 12 shows all domain-levels correlated significantly at a moderate degree with overall day satisfaction. The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was rejected. There is a significant relationship between day two domain-levels and day two overall satisfaction. Additionally, all domain-levels showed a moderate or strong degree of correlation with each other.

Table 12

Tuesday Domain Correlation Matrix

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Overall Day Satisfaction (n = 43) | 1 | .563** | .603** | .587** | .453** |
| 2. Facilities (n = 49) | | 1 | .506** | .723** | .598** |
| 3. Services (n = 49) | | | 1 | .571** | .703** |
| 4. Experience (n = 49) | | | | 1 | .746** |
| 5. Information (n = 49) | | | | | 1 |

** $p < .01$.

Wednesday.

Hypothesis 3.

Ho₃. There is no significant correlation between day three domain-level satisfaction and day three overall satisfaction.

Table 13 shows all domain-levels correlated at a moderate degree with overall day satisfaction. The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was rejected. There is a significant relationship between day three domain-levels and day three overall satisfaction. All domain-levels showed a moderate degree of correlation with each other.

Table 13

Wednesday Domain Correlation Matrix

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Overall Day Satisfaction (n = 39) | 1 | .427* | .611** | .396* | .379* |
| 2. Facilities (n = 43) | | 1 | .398** | .474** | .661** |
| 3. Services (n = 43) | | | 1 | .456** | .579** |
| 4. Experience (n = 43) | | | | 1 | .458** |
| 5. Information (n = 43) | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Thursday.

Hypothesis 4.

Ho₄. There is no significant correlation between day four domain-level satisfaction and day four overall satisfaction.

The results of the domain-level correlation for day four show all domain-levels correlated significantly with overall day satisfaction. There is a significant relationship between day four domain-levels and day four overall satisfaction. All domain-levels showed a moderate degree of correlation with each other.

Table 14

Thursday Domain Correlation Matrix

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Overall Day Satisfaction (n = 40) | 1 | .492** | .563** | .436** | .668** |
| 2. Facilities (n = 44) | | 1 | .421** | .603** | .622** |
| 3. Services (n = 44) | | | 1 | .448** | .609** |
| 4. Experience (n = 44) | | | | 1 | .530** |
| 5. Information (n = 44) | | | | | 1 |

** $p < .01$.

Friday.

Hypothesis 5.

Ho₅. There is no significant correlation between day five domain-level satisfaction and day five overall satisfaction.

Table 15 shows all domain-levels correlated significantly with overall satisfaction for the fourth day in a row. The null hypothesis for this hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between day five domain-levels and day five overall satisfaction. Additionally, all domain-levels again showed a moderate degree of correlation with each other.

Table 15

Friday Domain Correlation Matrix

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Overall Day Satisfaction (n = 34) | 1 | .709** | .601** | .493** | .740** |
| 2. Facilities (n = 36) | | 1 | .620** | .498** | .693** |
| 3. Services (n = 36) | | | 1 | .520** | .755** |
| 4. Experience (n = 36) | | | | 1 | .594** |
| 5. Information (n = 36) | | | | | 1 |

** $p < .01$.

Summary.

Results from the Pearson r between weekday domain-levels showed all domain-levels correlated significantly with each other every day of the week. Correlations between daily domain-levels and overall day satisfaction showed significant relationships between each domain-level and overall satisfaction on days two, three, four, and five. The null hypothesis was rejected for each of these days, H_{02} through H_{05} . The null hypothesis for day one, H_{01} , was accepted as a whole with an exception for the services domain.

Inferential Analysis

Performance Rating by Demographic Profile

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was computed on the demographic variables to determine if attribute performance ratings of satisfaction differed within the sample. Since sample size for age and trail use groups weren't normally distributed and more than two sets of means were compared, a Kruskal-Wallis H test was run as opposed to an ANOVA.

While significant test results show at least one group is different from at least one other group, no post-hoc analysis could be computed to show significant difference between groups due to the data being nonparametric, or distribution-free (Cronk, 1999). Only significant results were reported to due space limitations.

Age.

Participants were grouped into U.S. Census Bureau categories. Group one consisted of participants 20 to 44 years of age, group two encompassed ages 45 to 64, and 65 to 84 year olds were in group three.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with facility cleanliness by participants grouped into three age categories. A significant result was found ($H(2) = 8.22, p < .05$) indicating that the three groups differed from each other. Participants aged 20 to 44 years old had an 85.17 mean rank, while riders aged 45 to 64 had a 104.26 mean rank and those 65 to 84 averaged an 112.50 rank. Older participants evaluated satisfaction of facility cleanliness with higher values.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with safety and security information about the area by participants grouped into three age categories. A significant result was found ($H(2) = 9.274, p = .01$) indicating that the three groups differed from each other. Participants aged 20 to 44 averaged a 84.17 rank, while those 45 to 64 had a 106.70 mean rank and riders 65 to 84 years of age registered a 109.86 mean rank. Older participants evaluated satisfaction of safety and security information with higher values.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with staff and volunteer courtesy by participants grouped into three age

categories. A significant result was found ($H(2) = 6.316, p < .05$) indicating that the three groups differed from each other. Participants aged 20 to 44 years old had a 93.77 mean rank, while those 45 to 64 averaged a 105.05 rank and 65 to 84 year olds had a 106.74 mean rank. Older participants evaluated staff and volunteer courtesy with higher values.

Trail use.

Participants were asked approximately how many times they had ridden the Katy Trail the previous year. Riders were categorized into one of four groups based upon response. Those having never used the trail before were categorized into group one. Group two considered of riders using the trail 1-10 days, while those using the trail between 11-20 days were in group three and participants with more than 20 days of use made up group four.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with hot showers by participants grouped into four trail use categories. A significant result was found ($H(3) = 21.306, p < .01$) indicating that the groups differed from each other. Participants with no previous trail use registered a 95.69 mean rank, those with 1-10 user days had a 92.09 mean rank, while riders using the trail 11-20 days registered a 57.96 mean rank and participants with over 20 user days averaged a 106.00 rank. Participants with more than 20 use days evaluated satisfaction with hot showers with higher values than any other trail use group.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with trail maintenance by participants grouped into four trail use categories. A significant result was found ($H(3) = 8.577, p < .05$) indicating that the groups differed from each other. Participants with no previous trail use had a 98.04 mean rank, those with

1-10 use days had a 98.57 mean rank, while participants with 11-20 days registered a 71.14 mean rank and users with over 20 days had a 119.64 mean rank. Participants with more than 20 trail use days evaluated satisfaction with trail maintenance with higher values than any other trail use group.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with availability of food by participants grouped into four trail use categories. A significant result was found ($H(3) = 13.241, p < .01$) indicating that the groups differed from each other. Participants with no previous trail use had an 83.41 mean rank, users with 1-10 days had a 107.54 mean rank, while those with 11-20 days registered a 107.71 mean rank and users with more than 20 days had a 116.00 mean rank. Results show ratings of satisfaction with availability of food increase as a participant's trail use days increase.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with level of challenge by participants grouped into four trail use categories. A significant result was found ($H(3) = 8.547, p < .05$) indicating that the groups differed from each other. Participants with no previous trail use had an 87.28 mean rank, users with 1-10 days had a 99.25 mean rank, while those with 11-20 days registered a 108.00 mean rank and users with more than 20 days had a 116.50 mean rank. Results show ratings of satisfaction with level of challenge increase as a participant's trail use days increase.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with SAG service by participants grouped into four trail use categories. A significant result was found ($H(3) = 10.371, p < .05$) indicating that the groups differed

from each other. Participants with no previous trail use had an 82.94 mean rank, users with 1-10 days had a 102.88 mean rank, while those with 11-20 days registered a 104.25 mean rank and users with more than 20 days had a 101.48 mean rank. Participants with 11-20 trail use days evaluated satisfaction with SAG service with higher values than any other trail use group.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted comparing responses to ratings of satisfaction with current and accurate information by participants grouped into four trail use categories. A significant result was found ($H(3) = 9.740, p < .05$) indicating that the groups differed from each other. Participants with no previous trail use had a 90.66 mean rank, users with 1-10 days had a 107.20 mean rank, while those with 11-20 days registered an 82.71 mean rank and users with more than 20 days had a 116.38 mean rank. Participants with more than 20 use days evaluated satisfaction with current and accurate information with higher values than any other trail use group.

Summary.

Results from the Kruskal-Wallis test showed ratings of attribute satisfaction differed within the age demographic for the variables facility cleanliness, safety and security information about the area, and staff and volunteer courtesy. For each of these attributes, participants in the 65 to 84 age group rated them with higher values of satisfaction than any other age group.

The Kruskal-Wallis test within the trail use demographic showed ratings of attribute satisfaction differed between the four groups for the attributes hot showers at campsite, trail maintenance, availability of food, level of challenge, SAG service, and current and accurate information. Participants with 20 or more trail use days rated the

attributes hot showers, trail maintenance, availability of food, level of challenge, and current and accurate information with higher values of satisfaction than any other trail use group. Additionally, ratings of satisfaction for the variables availability of food and level of challenge increased as the number of participant trail use days increased.

Difference by Day of Week

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to determine significant difference of each attribute and domain-level across days of the week. Post hoc analysis was conducted using Tukey's HSD to determine the nature of the differences between the days. Only attributes and domain-levels showing significant difference across days of the week were reported due to space limitations.

Attribute.

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing trail maintenance satisfaction means from each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,218) = 13.76, p < .01$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between the days. These results indicated that satisfaction with trail maintenance for day three was significantly lower ($m = 3.74, sd = 0.95$) than satisfaction with day's one ($m = 4.77, sd = 0.54$), two ($m = 4.38, sd = 0.57$), and five ($m = 4.53, sd = 0.65$). Additionally, satisfaction ratings for day one were significantly higher than day four ($m = 4.11, sd = 0.84$).

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing natural/historical information satisfaction means from each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,211) = 2.50, p < .05$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between the days. These results indicated that satisfaction with

natural/historical information for day two were significantly lower ($m = 4.21, sd = 0.83$) than satisfaction with day five ($m = 4.66, sd = 0.54$).

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing length of ride satisfaction means from each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,202) = 4.36, p < .01$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between the days. These results indicated satisfaction with length of ride for day one was significantly lower ($m = 4.17, sd = 1.02$) than satisfaction with day's four ($m = 4.63, sd = 0.71$), and five ($m = 4.83, sd = 0.51$).

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing restroom availability satisfaction means from each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,216) = 4.65, p < .01$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between the days. These results indicated that satisfaction with restroom availability for day four was significantly lower ($m = 3.89, sd = 1.28$) than satisfaction with day's one ($m = 4.57, sd = 0.57$), three ($m = 4.48, sd = 0.83$), and five ($m = 4.51, sd = 0.74$).

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing weather condition satisfaction means from each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,203) = 10.91, p < .01$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between the days. These results indicated satisfaction with weather conditions for day four was significantly lower ($m = 3.15, sd = 1.27$) than satisfaction with day's one ($m = 4.38, sd = 0.88$), two ($m = 4.38, sd = 0.78$), three ($m = 3.80, sd = 0.97$), and five ($m = 3.85, sd = 1.15$).

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing level of personal fatigue satisfaction means from each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,208) = 4.27, p < .01$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between the days. These results indicated satisfaction with level of personal fatigue for day five was significantly higher ($m = 4.67, sd = 0.59$) than satisfaction with day's one ($m = 3.90, sd = 1.10$), two ($m = 4.05, sd = 0.94$), and four ($m = 3.95, sd = 0.99$).

Domain-level.

A one-way ANOVA was run comparing facilities domain satisfaction means across each day of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found among the days ($F(4,220) = 2.68, p < .05$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the difference between the days. These results indicated satisfaction with facilities domain for day one was significantly higher ($m = 4.57, sd = 0.41$) than satisfaction with day four ($m = 4.31, sd = 0.49$).

Summary.

Results from the ANOVA showed ratings of attribute satisfaction significantly differed across the week for the variables trail maintenance, natural/historical information about the area, length of ride, restroom availability, weather conditions, and level of personal fatigue. Post-hoc analysis showed the nature of the significant difference between days. Trail maintenance received the lowest ratings on day three, significantly lower than days one, two, and five. Ratings of satisfaction for length of ride were significantly lower for day one than day's four or five. The attribute restroom availability received significantly lower ratings of satisfaction on day four than day's one, three, and five. On day four weather conditions received significantly lower ratings of satisfaction

than the rest of the week. Ratings for the level of personal fatigue attribute were significantly higher on day five than day's one, two, and four.

