

# **Studies of the 2005 and 2006 Michigander Participants**

**Rails-trails studied in 2005:  
Kal Haven Trail  
Rails-trails studied in 2006:  
Ewart to Mackinaw City**

Prepared by:

Kiki Kaplanidou, PhD.  
Christine Vogt, PhD.

Department of Community, Agriculture, Recreation and Resource Studies  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing  
48824-1222  
[www.carrs.msu.edu/trails](http://www.carrs.msu.edu/trails)

February 2007

## Acknowledgements

Funding for this part of the project came from the Michigan Department of Transportation, Michigan State University and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station. Other support and assistance was provided by Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance and more specifically by Nancy Krupiarz and Barry Culham whom we thank sincerely for their input.

## **Executive Summary of the 2005 and 2006 Studies of Michigander Participants**

The purpose of this study was to better understand the characteristics of events taking place on rails-trails and their impact on local communities. The rails-trails studied in this research project were the Kal Haven (2005 ride) and the trails from Evart to Mackinaw City (2006 ride).

In August of 2005, a sample of the 2005 event participants were sent a four-page questionnaire, which asked about their trip experience and satisfaction, perceptions of the Michigander as a event and their behavioral intentions regarding some of the destinations that participants visited during their ride. Nine-hundred-and-ninety-two individuals participated in the event which translated into 720 households, which was the desired sampling unit in this research. From the 720 mailed surveys, 4 came back undeliverable and 12 replied but didn't fill out the questionnaire. These 12 people reported they registered but they didn't participate in the event due to personal reasons. Consequently, the total effective sample was 704 and 495 people returned their questionnaires resulting in a 70% response rate.

In October of 2006, a follow-up mailing was conducted with those individuals who responded to the 2005 survey. The purpose of the follow-up survey was to record actual behaviors on trails featured in events one year following the event and to determine whether these individuals participated again in the 2006 Michigander. From the possible 495 sample, 344 individuals responded in the follow-up survey yielding a response rate of 87%.

### **The highlights of the results for the 2005 survey:**

- Slightly less than half of the respondents (43%) were weekend event riders, while 57% of the respondents participated in the week long Michigander event.
- Most of the 2005 riders (75%) were repeat Michigander respondents with the average number of participation times around 5 times.
- Weekend riders were less likely to be repeat respondents (70%) compared to the week long riders (79%).
- The location of the trails route had “a lot” of influence on their decision to ride for 15% of the respondents and “some” influence for 60%. One quarter of the respondents felt the location did not influence their decision.
- The average number of family members riding in the event with the participant was around three people.
- Most of the event respondents (94%) were “satisfied” or “extremely satisfied” with the condition of the Kal Haven Trail, the overall Michigander experience (95%), and the condition of other trails that were part of the event (77%).
- Respondents' intentions to return to the area of South Haven and the Kal Haven trail were overall fairly high. Specifically, most of the respondents (58%) indicated that it is “somewhat likely” or “extremely likely” that they will ride the Kal Haven trail in the following two years. Less than half (46%) indicated that it is “somewhat likely” or “extremely likely” they would visit South Haven area for a vacation, while 44% indicated that it “somewhat likely” or “extremely likely” they would visit South Haven area to participate in a sport or outdoor recreation activity.

- Most of the 2005 respondents thought the Michigander as an event was fulfilling (91%), friendly (88%), organized (87%), rugged (75%), inspiring (77%), and efficient (68%). Also, most of the respondents described the 2005 Michigander as “somewhat” or “extremely” spirited (93%) and “quite safe” or “extremely safe” (86%).
- The respondents indicated that friends and family were supportive of the respondents’ partaking in the Michigander. More specifically, 90% of the respondents indicated their friends support their participation in the Michigander, while 92% indicated their family approves of their participation in the Michigander.
- Most of the respondents (90%) indicated they had the financial resources to participate in the 2006 Michigander, while 96% indicated they had the physical resources to participate in the 2006 Michigander.
- The average number of years respondents have been riding on trails was reported to be about 16 years. Less than one-third of the respondents ride their bike once a week (29%). Each household was reported to have between two and three mountain bikes and between one and two road bikes.
- The respondents took an average of three bicycling trips between the years of 2000 to 2005.
- One-third of the respondents indicated they were members of the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, while 16% indicated they are members of the Michigan Trails and Greenway Alliance (which is the same organization that changed their name during the year of the survey).
- Many of the respondents (61%) rode the Kal Haven trail in 2004, the year before the event for an average of two times.
- The average spending on the event was around \$214 per participant, which is in addition to the event registration fee.
- Respondents in the Michigander were likely to belong to a two-person family with no children under the age of 19 living in the household.
- Most of the respondents (68%) were employed full time and 68% had more than \$60,000 of annual household income in 2004.
- Participants averaged 48 years old. More than half were males (53%).
- Finally, 91% of the respondents were from Michigan.