The only domain-level showing significant difference across the week was facilities. Post-hoc analysis revealed day one ratings of satisfaction were significantly higher than day four ratings.

Demographic Profile Occurrence

A chi square goodness of fit test was run on the demographic variables gender, level of education, and income to determine if; the sample proportions occurred an equal number of times, the sample proportions match Division of State Parks 2005 Katy Trail Ride Survey Results, and the sample proportions match Division of State Parks 2005 Katy Trail Ride population.

Sample proportion occurrence.

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of occurrence of the gender variable. It was hypothesized that each value would occur an equal number of times. No significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(1) = .42, p > .05$). It appears gender occurs an equal number of times.

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of occurrence of each value of the level of education demographic. It was hypothesized each value would occur an equal number of times. A significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(4) = 67.03, p < .05$).

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of occurrence of each value of the income demographic. It was hypothesized each value

would occur an equal number of times. A significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(5) = 117.69, p < .05$).

Sample proportion v. DSP Katy Ride 2005 survey results.

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of the sample proportion gender variable to the expected value of Division of State Parks survey results gender variable. It was hypothesized the obtained frequency would not differ significantly from those that would be expected. No significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(1) = .961, p > .05$). It appears gender from the sample proportion matches gender from DSP survey results.

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of the sample proportion education variable to the expected value of Division of State Parks survey results education variable. It was hypothesized the obtained frequency would not differ significantly from those that would be expected. No significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(4) = 8.385, p > .05$). It appears education level from the sample proportion matches education level from DSP survey results.

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of the sample proportion income variable to the expected value of Division of State Parks survey results income variable. It was hypothesized the obtained frequency would not differ significantly from those that would be expected. No significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(5) = 4.001, p > .05$). It appears gross household income from the sample proportion matches gross household income from DSP survey results.

Sample proportion v. DSP Katy Trail Ride 2005 population.

A chi square goodness of fit was calculated comparing the frequency of the sample proportion gender variable to the expected value of DSP population gender variable. It was hypothesized the obtained frequency would not differ significantly from those that would be expected. No significant deviation from the hypothesized values was found ($\chi^2(1) = 1.004, p > .05$). It appears gender from the sample proportion matches gender from DSP Katy Trail Ride 2005 population.

Summary.

While gender occurred an equal number of times within the sample proportion, the education and income demographic did not occur an equal number of times. There were an equal number of males and females in this study, while education and income were skewed.

When age, education, and income from the sample proportion were compared to DSP survey results, no significant deviation was found. Age, education, and income demographic profiles from the sample proportion matched the frequency of age, education, and income demographic profiles from DSP survey results. Demographic profiles from the samples were not significantly different.

While gender from the sample proportion was not significantly different than gender from Katy Trail Ride 2005 population, education and income were significantly different. Only gender from the sample proportion matched gender from the population. Education and income demographic groups were not representative of the Katy Trail Ride 2005 population.

Relationship between Satisfaction with Day's Experience and Overall Satisfaction

Given the sample proportion variables gender, level of education, and income matched the variables gender, level of education, and income from post hoc survey results conducted by Division of State Parks; a chi square test of independence was run to determine significant relationship between the variable overall satisfaction with the day's experience from the sample proportion and Division of State Parks survey results variable overall event satisfaction. Ratings of satisfaction at the 'very dissatisfied', 'somewhat dissatisfied', and 'neutral' levels were grouped to form one level.

Monday.

Hypothesis 6.

Ho₆. There is significant interaction between day one overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

A chi square test of independence was calculated comparing overall satisfaction with Monday's experience and overall event satisfaction. No significant relationship was found ($\chi^2(2) = 3.9787, p > .05$). The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant relationship between day one overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Tuesday.

Hypothesis 7.

Ho₇. There is no significant interaction between day two overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

A chi square test of independence was calculated comparing overall satisfaction with Tuesday's experience and overall event satisfaction. No significant relationship was

found ($\chi^2(2) = 3.1451, p > .05$). The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant relationship between day two overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Wednesday.

Hypothesis 8.

Ho₈. There is no significant interaction between day three overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

A chi square test of independence was calculated comparing overall satisfaction with Wednesday's experience and overall event satisfaction. No significant relationship was found ($\chi^2(2) = 2.9291, p > .05$). The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant relationship between day three overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Thursday.

Hypothesis 9.

Ho₉. There is no significant interaction between day four overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

A chi square test of independence was calculated comparing overall satisfaction with Thursday's experience and overall event satisfaction. No significant relationship was found ($\chi^2(2) = 2.2063, p > .05$). The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant relationship between day four overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Friday.

Hypothesis 10.

Ho₁₀. There is no significant interaction between day five overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

A chi square test of independence was calculated comparing overall satisfaction with Friday's experience and overall event satisfaction. A significant interaction was found ($\chi^2(2) = 6.4738, p < .05$). The null hypothesis for this hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant relationship between day five overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction. The sample proportion participants reported being 'very satisfied' more often than DSP survey participants.

These results show participants from the sample proportion surveyed by the author differed significantly from participants surveyed by Division of State Parks. Riders surveyed directly after the completion of Friday's ride were 'very satisfied' with the day's experience more often than those surveyed post hoc about overall event satisfaction.

Summary.

Results from the chi square test of independence showed there was no significant relationship between overall event satisfaction and overall day satisfaction from day's one, two, three, and four. The null hypothesis was accepted for each of these days, Ho₆ through Ho₉. The null hypothesis for Ho₁₀ was rejected as results showed a significant relationship between day five overall satisfaction and overall event satisfaction. Participants from the sample proportion reported being 'very satisfied' on day five more often than participants from DSP survey results.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant relationships existed between day satisfaction and overall event satisfaction. Additionally, the study intended to measure participant satisfaction with specific site attributes over the course of a multi-day recreation event and to determine demographic characteristics of Katy Trail Ride 2005 participants. This chapter summarizes the results of the study, provides a discussion of conclusions, and gives recommendations based on the analysis of survey data for future research.

Review of Literature

Research on satisfaction within outdoor recreation over the course of a multi-day experience has been limited (Lee et al., 1994; Cashel et al., 1996). This research has shown attitude and mood change as the length of the event increases (Cashel, et al.), as a leisure experience is multi-dimensional, transitory, and multi-phased (Lee et al.). These changes in attitude and mood, changes in landscape beauty and ability to cope with unexpected situations have been shown to influence participant satisfaction engaged in recreation events (Hull, et al., 1992; Cashel et al.; Hultsman, 1998). Additionally, participant satisfaction has been shown to register a spike of extreme satisfaction at the conclusion of an experience (Hull, Stewart, & Yi, 1992).

Performance only measures of satisfaction have been found to be a better indicator of overall satisfaction as well as domain-level satisfaction (Crompton & Love, 1995; Burns et al, 2003). A performance only measure was used to determine participant

satisfaction with DSP performance of facilities, services, information, and experience of Katy Trail Ride 2005.

A total of 225 participant questionnaires were collected during the study period from June 20, 2005 to June 24, 2005. Of the 225 collected surveys, 50 were repeat participant surveys, leaving 175 non-duplicated participant surveys for demographic analysis.

A rider profile of Katy Trail Ride 2005 indicates participants (n = 175) were almost equally as likely to be male or female, have an average age of 52 years, and possess a graduate degree, with an annual household income over \$75,000. While the majority (43.7%) of participants had never used the Katy Trail before, the mean trail use was 11.68 days per year.

Attribute Satisfaction Rating

Satisfied customers are more likely to be repeat visitors, loyal users, support the agency, and disseminate positive word-of-mouth to others (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Tian-Cole et. al, 2002). Seventy-two percent of participants rated the overall satisfaction with the day's experience variable at the highest level, 'very satisfied'. Additionally, 60.7% of responses to level of satisfaction with specific features of Katy Trail Ride were 'very satisfied'. Such high ratings of participant satisfaction signify Division of State Parks is providing good performance of trail and ride attributes.

Management should provide explicit attention to areas in which they can directly affect participants' outdoor recreation experience (Manning, 1999). The lowest rated grand mean for an attribute under DSP control was variability of food (4.16), ranking 21st. While each weekday received relatively low ratings of satisfaction for variability of

food, with Monday registering the lowest score with a 3.92 average. While participants were generally 'very satisfied' with the ride as a whole at day's end, they weren't satisfied with the variety of food received. These results show increasing the variety of food offered to participants throughout the day and week might increase satisfaction with the day's experience as well as overall event satisfaction.

Three additional attributes relating to food in the service domain receiving low scores were availability of food (4.28) ranking 19th, quantity of food (4.32) ranking 17th, and quality of food (4.38) ranking 15th. These results, combined with low variability scores, show participants cycling 225 miles in five days consider their 'fuel' to be an area most often influencing satisfaction and one of the most important attributes of the trip.

The weather conditions attribute received the lowest rating of satisfaction for the week with a 3.91 grand mean. With day one and day two high temperatures in the 80's, level of satisfaction registered just below attribute average (4.45) with a 4.38 rating (Weather Underground, 2007). Ratings of satisfaction with weather conditions decreased as daytime high temperatures increased with; Wednesday's high of 91 degrees (3.80), Thursday's high of 97 degrees (3.15), and Friday's high of 95 degrees (3.85) (Weather Underground). While management cannot control weather conditions, they can make adjustments to help accommodate participant satisfaction. In terms of satisfaction decreasing with increasing temperatures, a suggestion would be to offer breakfast earlier in the morning to allow riders to start the day sooner as to finish before the midday heat reaches its height.

The second lowest rated grand mean (4.13) for a feature was level of personal fatigue. Level of personal fatigue saw the lowest rating of satisfaction on Monday (3.90)

with the longest trail section of Katy Trail Ride 2005, while Friday (4.67), the ride's shortest trail section, rated significantly higher than all other days except day three. To offset the imbalance of personal fatigue satisfaction ratings, adjustments could be made to make the mileage more consistent across days of the week. While riders traveled 61.3 miles on Monday, they covered only 26.8 miles on Friday.

While management can only make adjustments to uncontrollable attribute areas such as weather conditions and level of personal fatigue, they can control the information participants receive about such attributes through the week. This is an area in which DSP received high grand mean ratings. Attributes within the information domain; staff and volunteer information (4.57), ease of obtaining information (4.53), and current and accurate information (4.55) registered consistently high satisfaction scores throughout the week.

Additional areas under DSP control receiving high ratings of satisfaction were staff and volunteer courtesy (4.88), hot showers at campsite (4.85), and SAG service (4.63).

While mean only performance measures can provide valuable management relevant information, comparing means across the week to detect significant differences can provide information about daily performance of attributes. These results show if there are any significant attribute rating differences from day to day. When comparing weekday attribute means, six attributes (natural/historical information about the area, trail maintenance, length of ride, restroom availability, weather conditions, and level of personal fatigue) showed significant difference across the week. Of the six attributes showing significant difference, four were under direct control of DSP.

Rating of satisfaction for trail maintenance on Wednesday was a 3.74, significantly lower than all other days except Thursday. These results show us that participants were more dissatisfied with the trail conditions from Hartsburg to Hermann than they were for the rest of the week.

Secondly, the attribute restroom availability received a 3.89 rating on Thursday. The Hermann to Augusta section rated significantly lower than all other days except Tuesday. Participants were not as satisfied with the availability of restrooms on day four as they were with the rest of the week.

Length of ride received the lowest rating of satisfaction on day one. Not coincidentally, Monday was the longest section of the five day ride. Monday's ratings (4.17) were significantly lower than Thursday and Friday. These results show participants were most satisfied on day five, the shortest section, while the longest trail section registered as the most dissatisfying for trail length.

The final attribute under DSP control showing a significant difference through the week was natural/historical information about the area. Tuesday's 4.21 rating was significantly lower than day five. Participants felt the Pilot Grove to Hartsburg section was more dissatisfying than the Augusta to St. Charles section in regards to natural/historical information.

Demographic Group Ratings

Results from the Kruskal-Wallis test show, while only three of the twenty-three attributes showed significant difference across age groups, participants in the oldest age group, 65 to 84 years, rated values of satisfaction higher than any other age group for all

three variables; facility cleanliness, safety and security information about the area, and staff and volunteer courtesy.

Additionally, when divided into trail use categories, six attributes showed significant difference. Participants with more than 20 trail use days the previous year rated satisfaction higher than any other trail use group for the attributes; hot showers, trail maintenance, availability of food, level of challenge, and current and accurate information. Ratings of satisfaction for the level of challenge and availability of food attributes increased as the number of participant trail use days increased.

While only three of the 23 attributes showed significant difference between age groups and six of 23 between trail use groups, these significant differences seemed to show experience or expectation dictate higher ratings of satisfaction. Participants making up the oldest age category rated all three attributes higher than the other two age groups, while those with the most trail use days rated five of the six attributes higher than those in the three other trail use groups. Additionally, as trail use days increased so did ratings of satisfaction for level of challenge and availability of food.

Attribute Correlation

Significant results from the Pearson product moment correlation show a linear relationship; measure of tendency of the variables to increase or decrease together.

The attribute overall satisfaction with the day's experience correlated significantly with several attributes throughout the week; day two saw facility cleanliness and aesthetics of surroundings, with day four registering SAG service and current and accurate information, while day five showed significant correlations with facility maintenance, safety and security information, natural and historical information, and

current and accurate information. These relationships show that as level of satisfaction with the attributes increases, level of overall satisfaction with the day's experience increases as well. Additionally, the attributes can mutually decrease the rating of overall satisfaction with the day's experience if satisfaction is not met.

The variance from these relationships showed that although facility cleanliness, aesthetics of surroundings, SAG service, current and accurate information, facility maintenance, safety and security information, natural/historical information, and current and accurate information were significantly related to overall day satisfaction, additional unaccountable variables influenced these relationships as well. The attribute facility maintenance registered the strongest correlation with overall day satisfaction on Friday with a .779 coefficient. Results of the r squared showed that only 60.5% of the variance was accounted for in this relationship.

Another significant attribute correlation of interest was the variability of food/quality of food relationship reported Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. This relationship shows as participant satisfaction with the variety of food offered increases, satisfaction with food quality shifts mutually. Occurring on days three, four and five, participants felt an increase in the variety of food meant an increase in the quality of food. Conversely, as the relationship is linear, a decrease in satisfaction with food quality means a decrease in satisfaction with food variety.

Domain-level Correlation

The null hypothesis for day one was accepted as a whole, as the experience, facilities, and information domain-levels showed no significant correlation with overall satisfaction. The services domain-level was the only one that showed a moderate level of

significant correlation with overall day satisfaction on Monday. This significant correlation shows the services domain had the largest impact on overall satisfaction from day one. While the correlation was significant, the moderate relationship was relatively weak ($r(45) = .431, p < .01$). Only 18.5% of the variance between the services domain-level and overall day satisfaction were accountable.

All domain-levels correlated significantly with overall day satisfaction on day's two, three, four, and five. The null hypothesis for these days was rejected as a significant relationship exists between the domain-levels and overall day satisfaction. These results show participants' overall day satisfaction was related to each of the domain-levels on a daily basis Tuesday through Friday.

Additionally, all domain-levels correlated significantly with one another on all days. There was a significant relationship between services, facilities, experience, and information Monday through Friday.

Overall Day Satisfaction and Overall Event Satisfaction

The overall day satisfaction measure came from the researcher's survey, Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride Features administered nightly. Overall event satisfaction ratings came from a DSP mail in survey that was distributed as participants completed the event. Results from a chi square goodness of fit show the demographic variables gender, level of education, and income from the researcher's sample proportion matched the frequency of gender, level of education, and income from DSP Katy Trail Ride 2005 Survey Results. Since sample demographic frequencies were similar between the two survey results, a chi square test of independence was computed to determine interaction between the measures overall day satisfaction and overall event satisfaction.

Significant interaction was found only between overall satisfaction with Friday's experience and overall event satisfaction. The sample proportion survey produced different ratios than the DSP survey regarding overall satisfaction. Statistically, more 'very satisfied' ratings were reported for overall satisfaction with Friday's experience than were reported for overall event satisfaction. The null hypothesis for H_{010} was rejected as a result of the significant findings.

Further, results from the chi square test of independence show days one, two, three and four overall day satisfaction ratings did not vary significantly from overall event satisfaction data; similar results were found for datasets. The null hypothesis was accepted for H_{06} through H_{09} since no significant interactions were found.

Additional Comments Regarding Satisfaction

Participants were given a blank section below demographic profile questions to provide additional comments regarding their satisfaction with each day's experience. While a majority of comments were mere suggestions for DSP from individual participants; i.e. sunshades at information stops, composting toilets, a place to clean bikes, etc; three areas generated concern by participants throughout the week. Areas of concern included more community involvement, greater variety of food at SAG stops, and gate openings at roadway crossings.

Participant concerns over community involvement were evident. Riders expressed feelings that there was no communication between DSP and individual towns, as communities didn't seem to know the ride was coming through their area. The majority of comments included that businesses weren't opened for shopping and restaurants were either not open or not prepared for large crowds. Suggestions for future community

involvement included having bake sales, beer gardens, and coffee carts, having merchants run a shopping shuttle, local sports teams to carry luggage and set up campsites each evening, and organized midday lunches as riders pass through.

Gate openings along the Katy Trail are in place to slow riders as they approach roadway crossings. Participants felt gate openings were too narrow and several individuals conveyed worries about the gates creating accidents as opposed to avoiding them. The majority of riders suggested opening gates in the morning and having a sweeper to close the gates after the last rider in the evening. Another suggestion includes painting gates white or yellow to increase visibility as shaded gates are hard to see.

Comments about SAG service were most often about variety of food offered. Most often participants remarked about being tired of bananas by the end of day two, while asking for different kinds of fruit, bagels, peanut butter and jelly sandwiches, pickles, etc. Others asked for Gatorade at stops as opposed to just water.

While the open comment section most often attracted suggestions for future rides, participants also filled the space with praise and thank you. The additional comment list can be located in Appendix F.

Discussion

Satisfaction is ultimately defined as the correlation between expectations and outcomes (Manning, 1999). Smaller discrepancy leads to greater levels of overall satisfaction. Since providing participants with a satisfying experience is the central objective of park and recreation agencies, evaluating user perception of managerial relevant concepts allows the agency to see where it is succeeding.

Over sixty percent of measured attributes registered a grand mean above the attribute average (4.45). While DSP achieved success over most attributes, areas of concern include roadway crossings, trail maintenance between Hartsburg and Hermann, availability of restrooms between Hermann and Augusta, length of trail section on Monday, and all measures of food (variability, availability, quantity, and quality). The level to which these concerns are met will have a large impact on the behavioral intentions of Katy Trail Ride participants.

While the areas of concern above are based on poor ratings of satisfaction, further areas of interest were revealed by looking at attribute correlation results. Managerial relevant attributes correlating at a significant level with overall day satisfaction were; facility cleanliness, facility maintenance, SAG service, current and accurate information, safety and security information, and natural/historical information. These attributes have a linear relationship with overall day satisfaction; as an attribute increases/decreases, the other attribute shows a reciprocal move. Despite the fact that all listed attributes ranked in the top 50 percentile of satisfaction ratings, a decrease in satisfaction to any of these attributes would decrease participant perception of overall day satisfaction reciprocally. Therefore, it is important for DSP to continue to exceed expectations in these areas.

Recommendations

Instead of random sampling, surveys could be administered according to rider number. This would allow for the same sample to complete the survey on a daily basis. If a true random sample was still desired, a section could have been added to the questionnaire stating if the participant had previously completed a survey to please not

respond to an additional survey. In this event, cases would not have had to be sorted and deductively removed to exclude duplicate cases for demographic profiling.

Additionally, a line could have been added to the trail use question. Adding in brackets, excluding Katy Trail Ride 2005, would produce a more accurate account of trail use days by participants. As the question was stated, participants completing day one of Katy Trail Ride filled in a 1 on the question of trail use within the last year, after Tuesday's completion, trail use numbers went to two, and so on throughout the week. Participants, who had never ridden the Katy Trail before, reported five days of trail use at the completion of Katy Trail Ride 2005.

Future Research

A question asking if the participant had ever completed a DSP Katy Trail Ride before could have been added. As participants sometimes perform the ride on more than one occasion, this information could be used to test how participants with expectations from a previous year relate to first time riders. Results from this study indicated the more trail use experience a participant had led to higher ratings of attribute satisfaction.

Additionally, another option to allow for a test-retest of participants would be to assign each rider their own personal user ID. This ID would forever be their identification for Katy Trail Rides. If the participant never rides another DSP organized Katy Trail Ride, the ID would be retired. If an individual participates on more than one occasion, they would be identified by the previous ID. Personalized participant identification in this way would allow for an individual to be tracked across years to determine if experience or expectations impact satisfaction results.

A study comparing satisfaction of attributes under an organizations control and those attribute falling outside managerial control would be interesting. This might indicate whether outdoor recreation user's satisfaction is effected primarily by managerial controlled attributes. Results from this study show while satisfaction with weather conditions and level of personal fatigue, both attributes outside DSP control, registered the lowest mean ratings for the week, neither showed a relationship with daily satisfaction. Additionally, the only attribute outside DSP control showing a relationship with overall daily satisfaction was aesthetics of surroundings on day two; ratings for aesthetics on day two received higher than average values indicating satisfaction as opposed to dissatisfaction.

Another area of interest for a future study would be to determine why an individual would willingly take a vacation that requires cycling 225 miles in five days through Missouri's June climate. Determining motivation and how it impacts satisfaction might give additional insight into why results from this study indicated attribute and daily satisfaction at the 'very satisfied' level over sixty percent.

Conclusion

Just as a spike in satisfaction at the end of a multi-day experience was reported by Hull et al. (1992), results from this study indicated a spike was registered at the conclusion of Katy Trail Ride 2005. A significant difference was found between day five overall daily satisfaction and overall event satisfaction. The study sample proportion received more ratings of 'very satisfied' at the conclusion of the event when compared to results from overall event satisfaction conducted post hoc. These results indicated a spike did indeed occur upon completion of the multi-day experience.

No significant relationship was found for day's one through four and overall event satisfaction, indicating participants' real time measure evaluation on these days was similar to participants' post hoc assessment. Stewart and Hull (1992) found significant differences between post hoc results conducted directly after the experience and post hoc results conducted three months later. Similar results were not found by this study.

Due to the spike registered directly following the completion of the multi-day event, and similar results between day's one through four real time measure and post hoc overall event satisfaction measure; the author would recommend DSP continue to conduct a one time post hoc evaluation allowing for introspection, or conduct daily real time measures to continue to evaluate Katy Trail Ride attribute performance. A one time measure immediately following the completion of the ride would not be recommended due to the spike of satisfaction found by this study.

Specific Recommendations to the Agency

A list of specific recommendations for DSP was produced based upon results from this study and open ended comments from participants. The author understands not all areas can be addressed due to logistics concerning time and money.

1. Increase food variability.
2. Increase community involvement and communication.
3. Devise a plan to open gates along the day's route.
4. Even out mileage.
5. Address trail maintenance between Hartsburg and Hermann.
6. Address restroom availability between Hermann and Augusta.
7. Survey daily to obtain attributes performance of each day's ride.