**The highlights from the 2006 survey of the 2005 respondents:**

- More than two-thirds (65%) of respondents to the 2006 survey rode in both the 2005 and 2006 Michigander events.

For those who rode in the 2006 event,

- The average number of times respondents participated in the Michigander was seven times.
- The average number of family members who rode with the respondent was around two and the average number of friends was between three and four. Only eight percent of the respondents indicated they attended the event alone.

- The location of the Michigander's trail route had "some" influence on 43% of the respondents who rode in the 2006 Michigander, 19% indicated the location of the route had "a lot of influence" in their decision, and 38% indicated "no influence."
- Most (81%) of the respondents were "somewhat" or "extremely" satisfied with the overall condition of the 2006 trails and route. Most were "somewhat" or "extremely" satisfied with the overall Michigander experience (94%) and the condition of other trails that were part of the event (77%).
- When respondents were asked about their intentions to participate in the 2007 Michigander, 89% indicated that it is "somewhat" or "extremely" likely they will. When asked about intentions to go back for vacation to some of the areas featured in the 2006 ride, 66% said that it is "somewhat" or "extremely" likely that they will revisit the area.
- Almost two-thirds (61%) of the respondents indicated they changed their behavior toward adopting biking as a year round activity because of their Michigander participation.
- Most of the 2006 respondents thought the Michigander as an event was "quite" or "very" fulfilling (95%), beautiful (94%), excellent (93%), cheerful (91%), joyful (91%), healthy (90%), supportive (89%), exciting (86%), relaxing (86%), valuable (86%), adventurous (85%), inspiring (81%), and stimulating (71%).
- The overall image of northwest Michigan as a vacation destination was perceived as "somewhat" or "very" positive by 98% of the respondents, and its image as a bike destination was "somewhat" or "very" positive by 97% of the respondents.
- Regarding spending beyond the even registration fee, the respondents spent, on average, per travel party (average size two persons) \$90 on accommodations, \$88 on meals, \$37 on take out meals, \$45 on biking equipment, \$35 on Michigander souvenirs, \$27 on groceries, \$0 on parking and \$71 on gas.
- Regarding other people's support with their Michigander participation, 84% of the respondents indicated they "somewhat" or "totally" agreed their family supports them in participating in the event
- Most of the respondents (95%) believed they had the financial resources to participate in the 2007 Michigander.

The following results include all people who responded to this 2006 survey (n=344).

- Regarding their actual behaviors during the 2005-2006 year, about one-quarter of the respondents (26%) used the Kal Haven trail and went back to South Haven for a vacation (25%). The majority of the respondents (72%) reported they used other trails for biking. South Haven was visited by 28% of the respondents to participate in another sport or outdoor recreation activity.
- Less than half (42%) traveled to other Michigan areas to participate in bike events since the 2005 Michigander event.
- Two-thirds of the respondents came from households with a 2005 annual income of over \$60,000. Respondents were slightly more likely to be male (54%) and 64% of the respondents were between 45 and 64 years old.

## Purpose of the study

The study of the Michigander participants aimed to understand their intentions and behaviors regarding bicycling, the use of trails and their intentions to revisit areas that they were exposed to through the event.

The purpose of studying bicycling events is to describe the participants and their cycling history, chronicle their participation in the event, and gather their opinions concerning the event, the rail-trail, and but also the destination where the event was held. The destination was deemed important because activities are often evaluated by consumers within the context they take place.

This report is organized in the following sections:

- Description of the 2005 and 2006 Michigander events
- Procedures for conducting the study of event participants
- Results from the 2005 survey
  - *Demographic profile of 2005 and 2006 Michigander respondents*
  - *Biking preferences and behaviors*
  - *Satisfaction with the Michigander and the trails*
  - *Intentions to return to some of the trails and involved destinations*
  - *Event image perceptions*
  - *Michigander as an event with personality*
  - *Social support for Michigander*
  - *Physical and financial resources*
  - *Spending patterns of the 2005 respondents*
  - *Perceptions of the destination where the event was held*
- Results from the 2006 survey
  - *Demographics*
  - *Previous behavior with Michigander participation*
  - *Satisfaction with the trails and event*
  - *Intentions*
  - *Perceptions of the 2006 Michigander*
  - *Image of northwest Michigan*
  - *Respondents' past behaviors with trails and biking in general*
  - *Spending patterns of the 2006 respondents*
- Implications

## **Description of the 2005 and 2006 Michigander Bike Event**

The Michigander is sponsored by Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance (Former Rails-to-Trails organization). The 2005 event began in South Haven and ended in Algonac. The weekend ride was 35 miles each day. The seven day was a total of 315 miles.