8. Continue post-hoc survey collection due to spike registered at completion.

References

- Baker, D.A., & Crompton, J.L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(3), 785-804.
- Bhullar, H., Braschler, C., Gillespie, G., Kaylen, M., & Vaught, D. (1991). *Missouri River State Trail Study*. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri-Columbia, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and Department of Agricultural Economics.
- Burns, R.C., Graefe, A.R., & Absher, J.D. (2003). Alternative measurement approaches to recreational customer satisfaction: Satisfaction-only versus gap scores. *Leisure Sciences, 25*(4), 363-380.
- Cashell, C., Lane, S., & Montgomery, D. (1996). Emotional response patterns of participation during a wilderness experience. *Journal of Wilderness and Environmental Medicine, 1*, 9-18.
- Crompton, J.L., & Love, L.L. (1995). The predictive validity of alternative approaches to evaluating quality of a festival. *Journal of Travel Research, 34*(1), 11-24.
- Cronk, B.C. (1999). *How to use SPSS: A step-by-step guide to analysis and interpretation*. Los Angeles, CA: Pryczak Publishing.
- Department of Natural Resources. (2002). *Katy Trail State Park general information*. Retrieved April 1, 2005, from <http://www.mostateparks.com/katytrail/generalinfo.htm>
- Department of Natural Resources. (2005). *Katy Trail Ride, June 20-24, 2005*. Retrieved April 26, 2005, from <http://www.mostateparks.com/katytrail/2005ride.htm>

- Department of Natural Resources. (2005). *Missouri State Park History*. Retrieved April 26, 2007, from <http://www.mostateparks.com/history.htm>
- Dufur, B. (1999). *Katy Trail guidebook excerpts*. Retrieved April 27, 2005, from http://www.pebblepublishing.com/katy_trail_guidebook_excerpts.htm
- Ferriell, J. (2007). *Amateur radio operations & SAG vehicles*. Retrieved July 10, 2007, from <http://www.gobahams.org/Sag.htm>
- Fletcher, D., & Fletcher, H. (2003). Manageable predictors of park visitor satisfaction: Maintenance and personnel. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 21(1), 21-37,
- Hammitt, W.E., Bixler, R.D., & Noe, F.P. (1996). Going beyond importance-performance analysis to analyze the observance-influence of park impacts. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 14(1), 45-62.
- Howat, G., Murray, D., & Crilley, G. (1999). The relationship between service problems and perceptions of service quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions of Australian public sports and leisure center customers. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 17(2), 42-64.
- Hull, R.B., Stewart, W.P., & Yi, Y.K. (1992). Experience patterns: Capturing the dynamic nature of a recreation experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24(3), 240-252.
- Hultsman, W. (1998). The multi-day, competitive leisure event: Examining satisfaction over time. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(4), 472-497.
- Lee, R. (1975). *The management of human components in Yosemite National Park ecosystem: Final research report*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

- Lee, Y., Dattilo, J., & Howard, D. (1994). The complex and dynamic nature of leisure experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(3), 195-211.
- Manning, R. E. (1999). *Studies in outdoor recreation: Search and research for satisfaction*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press.
- National Trails System Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1241-1251 (1968).
- Nevel, B., & Harnik, P. (1990). *Railroads recycled: How local initiative and federal support launched the Rails-to-Trails movement 1965-1990*. Washington, D.C.: Rails-to-Trails Conservancy.
- Novatorov, E.V., Seong-Seop, K., Wall, K., & Crompton, J. (1998). An index of recreation marketing excellence: An audit instrument for measuring the effectiveness of marketing efforts at a student recreation center. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 16(3), 58-80.
- Petrick, J.F. (2004). The roles of quality, value, and satisfaction in predicting cruise passengers' behavioral intentions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 397-407.
- Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. (2005). *Trail link: Find the best trails for outdoor recreation*. Retrieved April 10, 2005, from <http://www.traillink.com/>
- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. (2003). Version 12.0.1. [Computer software]. Chicago: SPSS.
- Stewart, W.P., & Hull, R.B. (1992). Satisfaction of what? Post hoc versus real-time construct validity. *Leisure Sciences*, 14(3), 195-209.
- Tarrant, M.A., & Smith, E.K. (2002). The use of a modified importance-performance framework to examine visitor satisfaction with attributes of outdoor recreation settings. *Managing Leisure*, 7, 69-82.

- Tian-Cole, S., & Crompton, J.L. (2003). A conceptualization of the relationships between service quality and visitor satisfaction, and their links to destination selection. *Leisure Studies*, 22, 65-80.
- Tian-Cole, S., Crompton, J.L., & Willson, V.L. (2002). An empirical investigation of the relationships between service quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions among visitors to a wildlife refuge. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(1), 1-24.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *U.S. Interim Projections by Age, Sex, Race, & Hispanic Origin*. Retrieved January 23, 2007, from <http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/natprojt02a.xls>
- Waigandt, A. (2003). *An introduction to research & statistics*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Weather Underground, Inc. (2007). Retrieved March 22, 2007, from <http://www.wunderground.com>
- West, P. (1982). Effects of user behavior on the perception of crowding in backcountry forest recreation. *Forest Science*, 28(1), 95-105.
- Whisman, S.A., & Hollenhorst, S.J. (1998). A path model of whitewater boating satisfaction on the Cheat River of West Virginia. *Environmental Management*, 22(1), 109-117.

Appendix A

Katy Trail Ride 2005 Map



Appendix B

Division of State Parks Katy Trail Ride 2005 Survey Results

GENDER

| | Frequency | Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|
| male | 72 | 48.6 |
| female | 76 | 51.4 |
| Total | 148 | 100.0 |

AGE

| | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|
| 14 and under | 4 | 2.7 |
| 15-19 | 5 | 3.4 |
| 20-29 | 4 | 2.7 |
| 30-39 | 7 | 4.7 |
| 40-49 | 44 | 29.7 |
| 50-59 | 51 | 34.5 |
| 60-69 | 29 | 19.6 |
| 70 and over | 4 | 2.7 |
| Total | 148 | 100.0 |

Household income

| | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| under \$5,000 | 3 | 2.2 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 1 | .7 |
| \$15,000-19,999 | 2 | 1.5 |
| \$20,000-24,999 | 4 | 3.0 |
| \$25,000-29,999 | 3 | 2.2 |
| \$30,000-34,999 | 5 | 3.7 |
| \$35,999-39,999 | 6 | 4.5 |
| \$40,000-44,999 | 8 | 6.0 |
| \$45,000-49,999 | 6 | 4.5 |
| \$50,000-75,000 | 29 | 21.6 |
| over \$75,000 | 67 | 50.0 |
| Total | 134 | 100.0 |

Ethnic background

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Caucasian/White | 143 | 97.3 |
| | African American | 1 | .7 |
| | Hispanic | 1 | .7 |
| | Other | 1 | .7 |
| | Decline to answer | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 147 | 100.0 |

Highest level of formal education completed

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Grades 1 to 8 | 4 | 2.7 |
| | Some high school | 3 | 2.1 |
| | High school | 9 | 6.2 |
| | Some college | 27 | 18.5 |
| | Undergraduate degree | 46 | 31.5 |
| | Graduate degree | 57 | 39.0 |
| | Total | 146 | 100.0 |

I bike most often on (check all that apply):

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
| Bicycle trails | Yes | 85 | 57.4 |
| | No | 63 | 42.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Paved county roads | Yes | 70 | 47.3 |
| | No | 78 | 52.7 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Katy Trail State Park | Yes | 50 | 33.8 |
| | No | 98 | 66.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Streets in town | Yes | 59 | 39.9 |
| | No | 89 | 60.1 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Gravel roads | Yes | 18 | 12.2 |
| | No | 130 | 87.8 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Mountain bike trails | Yes | 13 | 8.8 |
| | No | 135 | 91.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Other | Yes | 7 | 4.7 |

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|
| | No | 141 | 95.3 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |

Where else do you ride?

City.
 I don't bike a whole lot.
 Neighborhood.
 None.
 Stationary bike with frame.

Approximate number of miles you ride each year:

Average = 1,110.8

How many miles per day would you like to ride during the 2005 Katy Trail Ride?

Average = 45.4

I learned about the 2005 Katy Trail Ride from:

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Valid Past Camp or 2004 Katy Trail Ride Participant | 61 | 41.5 |
| Registration Form | 3 | 2.0 |
| Katy Trail Web Page | 42 | 28.6 |
| Other Web Site | 3 | 2.0 |
| Bicycle Club | 1 | .7 |
| Newspaper | 7 | 4.8 |
| Bicycling Magazine | 1 | .7 |
| State Parks Special Event Calendar | 2 | 1.4 |
| Other | 27 | 18.4 |
| Total | 147 | 100.0 |

What other website?

NBTDA

What newspaper?

Clinton Democrat
 Columbia Tribune
 Daily Press
 Florissant News
 St. Louis Post Dispatch
 St. Louis Post Dispatch
 St. Louis Post Dispatch
 USA TODAY

What bicycling magazine?

Adventure Cycling

What other way?

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| At the GITAP ride | Friend | State park employee |
| Bike sale | Friend Jim Abbitt (#43) | Trail Net |
| Bike sale | Friend on another ride | Wife |
| Biked trail in 2002 | Mom | |
| Bikesellers.com (store) | Mom | |

Co-worker
 Dufur's Katy Trail Book
 Friend
 Friend

Person
 Riding across USA
 Rode before
 Rode on 2001 ride

I decided to participate in this ride because (check all that apply):

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|
| I enjoy cycling | Yes | 118 | 79.7 |
| | No | 30 | 20.3 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| I wanted to enjoy Missouri's Katy Trail State Park | Yes | 96 | 64.9 |
| | No | 52 | 35.1 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| I wanted a physical challenge | Yes | 85 | 57.4 |
| | No | 63 | 42.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| I enjoy an organized and active vacation | Yes | 66 | 44.6 |
| | No | 82 | 55.4 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| It was an opportunity to share an event with my family and/or friends | Yes | 61 | 41.2 |
| | No | 87 | 58.8 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| I wanted to meet other bicyclists | Yes | 46 | 31.1 |
| | No | 102 | 68.9 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| I've never participated in a long distance cycling event | Yes | 44 | 29.7 |
| | No | 104 | 70.3 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Other | Yes | 11 | 7.4 |
| | No | 137 | 92.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |

What other reason?

- Ability level and distances.
- All of the above.
- Family heritage.
- Gather info for return trip.
- Interested in seeing St. Louis after the event.
- Mom.
- Parents made me.
- See scenery.
- Time left on our vacation.
- Wanted to see trail again.

I participated as a:

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Full-tour participant | 141 | 95.9 |
| | Day-rider | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Non-rider | 1 | .7 |
| | Volunteer | 3 | 2.0 |
| | Total | 147 | 100.0 |

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Average |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|
| Number of days as a day-rider | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.00 |
| Number of days as a non-rider | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5.00 |

The registration brochure provided me with all the necessary information required for participation

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 79 | 54.1 |
| | Agree | 59 | 40.4 |
| | No opinion | 3 | 2.1 |
| | Disagree | 4 | 2.7 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 146 | 100.0 |

The registration brochure gave an accurate description of the ride

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 78 | 53.4 |
| | Agree | 56 | 38.4 |
| | No opinion | 6 | 4.1 |
| | Disagree | 5 | 3.4 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 146 | 100.0 |

The registration brochure sufficiently detailed arrangements re: food, lodging & transportation

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 73 | 50.3 |
| | Agree | 58 | 40.0 |
| | No opinion | 8 | 5.5 |
| | Disagree | 5 | 3.4 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 145 | 100.0 |

The registration confirmation postcard or email was received in a timely manner

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 72 | 52.2 |
| | Agree | 46 | 33.3 |
| | No opinion | 11 | 8.0 |
| | Disagree | 5 | 3.6 |
| | Strongly disagree | 4 | 2.9 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

The registration confirmation postcard or email was accurate

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 79 | 57.2 |
| | Agree | 45 | 32.6 |
| | No opinion | 8 | 5.8 |
| | Disagree | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Strongly disagree | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

The registration confirmation postcard or email was informative

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 63 | 49.6 |
| | Agree | 47 | 37.0 |
| | No opinion | 9 | 7.1 |
| | Disagree | 5 | 3.9 |
| | Strongly disagree | 3 | 2.4 |
| | Total | 127 | 100.0 |

The confirmation packet arrived in a timely manner

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 62 | 44.9 |
| | Agree | 40 | 29.0 |
| | No opinion | 15 | 10.9 |
| | Disagree | 8 | 5.8 |
| | Strongly disagree | 13 | 9.4 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

The confirmation packet was easy to follow

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 66 | 49.3 |
| | Agree | 54 | 40.3 |
| | No opinion | 6 | 4.5 |
| | Strongly disagree | 8 | 6.0 |
| | Total | 134 | 100.0 |

The confirmation packet addressed all my concerns re: the logistics of the trip

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 60 | 45.1 |
| | Agree | 52 | 39.1 |
| | No opinion | 12 | 9.0 |
| | Disagree | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Strongly disagree | 7 | 5.3 |
| | Total | 133 | 100.0 |

The confirmation packet gave an accurate description as to the degree of difficulty of the trip

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 63 | 47.0 |
| | Agree | 48 | 35.8 |
| | No opinion | 13 | 9.7 |
| | Disagree | 4 | 3.0 |
| | Strongly disagree | 6 | 4.5 |
| | Total | 134 | 100.0 |

The confirmation packet clearly outlined my responsibilities as a rider

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 73 | 54.1 |
| | Agree | 44 | 32.6 |
| | No opinion | 9 | 6.7 |
| | Disagree | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Strongly disagree | 6 | 4.4 |
| | Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Do you feel the registration fee is

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | too low | 9 | 6.5 |
| | too high | 9 | 6.5 |
| | about right | 121 | 87.1 |
| | Total | 139 | 100.0 |

The Motor Coach Shuttle I took met my expectations

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 48 | 53.9 |
| | Agree | 33 | 37.1 |
| | No opinion | 7 | 7.9 |
| | Disagree | 1 | 1.1 |
| | Total | 89 | 100.0 |

The Motor Coach Shuttle I took was worth the cost

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 45 | 48.9 |
| | Agree | 37 | 40.2 |
| | No opinion | 8 | 8.7 |
| | Disagree | 1 | 1.1 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | 1.1 |
| | Total | 92 | 100.0 |

I took the

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | advance shuttle | 50 | 51.5 |
| | return shuttle | 37 | 38.1 |
| | roundtrip shuttle | 10 | 10.3 |
| | Total | 97 | 100.0 |

The ride staff and volunteers were friendly

| | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid Strongly agree | 116 | 80.0 |
| Agree | 26 | 17.9 |
| No opinion | 1 | .7 |
| Disagree | 1 | .7 |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 |

The ride staff and volunteers were readily available

| | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid Strongly agree | 107 | 74.3 |
| Agree | 34 | 23.6 |
| No opinion | 2 | 1.4 |
| Disagree | 1 | .7 |
| Total | 144 | 100.0 |

The ride staff and volunteers were able to provide assistance

| | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid Strongly agree | 99 | 69.2 |
| Agree | 36 | 25.2 |
| No opinion | 7 | 4.9 |
| Disagree | 1 | .7 |
| Total | 143 | 100.0 |

The baggage shuttle service handled my baggage with care

| | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid Strongly agree | 87 | 62.6 |
| Agree | 43 | 30.9 |
| No opinion | 7 | 5.0 |
| Strongly disagree | 2 | 1.4 |
| Total | 139 | 100.0 |

The baggage shuttle service unloaded my baggage when needed

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 96 | 69.6 |
| | Agree | 34 | 24.6 |
| | No opinion | 7 | 5.1 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

The baggage shuttle service was to my satisfaction

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 98 | 70.5 |
| | Agree | 36 | 25.9 |
| | No opinion | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 139 | 100.0 |

The portable shower facility was necessary for a ride this size

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 119 | 90.8 |
| | Agree | 9 | 6.9 |
| | No opinion | 1 | .8 |
| | Strongly disagree | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 131 | 100.0 |

The portable shower facility was clean and well maintained

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 105 | 78.9 |
| | Agree | 25 | 18.8 |
| | No opinion | 1 | .8 |
| | Strongly disagree | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 133 | 100.0 |

The portable shower facility was worth the extra cost

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 112 | 85.5 |
| | Agree | 14 | 10.7 |
| | No opinion | 3 | 2.3 |
| | Strongly disagree | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 131 | 100.0 |

The hotel shuttle was accessible and on time

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 10 | 16.9 |
| | Agree | 11 | 18.6 |
| | No opinion | 38 | 64.4 |
| | Total | 59 | 100.0 |

The hotel shuttle was worth the \$15 daily fee

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 8 | 13.6 |
| | Agree | 9 | 15.3 |
| | No opinion | 40 | 67.8 |
| | Strongly disagree | 2 | 3.4 |
| | Total | 59 | 100.0 |

The restroom facilities were conveniently located

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 33 | 24.1 |
| | Agree | 70 | 51.1 |
| | No opinion | 17 | 12.4 |
| | Disagree | 15 | 10.9 |
| | Strongly disagree | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 137 | 100.0 |

The restroom facilities were abundant in number

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 31 | 22.6 |
| | Agree | 63 | 46.0 |
| | No opinion | 18 | 13.1 |
| | Disagree | 19 | 13.9 |
| | Strongly disagree | 6 | 4.4 |
| | Total | 137 | 100.0 |

The restroom facilities were clean and well maintained

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 33 | 24.1 |
| | Agree | 63 | 46.0 |
| | No opinion | 18 | 13.1 |
| | Disagree | 21 | 15.3 |
| | Strongly disagree | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 137 | 100.0 |

The bicycle repair service was available when needed

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 40 | 37.4 |
| | Agree | 28 | 26.2 |
| | No opinion | 31 | 29.0 |
| | Disagree | 8 | 7.5 |
| | Total | 107 | 100.0 |

The bicycle repair service provided adequate bicycle repair

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 40 | 38.1 |
| | Agree | 26 | 24.8 |
| | No opinion | 33 | 31.4 |
| | Disagree | 6 | 5.7 |
| | Total | 105 | 100.0 |

The bicycle repair service was reasonable priced

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 35 | 35.7 |
| | Agree | 20 | 20.4 |
| | No opinion | 41 | 41.8 |
| | Disagree | 2 | 2.0 |
| | Total | 98 | 100.0 |

The SAG service was available when needed

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 87 | 64.4 |
| | Agree | 39 | 28.9 |
| | No opinion | 8 | 5.9 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 135 | 100.0 |

The SAG service provided enough water and bananas

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 82 | 59.0 |
| | Agree | 41 | 29.5 |
| | No opinion | 8 | 5.8 |
| | Disagree | 5 | 3.6 |
| | Strongly disagree | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Total | 139 | 100.0 |

The SAG service provided adequate first aid

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 52 | 43.7 |
| | Agree | 29 | 24.4 |
| | No opinion | 36 | 30.3 |
| | Disagree | 1 | .8 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .8 |
| | Total | 119 | 100.0 |

The map booklet was easy to follow

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 88 | 61.1 |
| | Agree | 47 | 32.6 |
| | No opinion | 5 | 3.5 |
| | Disagree | 3 | 2.1 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 144 | 100.0 |

The map booklet had accurate information

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 90 | 62.9 |
| | Agree | 45 | 31.5 |
| | No opinion | 6 | 4.2 |
| | Disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Strongly disagree | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 143 | 100.0 |

The map booklet could have been more detailed

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 25 | 18.5 |
| | Agree | 22 | 16.3 |
| | No opinion | 50 | 37.0 |
| | Disagree | 35 | 25.9 |
| | Strongly disagree | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Business advertisements in the map booklet made it easier to find needed services

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 29 | 21.0 |
| | Agree | 47 | 34.1 |
| | No opinion | 49 | 35.5 |
| | Disagree | 10 | 7.2 |
| | Strongly disagree | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

Business advertisements in the map booklet influenced my decision to stop at a business

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 27 | 19.6 |
| | Agree | 43 | 31.2 |
| | No opinion | 47 | 34.1 |
| | Disagree | 15 | 10.9 |
| | Strongly disagree | 6 | 4.3 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

The trail markings were easy to follow

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 86 | 60.1 |
| | Agree | 53 | 37.1 |
| | No opinion | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Disagree | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Total | 143 | 100.0 |

The trail markings could be improved

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Strongly agree | 25 | 19.4 |
| | Agree | 35 | 27.1 |
| | No opinion | 28 | 21.7 |
| | Disagree | 29 | 22.5 |
| | Strongly disagree | 12 | 9.3 |
| | Total | 129 | 100.0 |

Do you plan on returning to any of the communities that you have visited during the 2005 Ride?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Yes | 113 | 80.1 |
| | No | 28 | 19.9 |
| | Total | 141 | 100.0 |

Communities:

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
| Clinton | Yes | 19 | 12.8 |
| | No | 129 | 87.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Hartsburg | Yes | 55 | 37.2 |
| | No | 93 | 62.8 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Augusta | Yes | 79 | 53.4 |
| | No | 69 | 46.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Pilot Grove | Yes | 17 | 11.5 |
| | No | 131 | 88.5 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Hermann | Yes | 73 | 49.3 |
| | No | 75 | 50.7 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| St. Charles | Yes | 73 | 49.3 |
| | No | 75 | 50.7 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Other | Yes | 10 | 6.8 |
| | No | 138 | 93.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |

What other community?

Columbia
 Defiance, Marthasville
 Rocheport
 Rocheport
 Rocheport

Rocheport
 Rocheport
 Rocheport
 Rocheport

Are you from Missouri?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Yes | 70 | 49.3 |
| | No | 72 | 50.7 |
| | Total | 142 | 100.0 |

Do you anticipate returning to Missouri for future vacations or bicycling activities?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Yes | 56 | 81.2 |
| | No | 13 | 18.8 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 |

Did you or are you planning to spend time in MO before or after the ride for vacationing or recreation purposes?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | I came early | 17 | 24.3 |
| | I came just for the ride | 36 | 51.4 |
| | I will be staying after the ride | 17 | 24.3 |
| | Total | 70 | 100.0 |

How many days early?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | 1 | 15 | 88.2 |
| | 2 | 1 | 5.9 |
| | 4 | 1 | 5.9 |
| | Total | 17 | 100.0 |

How many days staying after?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | 1 | 5 | 22.7 |
| | 2 | 9 | 40.9 |
| | 4 | 4 | 18.2 |
| | 5 | 2 | 9.1 |
| | 7 | 2 | 9.1 |
| | Total | 22 | 100.0 |

If you are planning to vacation in conjunction with the ride, what areas are you planning to visit and what types of activities are you planning to participate in while on vacation?

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
| St. Louis | Yes | 35 | 23.6 |
| | No | 113 | 76.4 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Kansas City | Yes | 9 | 6.1 |
| | No | 139 | 93.9 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Branson | Yes | 9 | 6.1 |
| | No | 139 | 93.9 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Lake of the Ozarks | Yes | 13 | 8.8 |
| | No | 135 | 91.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Other | Yes | 7 | 4.7 |
| | No | 141 | 95.3 |

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|
| | No | 141 | 95.3 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |

What other area?

Alton
Columbia
Columbia
Hannibal
Independence
Iowa

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
| Sightseeing | Yes | 26 | 17.6 |
| | No | 122 | 82.4 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Amusement parks | Yes | 8 | 5.4 |
| | No | 140 | 94.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Musical attractions | Yes | 20 | 13.5 |
| | No | 128 | 86.5 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Outdoor recreation activities | Yes | 13 | 8.8 |
| | No | 135 | 91.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Other | Yes | 11 | 7.4 |
| | No | 137 | 92.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |

What other activities?

| | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| Ball game | Visit friends |
| Ball game | Visit relatives |
| Ball game | Visit relatives |
| Ball game | Visit relatives |
| Ball game | Zoo & aquarium |

Please rate the facilities at Clinton

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 75 | 56.4 |
| | Good | 43 | 32.3 |
| | Average | 13 | 9.8 |
| | Fair | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 133 | 100.0 |

Please rate the facilities at Pilot Grove

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 63 | 46.0 |
| | Good | 53 | 38.7 |
| | Average | 19 | 13.9 |
| | Fair | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 137 | 100.0 |

Please rate the facilities at Hartsburg

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 52 | 37.7 |
| | Good | 49 | 35.5 |
| | Average | 23 | 16.7 |
| | Fair | 9 | 6.5 |
| | Poor | 5 | 3.6 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

Please rate the facilities at Hermann

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 66 | 47.1 |
| | Good | 49 | 35.0 |
| | Average | 19 | 13.6 |
| | Fair | 3 | 2.1 |
| | Poor | 3 | 2.1 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

Please rate the facilities at Augusta

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 52 | 37.1 |
| | Good | 50 | 35.7 |
| | Average | 20 | 14.3 |
| | Fair | 10 | 7.1 |
| | Poor | 8 | 5.7 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

In the last year prior to this ride, how many times have you ridden the Katy Trail?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | never | 61 | 43.6 |
| | 1-10 times | 57 | 40.7 |
| | 11-20 times | 8 | 5.7 |
| | more than 20 times | 14 | 10.0 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

Please rate the route from Clinton to Pilot Grove

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 54 | 39.1 |
| | Good | 59 | 42.8 |
| | Average | 21 | 15.2 |
| | Fair | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Poor | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

Please rate the route from Pilot Grove to Hartsburg

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 67 | 48.6 |
| | Good | 58 | 42.0 |
| | Average | 11 | 8.0 |
| | Fair | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

Please rate the route from Hartsburg to Hermann

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 44 | 31.4 |
| | Good | 66 | 47.1 |
| | Average | 15 | 10.7 |
| | Fair | 10 | 7.1 |
| | Poor | 5 | 3.6 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

Please rate the route from Hermann to Augusta

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 55 | 39.3 |
| | Good | 65 | 46.4 |
| | Average | 16 | 11.4 |
| | Fair | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Poor | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

Please rate the route from Augusta to St. Charles

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 66 | 47.1 |
| | Good | 59 | 42.1 |
| | Average | 13 | 9.3 |
| | Fair | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

Do you have a directional route preference for the annual Katy Trail Ride?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | yes | 66 | 45.8 |
| | no | 78 | 54.2 |
| | Total | 144 | 100.0 |

What route do you prefer?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | east-west | 11 | 16.4 |
| | west-east | 56 | 83.6 |
| | Total | 67 | 100.0 |
| Total | | 148 | |

Would you be interested in a fall Katy Trail Ride?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | yes | 104 | 78.2 |
| | no | 29 | 21.8 |
| | Total | 133 | 100.0 |

How important is having dinner and breakfast provided as part of the tour registration fee?