The trails part of the 2005 Michigander included the Kal-Haven, Battle Creek Linear Park, Albion River, Falling Waters, Jackson Intercity, Lakelands, Huron Valley, West Bloomfield, Clinton River and Macomb Orchard trails.

The 2006 Michigander started in Ewart and finished in Mackinaw City. The two-day ride was 27 miles each day and took place on the Pere Marquette and White Pine trails. The seven-day event was a total of 315 miles, and included the: White Pine, Betsie Valley, TART, Little Traverse Wheelway and Petoskey to Mackinaw trails.

## **Procedures for conducting the 2005 study of respondents**

Based on the registration data provided by the Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance there were 992 participants for the 2005 event. A sample was chosen to include persons over 18 years old and one person per household to ensure independency of responses for statistical analysis. The measurement instrument for this study was a self-administered four-page questionnaire (see Appendix A for the questionnaire).

The contact information for the sample was obtained from the event organizers at the beginning of October 2005. Seven-hundred-and-twenty surveys were mailed (on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005) along with a detailed personalized cover letter printed on a Michigan State University letterhead and signed by the research project's investigators. Each survey was numbered on the back page using a unique identification number that matched the subject's information to that of the survey and was maintained in a master list. This approach allowed for non-response tracking and follow-up mailing procedures in the next year.

The letter explained the purpose of the study and the reasons a response is important (cover letters available in Appendix B). The packet included a cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire and a prepaid return envelope. One week later (November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2005), a reminder postcard was mailed to the entire sample to thank those who already responded and to remind to the non-respondents that their responses were important to the research project. Two weeks after the postcard (November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005) a second mailing to the non-respondents took place which included a revised personalized cover letter (see Appendix B), a copy of the survey and a prepaid return envelope. In an effort to achieve a high response rate an incentive was offered to the recipients of the surveys. The incentive was the chance to win two \$50 discounts from the following year's "Michigander" event participation fees. The winners were notified through the event organizers in February 2006, and their names were announced in a newsletter event organizers distribute to event participants. From the 720 mailed surveys, 4 surveys were returned as undeliverable and 12 replied but didn't fill out the questionnaire. These 12 people reported that they registered but they didn't participate in the event due to personal reasons. Consequently, the total effective sample was 704. The response rates achieved are shown in

Table 1. The modified Dillman survey administration method yielded a response rate (70.3%) minimizing the potential impact of nonresponse error.

Table 1. Response rates for the 2005 Michigander survey

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Overall sample	720	
Effective sample	704	
Returned from first mailing	409	58.1%
Returned from second mailing	86	12.2%
Total returned	495	
<b>Response rate</b>		<b>70.3%</b>

For the 2006 study, we aimed to correlate the respondents' intentions with their actual behavior. For this purpose, we mailed a four-page survey to the 495 respondents of the 2005 survey asking questions about their behaviors during the previous year. Out of the 495 surveys sent, we received 344 back following the same mailing process as 2005. The response rate was 87%.

## Results

### *Demographic profile of 2005 and 2006 Michigander respondents*

The demographic analysis from the Michigander survey revealed the respondents were mainly male (53%) and their average age was 48 years old. Most of the 2006 respondents (64%) were between 45 and 64 years old. Most people in both surveys had annual household income over \$60,000. Table 2 presents the detailed information about the respondents' demographic information.

Table 2. Demographic information of the 2005 and 2006 respondents

	<b>2005 (n=495)</b>	<b>2006 (n=344)</b>
	<b>Percent or means</b>	<b>Percent or means</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	53.0%	54.0%
Female	47.0%	46.0%
<b>Employment</b>		
Employed, full-time	67.8%	n/a
Retired	15.3%	n/a
Employed, part-time	7.4%	n/a
Self-employed	4.1%	n/a
Student	3.1%	n/a
Homemaker	1.4%	n/a
Unemployed	0.6%	n/a
Other	0.2%	n/a
<b>Annual Household Income</b>		
Less than \$20,000	3.6%	3.5%
\$20,000 - \$39,999	8.9%	9.6%
\$40,000 - \$59,999	19.2%	18.8%
\$60,000 - \$79,999	20.3%	20.7%
\$80,000 or more	48.0%	47.5%
<b>Age</b>		
Under 25	5.3%	3.3%
25-34	8.4%	4.2%
35-44	20.8%	17.0%
45-54	35.3%	35.7%
55-64	22.0%	28.3%
65 or older	8.2%	11.6%
<b>Adults live in household</b>	2 (mean)	n/a
Persons under 19 living in household		n/a
0	55.0%	n/a
1	17.0%	n/a
2	19.0%	n/a
3	7.7%	n/a
More than 3	0.3%	n/a
<b>Michigan residents</b>	91.0%	n/a