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Very important | 130 | 88.4 |
| | Somewhat important | 14 | 9.5 |
| | Would prefer to purchase own meals | 3 | 2.0 |
| | Total | 147 | 100.0 |

Please rate the breakfast at Clinton

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 48 | 35.3 |
| | Good | 29 | 21.3 |
| | Average | 29 | 21.3 |
| | Fair | 20 | 14.7 |
| | Poor | 10 | 7.4 |
| | Total | 136 | 100.0 |

Please rate the breakfast at Pilot Grove

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 69 | 49.3 |
| | Good | 35 | 25.0 |
| | Average | 26 | 18.6 |
| | Fair | 5 | 3.6 |
| | Poor | 5 | 3.6 |
| | Total | 140 | 100.0 |

Please rate the breakfast at Hartsburg

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 74 | 54.4 |
| | Good | 40 | 29.4 |
| | Average | 11 | 8.1 |
| | Fair | 8 | 5.9 |
| | Poor | 3 | 2.2 |
| | Total | 136 | 100.0 |

Please rate the breakfast at Hermann

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 65 | 48.1 |
| | Good | 31 | 23.0 |
| | Average | 25 | 18.5 |
| | Fair | 9 | 6.7 |
| | Poor | 5 | 3.7 |
| | Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Please rate the breakfast at Augusta

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 39 | 30.0 |
| | Good | 42 | 32.3 |
| | Average | 26 | 20.0 |
| | Fair | 21 | 16.2 |
| | Poor | 2 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 130 | 100.0 |

Please rate the dinner at Pilot Grove

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 71 | 49.0 |
| | Good | 52 | 35.9 |
| | Average | 11 | 7.6 |
| | Fair | 7 | 4.8 |
| | Poor | 4 | 2.8 |
| | Total | 145 | 100.0 |

Please rate the dinner at Hartsburg

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 56 | 39.4 |
| | Good | 37 | 26.1 |
| | Average | 27 | 19.0 |
| | Fair | 10 | 7.0 |
| | Poor | 12 | 8.5 |
| | Total | 142 | 100.0 |

Please rate the dinner at Hermann

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 86 | 59.7 |
| | Good | 39 | 27.1 |
| | Average | 11 | 7.6 |
| | Fair | 7 | 4.9 |
| | Poor | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 144 | 100.0 |

Please rate the dinner at Augusta

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 96 | 67.1 |
| | Good | 30 | 21.0 |
| | Average | 13 | 9.1 |
| | Fair | 4 | 2.8 |
| | Total | 143 | 100.0 |

Please rate the lunch at St. Charles

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 61 | 44.2 |
| | Good | 53 | 38.4 |
| | Average | 21 | 15.2 |
| | Fair | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Poor | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 138 | 100.0 |

Your overall 2005 Katy Trail Ride experience was

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid | Excellent | 85 | 59.4 |
| | Good | 53 | 37.1 |
| | Average | 4 | 2.8 |
| | Poor | 1 | .7 |
| | Total | 143 | 100.0 |

Would you consider participating in this event next year?

| | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid yes | 90 | 61.6 |
| no | 22 | 15.1 |
| undecided | 34 | 23.3 |
| Total | 146 | 100.0 |

If yes, which month do you prefer to ride?

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid June | 72 | 61.5 |
| September | 45 | 38.5 |
| Total | 117 | 100.0 |

If no or undecided, why:

| | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|
| Schedule conflicts | Yes | 13 | 8.8 |
| | No | 135 | 91.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Participating in a different ride | Yes | 16 | 10.8 |
| | No | 132 | 89.2 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Less than satisfactory experience this year | Yes | 1 | .7 |
| | No | 147 | 99.3 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Do not know about the route yet | Yes | 2 | 1.4 |
| | No | 146 | 98.6 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |
| Other | Yes | 23 | 15.5 |
| | No | 125 | 84.5 |
| | Total | 148 | 100.0 |

What other reason?

- Distance
- Done it three years. May try something different.
- Heat.
- I am a road biker and this is fun. I would prefer to stick to paved rides.
- I am tired of this ride. I've done it four times and it is not exciting anymore.
- I wouldn't come alone.
- Limited vacation time.
- Many other places to go.
- Mom made me come this year.
- Need slower pace. Want some time for tourism-type stops.
- Need time to rest.
- One is enough (probably).
- Other types of activities.
- Other vacation venues.

Satisfied in having done the ride one time.
Someone to ride with.
Vacation schedule.
Very strenuous.
We live too far away.
We live far away, weather is too hot.
Will wait 'til 2007.

Appendix C

Questionnaire Review Panel

David Vaught, Ph.D.
Director of Internships
(573) 882-9517
Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism
105 Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources Building
Columbia, MO 65211-7230
vaughtdr@missouri.edu

Jaclyn Card, Ph.D.
Professor
(573) 882-9516
Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism
105 Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources Building
Columbia, MO 65211-7230
cardj@missouri.edu

Shu Tian-Cole, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
(573) 882-9518
Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism
105 Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources Building
Columbia, MO 65211-7230
colest@missouri.edu

David Kelly
Program Director for Market Development
Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Division of State Parks
P.O. Box 176
Jefferson City, MO 65102
david.kelly@dnr.mo.gov

Melanie Robinson
Special Events Coordinator
Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Division of State Parks
P.O. Box 176
Jefferson City, MO 65102
melanie.robinson@dnr.mo.gov

Appendix D

IRB Consent to Participate Form

Consent to Participate In a Study

Title: Satisfaction Across a Multi-day Outdoor Recreation Event

Investigator:

Timothy M. Montgomery
Department of Parks, Recreation and
Tourism
105 Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources
Building
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65211
(573) 999-1711

MU Institutional Review Board

483 McReynolds
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65211
(573) 882-9585

Description: The purpose of this study is to measure visitor satisfaction of specific site attributes of Katy Trail Ride 2005. This study will provide useful managerial information, when allocating resources, instituting policy, and assigning programming priorities for Missouri DSP. Information will be used to evaluate the current ride so DSP can make appropriate changes to make your experience more satisfying. I am asking for your help with this study. The questionnaire will ask you questions about DSP performance of specific attributes of the ride. This questionnaire should take approximately five minutes to complete.

Confidentiality: All information obtained from this questionnaire will be used only for the purpose of this study and will remain confidential.

Right to Withdraw: Participation is voluntary and you may choice to withdraw from this study at anytime.

Statement of Consent: I have read the information listed above. I am 18 years of age or older. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and receive answers. By signing the below, I consent to participate in this study.

Appendix E

Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride Features Questionnaire

Satisfaction of Katy Trail Ride Features

Please rate your level of satisfaction with each feature of the Katy Trail Ride listed below. Circle one number for each feature.

| FEATURE | SATISFACTION | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|----------------|-----|
| | Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neutral | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied | |
| facility cleanliness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| hot showers at campsite | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| variability of food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| natural/historical information about the area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| trail maintenance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| quantity of food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| length of ride | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| accessibility for individuals with disabilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| facility maintenance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| safety and security information about the area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| quality of food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| staff and volunteer courtesy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| aesthetics of surroundings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| availability of food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| staff and volunteer knowledge | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| social interaction with participants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| level of challenge | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| restroom availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| weather conditions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| SAG service | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| ease of obtaining information | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| level of personal fatigue | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| roadway crossings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| current and accurate information | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |

How would you rate your 'overall satisfaction' with today's experience?

| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neutral | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Please fill in or check the appropriate choice below:

1. Gender _____Female
 _____Male

2. What is your age? _____

3. Highest level of education completed:

_____some high school
_____high school/GED degree
_____some college
_____four-year college degree
_____graduate degree

4. Annual gross household income:

_____under \$15,000
_____ \$15,000-24,999
_____ \$25,000-34,999
_____ \$35,000-49,999
_____ \$50,000-74,999
_____ \$75,000 or more

5. Approximately how often have you bicycled on the Katy Trail in the last year?

Any additional comments regarding your satisfaction with today's experience are appreciated. Please write them in the space below.

Thank you for your time.

Appendix F

Additional Comment List

Monday

- Breakfast food was substantially gone when we got there.
- Night toilets didn't have t.p.
- Would prefer meals as an option.
- Shuttle to/from hotel takes too much time. Waited one hour while shuttle was diverted as a SAG vehicle.
- Web site did not clearly provide some important info and included lots of extraneous info. I had trouble finding routes with daily mileage. Also, should include info on distance of hotels from campsite and how to locate hotels from trail.
- \$20 per day for shuttle is steep. Tell us how we can ride bikes to/from campsite.
- Volunteers were very nice.
- Please provide rest stop food that can be eaten by diabetics; same for breakfast/dinner meals.
- Better map to start point for buses at beginning of ride.
- Fight Tiger, fight for old Mizzou!
- Benson Center is fabulous.
- Clinton merchants might consider running a shuttle.
- Sometimes staff can be pennywise and pound foolish. Remember customer service issues.
- We need a place to clean bikes.
- First night's campsite was very noisy due to traffic.
- Trail maintenance exceptional.
- Great experience. Thanks.

- Nice ride, just a little on the long side!!
- Put up my tent.
- Good ride.
- Better food at SAG stops.
- One premixed Gatorade cooler instead of all water.
- Meetings too long.
- Good luck on your project.
- Where were the eggs for breakfast?
- This survey was fantastic!!
- Width of openings at gates is a little too narrow.
- A paved Katy Trail would be very nice.
- Last SAG stop didn't have bathroom – needed to go.
- Good ride, but weather too hot.
- Good to get hard part of trail out of the way first.
- Excellent event – Thanks!

Tuesday

- I would appreciate a 3 or 4 day option. Michigan has such a practice whereby riders may choose among 4, 5, or 6 day rides, either along coast or thru interior of state. All rides convene at one town on the penultimate night of the trip and terminate at same place and date.
- There were stretches of loose and dangerous gravel between McBaine and Hartsburg, as if trail were covered with different kind of gravel with no rock dust.
- Future improvements to trail might include more bike racks at points of interest, sun shelters over the Lewis and Clark information stations, an updating of information about facility availability, e.g. food, camping, etc., for those who opt to do this ride on their own. (DNR material seems to be obsolete with respect to a few towns.)

- It would be interesting to know more about how this recreational trail was constructed and how it is maintained – I haven't come upon such info yet.
- Good ride.
- Heat in the p.m. was tough.
- Interesting territory.
- Not enough trashcans in camping areas.
- The problem with the camping in the yard of the brick house.
- I would like to see breakfast at 5:30 a.m.
- Fee charge for a campsite at the welcome center was not expected. Land owner accessed us \$10 per site.
- Make note trail marks identifying hazards. I came to an orange X designating soft sand but too late to avoid it.
- Hartsburg stop is not one of the greater stops due to being spread.
- After riding all day I do not want to ride to supper or showers.
- The gravel by last SAG stop was really soft.
- I loved the peanut butter at SAG stops.
- Ran out of food in Pilot Grove (dinner).
- Sandy areas need to be marked.
- Need more trail angels like Jean.
- Need cups at rest stops and better assortment of snacks – bananas are good but get old.
- The people are just great.
- Great job.
- Enjoying the time – not the heat.
- Possibly local communities could organize for lunches.

- Local football team to carry luggage to campsites. They could make a lot of money.
- Communities could be more involved for economic development.
- Would like to see one of the gates open at road crossings.
- Scenery was great!
- People from DNR are well organized and provided excellent information.
- Overall ride was excellent.
- While moving bicycles our tandem was scratched badly.
- Need place to clean bikes.
- SAG needs more variety.
- I'm enjoying myself very much!
- Beautiful scenery and just the right amount of riding.
- Meeting great people – both riders and volunteers.
- Thanks and good luck with Masters. I got mine from Mizzou, too.
- We would like local kids to haul luggage for tips when getting into camp and again in the morning.
- Ladies of communities have bake sales to raise money.
- How about a beer garden.
- How about a coffee cart.
- How about t-shirts in every town to represent towns we stayed in.
- Earlier breakfast.
- Open up gates for the days section.
- Very well supported.
- Open one gate and have sweeper to close gate when they come through.