n/a = not asked in survey

On average travel parties consisted of 2.7 family members, and 1.9 non-family members, and on average travel parties also included an additional person who did not ride in the event. Table 3 depicts the average size of the groups accompanying the respondents.

Table 3. Size of travel party based on family and others beyond family for the 2005 Michigander

<b>Travel party size</b>	<b>Family members who rode in the event (mean=2.7 people)</b>	<b>Others beside family who rode in the event (Mean=1.9 people)</b>	<b>Family or friends who did not ride in the event (Mean=1.0 person)</b>
	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Percent</b>
0	31%	25%	62%
1-2	54	48%	29%
3-4	11	17%	5%
5 or more	4	10%	4%

The respondents were asked to indicate which groups they were a member in 2005. The two groups with the highest membership were the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy and Michigan Trails and Greenway Alliance. Table 4 depicts more details about the respondent affiliation with bicycling organizations.

Table 4. Respondents' membership with bicycling groups

<b>Groups respondents were members</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Rails to Trails Conservancy	32.7%
Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance	16.4%
Local Bicycle Organization	12.3%
League of MI Bicyclists	11.3%
League of American Bicyclists	5.1%
Michigan Mountain Bike Association	2.6%
International Mountain Bike Association	2.2%
National Off Road Bicycle Association	0.4%

The average number of mountain bikes in the respondents' household was between two and three (mean=2.5) and the number of road bikes was between one and two (mean=1.6).

### *Biking preferences and behaviors*

To understand the participation patterns of repeat and first-time Michigander participants, a cross tabulation of the two-day event versus the seven-day event was estimated for repeat and first-time attendees. The results are shown in Table 5. Most people were repeat participants for both the weekend (70%) and seven-day ride (79%). Overall, 75% of the respondents were repeat participants with an average participation of approximately five Michigander events.

Table 5. Repeat and first time attendees by type of ride (weekend vs. seven day)

Days rode in the event?		Count	First ride?		Total
			No	Yes	
From 1-2 days away from home	Count	147	64	211	
	% within Days participants rode in the event	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%	
3 days through highest	Count	222	58	280	
	% within Days participants rode in the event	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
Total	Count	369	122	491	
	% within Days participants rode in the event	75.2%	24.8%	100.0%	

The participants who responded in the survey had experience with other sport tourism events. On average they participated in approximately five similar events from 2000 to 2005. These events were mainly described as including other biking tours. The nature of these events were related to running, walking, triathlon, sailing, climbing, canoeing golfing, cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, skiing, swimming, hiking, kayaking and fishing.

The location of the trails route had “some” influence or “a lot” of influence for 53% of the respondents. One-quarter (25%) of the respondents indicated the route had no influence whatsoever to their decision, while 22% indicated that the route did not have much influence. Table 6 presents these findings.

Table 6. Influence of the route on respondents’ decision to ride in the 2005 Michigander

Type of influence	Percent
No influence whatsoever	24.8%
Not much influence	22.1%
Some influence	21.5%
Moderate influence	16.2%
A lot of influence	15.4%

Most people participated in the seven-day ride (57%). Table 7 and 8 depict the number of days and night respondents stayed away from home with their participation in the event.

Table 7. Number of days respondents rode in the event

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
From 0-2 days away from home	211	42.9%
3 days or more	281	57.1%

Table 8. Number of nights respondents were away from home

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
From 0-2 nights away from home	168	35.7%
3 nights or more	303	64.3%

When the respondents were asked about their previous experience with riding the Kal Haven trail, most of them (61%) said they had ridden the trail before the 2005 Michigander with an average of 1.3 times (two respondents indicated they rode the trail 150 times but these two values were excluded from the analysis as outliers) . In addition, respondents reported that the average number of bike vacation trips they took from 2000 to 2005 was around three trips (mean=2.8).

Almost one-third of the respondents (29%) indicated that they bike on trails for recreation several times a week followed by one-fourth of the respondents (24%) biking several times a month on trails. Table 9 shows the distribution of respondents' biking behavior in more detail.

Table 9. Respondents' behavior regarding biking of trails for recreation throughout the year

<b>Biking behavior patterns</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Every day (as weather permits)	4.7%
Several times a week	28.5%
Once a week	14.8%
Several times a month	24.3%
Once a month	8.7%
Few times a year	19.0%

*Satisfaction with the Michigander and the trails*

Most of the respondents when asked about their satisfaction with the condition of the Kal Haven Trail reported they were very satisfied with the trail (mean=6.0), with the overall Michigander experience (mean=5.94) and the conditions of other trails that were part of the event (mean=5.22). Table 10 shows the distribution of responses on satisfaction scale.

Table 10. Respondents’ satisfaction with the trails and the overall Michigander experience

	<b>Extremely dissatisfied 1</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied 2</b>	<b>Dissatisfied 3</b>	<b>Neutral 4</b>	<b>Satisfied 5</b>	<b>Very satisfied 6</b>	<b>Extremely satisfied 7</b>
Overall Michigander experience	0.8%	0.8%	1.8%	1.0%	21.9%	42.2%	31.4%
Condition of the Kal Haven trail	0.4%	0.6%	.6%	3.3%	17.9%	46.2%	31.0%
Condition of other trails that were part of the event	1.5%	3%	6.4%	11.9%	29.9%	32.2%	15.1%

*Intentions to return to some of the trails and destinations in event route*

Most of the respondents (58%) were positively predisposed to return to the Kal Haven trail. Close to half (46%) indicated they would potentially visit South Haven either as a vacation destination. Finally, 44% said that they would potentially visit South Haven as a destination for sports and recreation. Table 11 shows the details of respondents’ likelihood to return to some of the areas where the event took place.

Table 11. Respondents’ intentions to revisit some of the areas of the event

	<b>Extremely unlikely 1</b>	<b>Very unlikely 2</b>	<b>Somewhat unlikely 3</b>	<b>Neutral 4</b>	<b>Somewhat likely 5</b>	<b>Very likely 6</b>	<b>Extremely likely 7</b>
Ride the Kal Haven trail (mean: 4.43)	6.3%	9.4%	12.5%	13.7%	33.7%	12.5%	11.9%
Visit South Haven for a vacation (mean: 4.11)	7.0%	12.7%	15.3%	19.0%	27.6%	10.2%	8.2%
Visit South Haven area to participate in a sport or outdoor recreation activity (mean: 3.99)	8.0%	13.9%	14.3%	20.0%	28.0%	10.4%	5.5%

*Event image perceptions*

When the respondents were asked to indicate their thoughts on the event on a set of opposite adjectives, the results showed they had positive image on most of the items used in the survey. For example, most of the respondents’ thought the Michigander was safe, fairly challenging, friendly, organized and exciting. Table 12 depicts the percentage allocation of the respondents’

responses on each one of the 28 image descriptor items. The mean score on each item is offered under each adjective on the left column.