- Bring something to do in the evening, horseshoes, washers, etc.
- Squeeze gates too close, gravel at gates was too much at times.
- Information on trail about places to eat was non-existent.
- Surely places in town could put up a board that said, '2 blocks up and 2 over' or something.
- First day was too long.
- Not enough benches between Green Ridge and Sedalia.
- Need to contact the towns people so we can have lunch available without hassles.
- Two places on second day had soft sand on cross over on levee.
- One lady went down behind me after New Franklin.
- Better bug spray.
- Sights are noisy.
- Survey too generalized.
- Towns do not seem prepared for large groups.
- Slow food service.
- Food unavailability.
- Hours not convenient.
- Been on most rides – including the first one.

Wednesday

- The walk to Stone Hill was not good after a long hot day.
- Service, quantity of food at Stone Hill was sub-par. Long lines, slow, and they ran out of food. They should have done better.
- Air conditioning would have been nice.
- More pasta type dishes instead of meat and potatoes.

- Check in people need to go through more details with every rider. (Kudos to the volunteers still.)
- Roadway crossings create accidents instead of avoiding them. Check out Prairie Path in Chicago for a model setup.
- The ride is very organized and fun!
- Solar composting toilets.
- Go Tigers!!
- Organized ride is great!
- This ride is a wonderful thing. Best thing I've ever done!
- More bathrooms.
- Dirty shower floors in truck.
- Even out mileage. Make first day shortest, or shorter.
- More snacks are needed at rest stops.
- Trail conditions need to be mentioned at ride meetings.
- Need cups at rest stops.
- Tuesday night we ate at 6:30. There was no chicken.
- Monday night no dessert.
- Rough spots on Katy on Wednesday and not marked.
- Lack of water at some of SAG stops was a problem.
- The trail in this area was soft.
- Several spots had major rough surfaces.
- Gates need to be open.
- Some areas have loose gravel and are not marked.
- Start breakfast earlier so riders can beat the heat.

- I have been very impressed with the excellent logistics.
- Food at the winery was not enough for this crowd!
- Please pass out happy pills to the whiners.
- Deal with coffee in the a.m. – put outside.
- More than two lines for food.
- See Show Me Center about line control.
- Hot water for tea in the morning.
- Trail was not as well maintained – more narrow in many places, loose gravel, bumpy, intersections weren't as smooth.
- SAG support and volunteers are excellent.
- This ride is one of the very best in the country.
- The effort by the staff to make certain the riders are safe and have fun is only exceeded by the staff of Adventure Cycling in my experience.
- The scenic beauty and historical significance of the Katy Trail are rarely exceeded.
- Excellent ride – I'll be back!
- Pancake man takes too long, but food is good.
- Bananas were great on day 1, so were plums. Bananas were o.k. on day 2, no plums. I'm really tired of bananas on day 3, where are the plums?

Thursday

- The heat has been awful but totally out of control of the staff.
- Beautiful ride.
- Breakfast was good but super ran short and the SAG stops ran out of Poweraide.
- More toilets spread out.
- Serve food to bikers (not to self).

- Some lack knowledge of towns by staff.
- Some level of lack of communication between town and event.
- Very friendly staff and riders.
- We will be back.
- It was very nice of Augusta Elementary to open buildings for a little AC.
- Please don't run out of dinner entrée.
- Too hot – nothing available to cool off.
- Restrooms inadequate.
- Great job!
- Should leave road guards open for duration of days ride.
- Sure was hot.
- How about an October ride, even if for a weekend?
- Very hot and humid this year.
- Sanitized bathrooms on trail.
- Packed down trail and wider in some places.
- Crossings gates in the shade need to be painted white/yellow for visibility.
- Faster riders frequently do not give warning when passing slower riders.
- It would be nice if the info booth had charges for cell phones.
- I'm sorry but the pancake man has to go. It delays us getting out in a timely manner and takes way too long to feed us.
- Many I've talked to the last few days have skipped breakfast. I had to this morning.
- The Clinton breakfast was perfect.
- Could someone sell Gatoraide and cookies along the way? Local people, organizations?

- Crew's great.
- Need more restrooms.
- Need better weather – too hot!

Friday

- On hot days – earlier breakfast.
- Great ride – staff and volunteers made it good. Thanks for everything!
- I was very pleased with the helpfulness of all the volunteers. They worked tirelessly with a cheerful attitude and strived to please us. Thank you!!
- Would have liked more afternoon/p.m. activities.
- Too much time between getting off trail and feed time.
- Town business folks didn't seem to be expecting us.
- Need more communication with businesses/towns along the route. Stores weren't open or prepared for us! No excuse.
- Where's the massage therapist?
- Where's the water hose – on hot days a SAG stop or two with a hose to squirt riders would have been appreciated.
- Fewer bananas – more bagels, pb sandwiches, etc.
- More opportunities to taste/visit wineries.
- Great SAG stop on today's ride – very enthusiastic.
- Awesome event overall!! Excellent!!
- It was great!
- Pickles!
- The ride would be much better with more community involvement/participation.
- DNR needs to communicate with host rest stops and overnight stops to have more restaurants open to handle crowds.