Table 12. Respondents' perceptions of the Michigander event

	Extremely 1	Quite 2	Slightly 3	Neither 4	Slightly 5	Quite 6	Extremely 7	
unsafe (mean: 5.9)	0.6%	2.9%	3.7%	2.7%	3.7%	55.9%	30.6%	safe
artificial (mean: 5.8)	0	1.9%	1.5%	13.8%	4.1%	54.4%	24.3%	natural
unappealing (mean: 6.1)	0.7%	1.1%	1.7%	2.8%	3.9%	53.3%	36.5%	appealing
easy (mean: 4.7)	2.7%	9.0%	7.8%	9.0%	36.9%	28.3%	6.3%	challenging
passive (mean: 3.8)	4.9%	15.5%	8.1%	43.9%	20.8%	4.9%	1.9%	competitive
stressful (mean: 5.5)	0.4%	2.5%	8.4%	11.3%	11.9%	43.2%	22.2%	carefree
inactive (mean: 5.8)	1.5%	4.4%	1.7%	3.6%	10.4%	49.8%	28.6%	active
inefficient (mean: 5.5)	0.4%	1.1%	2.1%	17.8%	10.8%	50.4%	17.4%	efficient
worthless (mean: 6.2)	0.2%	0	0.2%	5.3%	5.3%	48.5%	40.5%	valuable
unfriendly (mean: 6.0)	2.7%	5.2%	0.8%	0.2%	3.8%	38.8%	48.5%	friendly
unsupportive (mean: 6.1)	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	5.4%	5.8%	49.9%	37.4%	supportive
individualistic (mean: 4.9)	0.9%	5.5%	5.0%	28.2%	19.9%	31.2%	9.4%	collective
disorganized (mean: 6.1)	0.8%	.4%	3.1%	2.7%	5.2%	50.5%	37.2%	organized
ugly (mean: 6.1)	0	0	0.2%	6.1%	7.1%	47.3%	39.3%	beautiful
polluted (mean: 5.6)	0.8%	5.8%	3.1%	5.0%	7.5%	53.7%	24.0%	clean
gloomy (mean: 6.2)	0	0.2%	0.2%	3.4%	6.1%	54.3%	35.8%	cheerful
boring (mean: 5.9)	0	0.2%	1.3%	4.0%	18.7%	47.8%	27.8%	exciting
energizing (mean: 5.9)	1.3%	2.4%	1.5%	2.8%	12.0%	52.0%	28.1%	invigorating
distressing (mean: 5.8)	0.4%	0.8%	2.1%	5.9%	16.9%	51.9%	21.9%	relaxing
sad (mean: 6.0)	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	4.6%	10.2%	53.4%	31.1%	joyful
poor (mean: 6.1)	0.2%	0	0.2%	4.0%	10.5%	51.8%	33.3%	excellent
uninspiring (mean: 5.8)	0.2%	3.8%	1.7%	5.5%	12.2%	47.1%	29.6%	inspiring
unadventurous (mean: 5.8)	0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	5.7%	21.2%	45.0%	26.5%	adventurous
unstimulating (mean: 5.8)	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%	4.0%	12.7%	54.1%	28.2%	stimulating
unhealthy (mean: 6.4)	0	0.2%	0.6%	1.5%	4.4%	40.6%	52.7%	healthy
unfulfilling (mean: 6.3)	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	1.7%	6.1%	45.5%	45.9%	fulfilling
mental (mean: 5.6)	1.3%	1.8%	1.3%	10.9%	19.1%	40.4%	25.1%	physical
expensive (mean: 4.4)	1.3%	5.9%	24.6%	24.4%	13.2%	23.3%	7.4%	inexpensive

In an additional question, respondents were asked to rate a different list of words as potential descriptors or personality traits of the event. Most of the respondents believed that the word “rugged” (75%) described the Michigander’s personality, as well as the words “spirited” (93%) and “sincere” (80%). Table 13 depicts this information about which adjectives described the personality of the event.

Table 13. Respondents’ perceptions of the Michigander’s personality

	<b>extremely undescriptive 1</b>	<b>very undescriptive 2</b>	<b>Somewhat undescriptive 3</b>	<b>neither descriptive nor undescriptive 4</b>	<b>somewhat descriptive 5</b>	<b>very descriptive 6</b>	<b>extremely descriptive 7</b>
sincere (mean: 5.4)	1.3%	1.7%	2.1%	15.2%	22.9%	41.8%	15.0%
spirited (mean: 5.7)	1.1%	.4%	.9%	3.8%	20.9%	56.4%	16.6%
reliable (mean: 5.6)	1.3%	.4%	2.3%	8.1%	20.2%	49.5%	18.3%
sophisticated (mean: 4.3)	4.3%	7.1%	11.8%	30.9%	22.3%	18.0%	5.6%
rugged (mean: 4.9)	1.1%	2.4%	5.1%	16.7%	45.3%	21.6%	7.9%

### *Social support for Michigander*

Overall, friends and family were very supportive of the participants’ partaking in the event. More specifically, most of the respondents (80%) agreed their friends supported their participation to the Michigander. Furthermore, most of the respondents (92%) agreed their family approved of their participation in the event. Table 14 shows this information in more detail.

Table 14. Respondents’ perceptions of social support for the Michigander participation

	<b>totally disagree 1</b>	<b>Moderately disagree 2</b>	<b>somewhat disagree 3</b>	<b>neutral 4</b>	<b>somewhat agree 5</b>	<b>moderately agree 6</b>	<b>totally agree 7</b>
My friends who are important to me support my participation in the Michigander (Mean: 6.31)	1.4%	0.4%	1.0%	7.1%	6.7%	19.1%	64.2%
My family approves of my participation in the Michigander (Mean: 6.49)	3.3%	1.4%	1.4%	2.5%	1.6%	7.8%	82.0%

### *Physical and financial resources*

When the respondents were asked about how their financial and physical resources may influence their participation in the 2006 Michigander, most of the respondents said that these resources will not be a problem for their participation. More specifically, about 90% of the respondents said that they had the financial resources, while about 97% said they have the

physical resources to participate in the 2006 Michigander. Table 15 depicts this information in more detail.

Table 15. Respondents' perceptions of the influence of financial and physical resources on intentions to participate in the 2006 Michigander

	totally disagree 1	moderately disagree 2	somewhat disagree 3	neutral 4	somewhat agree 5	moderately agree 6	totally agree 7
I have the <u>financial</u> resources to participate in the Michigander next year (mean:6.22)	1.4%	1.4%	2.4%	4.3%	10.3%	18.3%	61.9%
I have the <u>physical</u> resources to participate in the Michigander next year ( mean:6.54)	1.0%	0%	0.4%	2.0%	5.9%	20.2%	70.5%

### *Spending patterns of the respondents*

In the 2005 survey there was only one question regarding the out-of-pocket spending, excluding the event registration of respondents for the Michigander. The spending patterns analysis is based on the two different trips offered at the event (two-day vs. seven-day). It can be observed from Table 16 that the two-day respondents spent more per day than the seven day respondents.

Table 16. Spending patterns of Michigander respondents based on the duration of the trip

	Number of participants in that type of trip	Population (N=992)	Average (mean) spending	Per day spending
0-2 days	211	427	\$181.3	\$90 (average spending divided by 2)
3-7 days	280	565	\$238.4	\$34 (average spending divided by 7)
Total	491	992		

Based on the 2005 data, the Michigander event population consisted of 992 people. The frequency analysis of the survey respondents showed that 43% were two-day riders and 57% participated in the seven-day event. If we interject that information to the population (N=992), 427 people (43%) were two-day riders and 565 people (57%) were seven-day riders. Consequently, the generated spending of the two-day riders amounts to \$77,415 and the amount spent by the seven-day riders amounts to \$134,696. The total generated spending is estimated to be \$212,111 for 992 people or \$214 per participant.

*Perceptions of the destination where the event was held*

A part of the questionnaire asked Michigander participants their perceptions of South Haven, the first city that was close to the first overnight stay of the participants. Some of the questions aimed to understand how much the city offered to the participants during their stay there (overnight) and other questions aimed to understand their emotional attachment to the destination. Most of the respondents had not been to South Haven in the past five years for either vacation (60%) or for a sport tourist event (68%).

Some respondents chose to not answer this set of questions because they may not have visited the area enough to have an opinion. Overall, for those respondents who provided an opinion, their image perceptions of South Haven were positive. Table 17 offers details on respondents' perceptions regarding the city's features and services.

Table 17. Ratings of South Haven’s offerings to them during their stay

	offers extremely little 1	offers very little 2	offers somewhat little 3	neither little nor much 4	Offers somewhat much 5	offers very much 6	offers extremely much 7	Not applicable
Good nightlife and entertainment (mean: 5.1)	1.5%	1.9%	3.0%	8.9%	21.8%	27.3%	6.1%	29.4%
Quality of infrastructure (mean: 5.3)	0.7%	0.7%	0.9%	11.5%	23%	33.4%	5.1%	24.8%
Personal safety (mean: 5.6)	0%	0%	0.8%	8.5%	21.6%	42.7%	13.1%	13.3%
standard hygiene and cleanliness (mean: 5.6)	0.8%	0.4%	1.1%	8.2%	16.9%	48.6%	12.3%	11.6%
Suitable accommodations (mean 5.4)	0.8%	0.8%	2.5%	8.1%	18.5%	36.3%	10.4%	22.5%
Good quality restaurants (mean: 5.6)	0.2%	0.6%	1.1%	8.9%	16.5%	37%	13.5%	22.2%
Great beaches (mean: 6.2)	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	4.0%	7.8%	33.3%	36.9%	17.1%
Friendly people (mean: 5.8)	0%	0.2%	0.6%	5.9%	16.6%	43.7%	20.4%	12.5%
Great museums (mean: 4.3)	1.3%	1.7%	1.1%	15.8%	5.6%	3.7%	1.9%	68.8%
Interesting historical attractions (mean: 4.9)	0.4%	1.5%	3.2%	14.9%	15.3%	11.4%	5.6%	47.6%
Beautiful scenery/natural attractions (mean: 6.2)	0%	0%	0.4%	2.6%	11.5%	37.1%	40.9%	7.5%
Good value for money (mean: 5.4)	0%	0.6%	3.2%	13.8%	19.5%	32.2%	11.4%	19.3%
Unpolluted/unspoiled environment (mean: 5.6)	0.4%	0.2%	0.9%	8.5%	22.6%	41.0%	15.0%	11.3%
Good climate (mean: 5.8)	0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	7.0%	17.1%	43.3%	20.3%	10.7%
Opportunities for sport activities (mean: 5.7)	0%	0.2%	0.6%	8.7%	15.8%	33.0%	18.8%	22.8%
Shopping facilities (mean: 5.4)	0.2%	0.4%	1.5%	10.8%	16.6%	25.7%	8.9%	35.9%
Great trails (mean: 6.0)	0%	0.6%	0.6%	4.0%	12.9%	42.8%	30.2%	8.9%