Appendix G

Attribute Correlation Matrix Tables

Monday Correlation Matrix (n = 47)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---|---|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Facility Cleanliness | 1 | .503** | .353* | .170 | .283* | .397** | .100 | .556** | .293* | .190 | -.030 | .181 | .392** | .249 | .422** | .013 | .214 | -.019 | -.057 | .092 | .220 | .017 | .387** | .156 |
| 2. Hot Showers at Campsite | | 1 | .098 | .458** | .406** | .108 | .151 | .534** | .417** | .334* | .089 | .232 | .107 | .295* | .311* | -.060 | .003 | -.044 | -.108 | .084 | .242 | .131 | .460** | .034 |
| 3. Variability of Food | | | 1 | .197 | .170 | .671** | .091 | .290 | .217 | .528** | .138 | .148 | .583** | .062 | .335* | .237 | .171 | -.106 | .089 | -.056 | -.034 | .007 | .341* | .211 |
| 4. Natural/Historical Info about the Area | | | | 1 | .418** | .271 | .146 | .158 | .177 | .218 | .210 | .369** | .303* | .163 | .420** | .137 | .045 | -.107 | .101 | .144 | .182 | .113 | .168 | .015 |
| 5. Trail Maintenance | | | | | 1 | .282* | .333* | .347* | .284* | .239 | .049 | .565** | .173 | .180 | .359** | .315* | .359** | .107 | -.060 | -.076 | .188 | .242 | .363** | .080 |
| 6. Quantity of Food | | | | | | 1 | .222 | .241 | .161 | .335* | .034 | .266 | .707** | .079 | .544** | .350* | .305* | .013 | .136 | .137 | .054 | -.101 | .369** | .419** |
| 7. Length of Ride | | | | | | | 1 | .193 | .169 | .290* | -.069 | .379** | .212 | .355* | .198 | .242 | .306* | .624** | .340* | .265 | .585** | .432** | .421** | .238 |
| 8. Facility Maintenance | | | | | | | | 1 | .346* | .229 | .027 | .041 | .122 | .303* | .124 | .069 | .298* | .207 | -.176 | .135 | .295 | .161 | .288** | -.041 |
| 9. Safety and Security Info about the Area | | | | | | | | | 1 | .312* | -.043 | .224 | -.034 | .326* | .173 | .367** | .318* | .185 | .326* | .304* | .083 | .440** | .529** | .026 |
| 10. Quality of Food | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .044 | .359** | .428** | .450** | .251 | .366** | .015 | .144 | .162 | .303* | .101 | .157 | .309* | .032 |
| 11. Staff and Volunteer Courtesy | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .195 | -.058 | .090 | .043 | -.037 | -.043 | -.083 | .053 | -.044 | -.102 | -.156 | -.064 | -.009 |
| 12. Aesthetics of Surroundings | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .330* | .483** | .367** | .451** | .149 | .085 | .375** | .177 | .060 | .025 | .362** | .413** |
| 13. Availability of Food | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .242 | .532** | .307* | .200 | .001 | .249 | .159 | .102 | -.099 | .245 | .451** |
| 14. Staff and Volunteer Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .009 | .324* | .139 | .164 | .319* | .526** | .020 | .105 | .556** | .143 |
| 15. Social Interaction with Participants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .469** | .177 | -.051 | .237 | .084 | .130 | -.029 | .128 | .190 |
| 16. Level of Challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .497** | .248 | .544** | .373* | .114 | .106 | .317 | .202 |
| 17. Restroom Availability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .271 | .259 | .239 | .262 | .195 | .487** | .191 |
| 18. Weather Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .298* | .363* | .463** | .546** | .191 | .227 |
| 19. SAG Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .447** | .037 | .223 | .346* | .358* |
| 20. Ease of Obtaining Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .180 | .189 | .447** | .171 |
| 21. Level of Personal Fatigue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .460** | .179 | .000 |
| 22. Roadway Crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .276* | -.085 |
| 23. Current and Accurate Information about the Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .292* |
| 24. Overall Satisfaction with the Day's Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Tuesday Correlation Matrix (n = 43)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---|---|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Facility Cleanliness | 1 | .486** | .422** | .215 | .216 | .280 | .292 | .507** | .174 | .126 | .069 | .360* | .197 | .220 | .131 | .174 | .382** | .613** | .140 | .016 | .406** | .485** | .419** | .681** |
| 2. Hot Showers at Campsite | | 1 | .503** | .457** | .175 | .158 | .168 | .601** | .492** | .325* | .237 | .347* | .255 | .358* | .127 | .198 | .159 | .355* | .351* | .292 | .438** | .212 | .659** | .265 |
| 3. Variability of Food | | | 1 | .597** | .388* | .401** | .431** | .581** | .220 | .626** | .548** | .628** | .533** | .530** | .278 | .444** | .249 | .301 | .485** | .529** | .670** | .583** | .468** | .526** |
| 4. Natural/Historical Info about the Area | | | | 1 | .356* | .345* | .639** | .533** | .245 | .359* | .254 | .458** | .324* | .518** | .410** | .509** | .167 | .320* | .485** | .599** | .709** | .453** | .659** | .408** |
| 5. Trail Maintenance | | | | | 1 | .166 | .388** | .462** | .266 | .022 | .283 | .394** | -.067 | .490** | .274 | .415** | .222 | .454** | .059 | .087 | .335* | .365* | .185 | .144 |
| 6. Quantity of Food | | | | | | 1 | .439** | .420** | .292* | .445** | .470** | .340* | .422** | .542** | .316* | .435** | .272 | .188 | .450** | .364* | .250 | .498** | .481** | .452** |
| 7. Length of Ride | | | | | | | 1 | .434** | .195 | .154 | .431** | .522** | .307* | .422** | .327 | .569** | .275 | .442** | .220 | .431** | .602** | .492** | .421** | .398* |
| 8. Facility Maintenance | | | | | | | | 1 | .546* | .288 | .361* | .546** | .258 | .614** | .241 | .573** | .256 | .578** | .207 | .155 | .510** | .388* | .484** | .324 |
| 9. Safety and Security Info about the Area | | | | | | | | | 1 | .188 | .338* | .180 | .059 | .330* | .047 | .322* | .035 | .221 | .088 | .115 | .364* | .120 | .394** | -.041 |
| 10. Quality of Food | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .465** | .273 | .551** | .472** | .309* | .358* | .236 | .152 | .669** | .487** | .215 | .235 | .405** | .474** |
| 11. Staff and Volunteer Courtesy | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .338* | .436** | .379** | .315* | .429** | .206 | .108 | .388** | .503** | .289 | .396** | .446** | .198 |
| 12. Aesthetics of Surroundings | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .395** | .499** | .284 | .501** | .338* | .404** | .319* | .317* | .361* | .411** | .394** | .668** |
| 13. Availability of Food | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .442** | .318* | .315* | .228 | .043 | .655** | .445** | .409** | .412** | .404* | .490** |
| 14. Staff and Volunteer Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .466** | .682** | .367* | .570** | .548** | .437** | .302* | .301* | .463** | .406** |
| 15. Social Interaction with Participants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .517** | .050 | .225 | .434** | .268 | .293 | .140 | .359* | .272 |
| 16. Level of Challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .434** | .452** | .460** | .395** | .375* | .393** | .447** | .348* |
| 17. Restroom Availability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .364* | .335 | .195 | .218 | .500** | .236 | .419** |
| 18. Weather Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .051 | .084 | .226 | .187 | .286 | .442** |
| 19. SAG Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .655** | .234 | .365* | .552** | .472** |
| 20. Ease of Obtaining Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .337* | .324* | .564** | .391 |
| 21. Level of Personal Fatigue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .632** | .536** | .417** |
| 22. Roadway Crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .374* | .516** |
| 23. Current and Accurate Information about the Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .528** |
| 24. Overall Satisfaction with the Day's Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Wednesday Correlation Matrix (n = 39)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---|---|------|------|--------|-------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Facility Cleanliness | 1 | .174 | .111 | .608** | -.050 | .221 | .240 | .439** | .468** | .326* | .026 | .053 | -.002 | .471** | .010 | .485** | .357* | -.206 | .000 | .249 | .407* | .277 | .437** | .234 |
| 2. Hot Showers at Campsite | | 1 | .248 | -.004 | .290 | .293 | .157 | .149 | .326* | .392* | -.049 | .332* | .367* | .173 | .335* | .351* | .130 | -.066 | .069 | .231 | .174 | .188 | .263 | .455** |
| 3. Variability of Food | | | 1 | .365 | .140 | .553** | .207 | .274 | .434** | .793** | .447** | .492** | .687** | .266 | -.044 | .309 | .080 | .069 | .375* | .489** | .377* | .240 | .298 | .437** |
| 4. Natural/Historical Info about the Area | | | | 1 | .271 | .509** | .309 | .561** | .614** | .395** | .200 | .287 | .324* | .367* | -.058 | .235 | .363* | .000 | .096 | .318* | .321* | .397** | .591** | .339* |
| 5. Trail Maintenance | | | | | 1 | .383* | .090 | .284 | .403** | .201 | .091 | .305* | .274 | .061 | .096 | .001 | .250 | .158 | -.009 | .059 | .091 | .213 | .312* | .375* |
| 6. Quantity of Food | | | | | | 1 | .191 | .340* | .460** | .675** | .300 | .164 | .683** | .188 | -.006 | .303 | .203 | .110 | .275 | .311* | .241 | .261 | .546** | .511** |
| 7. Length of Ride | | | | | | | 1 | .365* | .385* | .328* | .262 | .300 | .256 | .488** | .213 | -.021 | .077 | .262 | .295 | .321* | .421** | .239 | .344* | .233 |
| 8. Facility Maintenance | | | | | | | | 1 | .577** | .385* | .058 | .089 | .287 | .412* | -.166 | .020 | .109 | .100 | .000 | .233 | .261 | .301 | .394* | .179 |
| 9. Safety and Security Info about the Area | | | | | | | | | 1 | .551** | .238 | .392* | .460** | .591** | .080 | .179 | .393* | -.020 | .318* | .448** | .337* | .270 | .627** | .438** |
| 10. Quality of Food | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .431** | .467** | .678** | .363* | .031 | .323* | .163 | .018 | .358* | .407** | .280 | .313* | .470** | .542** |
| 11. Staff and Volunteer Courtesy | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .166 | .248 | .331* | -.117 | .036 | .208 | .182 | .352* | .327* | -.061 | -.050 | .117 | .251 |
| 12. Aesthetics of Surroundings | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .437** | .197 | .140 | .206 | .137 | -.080 | .295 | .339* | .212 | .311* | .310* | .449** |
| 13. Availability of Food | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .337* | .110 | .150 | .157 | .086 | .432** | .484** | .160 | .176 | .449** | .592** |
| 14. Staff and Volunteer Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .087 | .015 | .323* | .135 | .257 | .729** | .155 | .111 | .489** | .154 |
| 15. Social Interaction with Participants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .224 | .329* | .013 | .189 | .110 | -.070 | -.017 | .067 | .190 |
| 16. Level of Challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .056 | -.056 | .145 | .101 | .336* | .150 | .251 | .352* |
| 17. Restroom Availability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .179 | .112 | .162 | .295 | .208 | .312* | .257 |
| 18. Weather Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .070 | .159 | .149 | .070 | .181 | -.050 |
| 19. SAG Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .450** | .222 | .072 | .264 | .436** |
| 20. Ease of Obtaining Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .159 | .206 | .562** | .200 |
| 21. Level of Personal Fatigue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .513** | .286 | .282 |
| 22. Roadway Crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .475** | .246 |
| 23. Current and Accurate Information about the Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .324* |
| 24. Overall Satisfaction with the Day's Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Thursday Correlation Matrix (n = 40)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---|---|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Facility Cleanliness | 1 | .414* | .218 | .349* | .167 | .124 | -.058 | .343** | .527** | .189 | .187 | .465** | .251 | .288 | .120 | .287 | .307 | .128 | .376* | .501** | .028 | .333* | .235 | .393* |
| 2. Hot Showers at Campsite | | 1 | .180 | .279 | .262 | .221 | .059 | .137 | .327* | -.052 | .188 | .102 | .139 | .243 | .377* | .231 | .400* | .359* | .360* | .409* | .135 | .288 | .284 | .393* |
| 3. Variability of Food | | | 1 | -.080 | .169 | .411** | .342* | .304 | .437** | .705** | .461** | .318* | .502** | .240 | .215 | .488** | .044 | -.045 | .553** | .534** | .304 | .142 | .269 | .344* |
| 4. Natural/Historical Info about the Area | | | | 1 | -.168 | .150 | .118 | .333* | .115 | .033 | .153 | .228 | .080 | .307 | .503** | .071 | .246 | .320 | .140 | .128 | .094 | .259 | .367* | .359* |
| 5. Trail Maintenance | | | | | 1 | .025 | .376* | -.037 | .126 | .170 | -.117 | .265 | .023 | .161 | -.003 | .153 | .034 | .360* | .183 | .176 | .286 | .414** | .133 | .243 |
| 6. Quantity of Food | | | | | | 1 | .128 | .304 | .036 | .381* | .329* | -.107 | .413** | .287 | .250 | .027 | .067 | .072 | .125 | .087 | .095 | .033 | .095 | .249 |
| 7. Length of Ride | | | | | | | 1 | -.056 | .049 | .347* | .070 | .049 | -.042 | -.027 | -.049 | .343* | .157 | .160 | .343* | .094 | .304 | -.044 | -.101 | .061 |
| 8. Facility Maintenance | | | | | | | | 1 | .549** | .347* | .518** | .343* | .681** | .573** | .278 | .309 | .506** | .191 | .481** | .541** | .278 | .154 | .449** | .423** |
| 9. Safety and Security Info about the Area | | | | | | | | | 1 | .254 | .477** | .526** | .495** | .570** | .344* | .604** | .445* | .212 | .661** | .810** | .073 | .223 | .480** | .533** |
| 10. Quality of Food | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .325* | .331* | .496** | .211 | -.010 | .145 | -.090 | -.047 | .460** | .341* | .153 | .006 | .172 | .421** |
| 11. Staff and Volunteer Courtesy | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .190 | .483** | .589** | .384* | .265 | .187 | .008 | .668** | .647** | .125 | .003 | .510** | .439** |
| 12. Aesthetics of Surroundings | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .311* | .337* | .109 | .152 | .203 | .012 | .439** | .507** | .040 | .293 | .451** | .411** |
| 13. Availability of Food | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .616** | .338* | .149 | .378* | .109 | .467** | .526** | .155 | .161 | .480** | .533** |
| 14. Staff and Volunteer Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .427** | .288 | .358* | .190 | .493** | .587** | .023 | .236 | .696** | .532** |
| 15. Social Interaction with Participants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .386* | .228 | .285 | .323* | .396** | .170 | .333* | .596** | .355* |
| 16. Level of Challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .289 | .304 | .494** | .561** | .292 | .164 | .288 | .267 |
| 17. Restroom Availability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .448** | .456** | .411** | .161 | .193 | .167 | .257 |
| 18. Weather Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .226 | .301 | .279 | .313 | .126 | .336* |
| 19. SAG Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .761** | .324* | .123 | .336* | .682** |
| 20. Ease of Obtaining Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .244 | .434** | .532** | .561** |
| 21. Level of Personal Fatigue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .390** | .101 | .154 |
| 22. Roadway Crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .452** | .282 |
| 23. Current and Accurate Information about the Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .600** |
| 24. Overall Satisfaction with the Day's Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Friday Correlation Matrix (n = 34)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---|---|-------|-------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Facility Cleanliness | 1 | .441* | .363* | .121 | .305 | .558** | .389* | .600** | .601** | .380* | .585** | .217 | .017 | .315 | .105 | .306 | .300 | .153 | .048 | .406* | .047 | .374* | .506** | .506** |
| 2. Hot Showers at Campsite | | 1 | .457* | .113 | .478** | .335 | .314 | .572** | .455* | .241 | .217 | .168 | .105 | .027 | .126 | .291 | .288 | .051 | .077 | .177 | .000 | .444* | .580** | .569** |
| 3. Variability of Food | | | 1 | .415 | .433** | .615** | .369* | .602** | .438** | .765** | .459** | .342* | .708** | .397* | .504** | .230 | .512** | .099 | .306 | .225 | .146 | .521** | .629** | .505** |
| 4. Natural/Historical Info about the Area | | | | 1 | .241 | .337* | .312 | .511** | .659** | .525** | .351* | .376* | .512** | .490** | .531** | .256 | .253 | .369* | .410* | .623** | -.011 | .321 | .415* | .727** |
| 5. Trail Maintenance | | | | | 1 | .354* | .069 | .689** | .426* | .382* | .080 | .109 | .263 | .075 | .253 | .402* | .496** | .276 | .118 | .167 | .025 | .599** | .611** | .567** |
| 6. Quantity of Food | | | | | | 1 | .727** | .644* | .634** | .654** | .627** | .306 | .440** | .521** | .277 | .520** | .211 | .215 | .427* | .448** | .382* | .575** | .701** | .608** |
| 7. Length of Ride | | | | | | | 1 | .432* | .524** | .589** | .668** | .473** | .439** | .379* | .429* | .444** | .130 | .211 | .364* | .258 | .382* | .596** | .702** | .665** |
| 8. Facility Maintenance | | | | | | | | 1 | .854** | .634** | .284 | .240 | .325 | .275 | .391* | .488** | .634** | .512** | .070 | .364* | -.008 | .731** | .832** | .779** |
| 9. Safety and Security Info about the Area | | | | | | | | | 1 | .530** | .352* | .249 | .230 | .328 | .367* | .480** | .436* | .356* | .276 | .665** | .028 | .619** | .691** | .734** |
| 10. Quality of Food | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .508** | .336* | .733** | .458** | .630** | .302 | .572** | .303 | .244 | .243 | .122 | .541** | .679** | .656** |
| 11. Staff and Volunteer Courtesy | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .573** | .355* | .605** | .520** | .326 | .130 | .242 | .461** | .472** | .325 | .281 | .551** | .347* |
| 12. Aesthetics of Surroundings | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .430* | .470** | .612** | .373* | .206 | .385* | .409* | .348* | .253 | .183 | .352* | .355* |
| 13. Availability of Food | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .440** | .693** | .071 | .424* | .161 | .485** | .224 | .081 | .485** | .529** | .389* |
| 14. Staff and Volunteer Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .534** | .285 | .099 | .303 | .340* | .467** | .244 | .229 | .248 | .231 |
| 15. Social Interaction with Participants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .208 | .539** | .476** | .370* | .314 | .144 | .409* | .501** | .428* |
| 16. Level of Challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .422* | .511** | .030 | .265 | .570** | .441** | .385* | .516** |
| 17. Restroom Availability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .655** | -.065 | .049 | .249 | .624** | .553** | .488** |
| 18. Weather Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .027 | .229 | .095 | .267 | .181 | .433* |
| 19. SAG Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .689** | .312 | .280 | .540** | .280 |
| 20. Ease of Obtaining Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .052 | .292 | .446** | .531** |
| 21. Level of Personal Fatigue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .304 | .264 | .056 |
| 22. Roadway Crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .768** | .541** |
| 23. Current and Accurate Information about the Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .726** |
| 24. Overall Satisfaction with the Day's Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.