For their emotional disposition toward South Haven, respondents indicated that South Haven was exciting, pleasant, relaxing and friendly. Table 18 depicts respondents’ emotional perceptions in more detail.

Table 18. Respondents' emotional perceptions of South Haven as a vacation destination

	extremely 1	quite 2	slightly 3	neither 4	slightly 5	quite 6	extremely 7	
Gloomy (mean: 5.2)	0.2%	2.2%	2.6%	17.2%	29.9%	39.8%	8.2%	Exciting
Unpleasant (mean: 5.8)	0	0.2%	0.9%	11.3%	12.3%	56.3%	19.0%	Pleasant
Sleepy (mean: 4.6)	0.4%	2%	8.3%	40.0%	23.0%	22.8%	3.5%	Arousing
Distressing (mean: 5.7)	0	0.2%	0.9%	12.3%	12.6%	56.3%	17.7%	Relaxing
Unfriendly (mean: 5.7)	0	0.4%	0.4%	12.4%	12.6%	55.3%	18.9%	Friendly

### Results from the 2006 survey

The 2006 survey aimed to examine the actual behavior of the 2005 respondents but also to determine whether 2005 respondents took part in the 2006 Michigander and their perceptions of the 2006 event. A two-page survey was used for this segment of the research project and the survey can be found in Appendix C.

#### *Demographics*

Most of the respondents (68%) had annual household income more than \$60,000 and most of them (64%) were between the ages of 45 and 64 years old (see Table 1), a very similar profile compared to the slightly larger sample from 2005 of the same respondents.

#### *Previous behavior with Michigander participation*

All these 2006 respondents rode in the 2005 Michigander, and most of the respondents (65%) (n=224) indicated they rode in the 2006 Michigander. The following data analysis involves that segment of people (n=224).

These 2006 respondents had previously ridden in the Michigander seven times, on average.

Slightly over than one-third of the respondents (35%) indicated that family members rode with them in the 2006 Michigander with the average number of family persons to be two. Similarly, slightly over than one-third (38%) indicated they rode with an average number of three friends. Finally, a small percentage of the respondents (8%) indicated they attended alone. Table 19 depicts this information in more detail.

Table 19. Group composition of 2006 Michigander travelers

	Percent of group traveling with participant	Average number of people
Family	35%	2
Friends	38%	3
Alone	8%	-

Overall, the location of the trail's route did not seem to influence much the participant's decision to ride in the 2006 Michigander. This result may be an artifact of the respondents being very loyal of the event regardless of route selection. Table 20 portrays this information.

Table 20. Influence of the route on respondents' decision to ride the 2006 Michigander

Type of influence	Percent
No influence whatsoever	39%
Some influence	42%
A lot of influence	19%

### *Satisfaction with the trails and event*

Overall, respondents seemed to be satisfied with the condition of the trails (mean=5.42) that were part of the event and with the overall 2006 Michigander experience (mean=5.97). Table 21 shows more details on the distribution of the respondents' responses.

Table 21. Satisfaction levels of the Michigander respondents with trails, route and event

	Extremely dissatisfied 1	Very dissatisfied 2	Somewhat Dissatisfied 3	Neutra 1 4	Somewhat Satisfied 5	Very satisfied 6	Extremely satisfied 7
Overall condition of the trails and route	3.1%	3.1%	9.3%	3.1%	16.0%	44.4%	20.9%
Overall 2006 Michigander experience	1.8%	2.7%	0.9%	0.9%	8.9%	54.7%	30.2%

### *Intentions*

When the 2006 respondents were asked about their intentions to participate in the 2007 Michigander, most of them (89%) indicated they are likely to participate. When the respondents were asked if they would go back for vacation to the trails where the 2006 Michigander took place the majority (66%) indicated that they would. Table 22 presents these findings in more detail.

Table 22. Respondents' intentions to return to the 2007 Michigander and its trails

	Extremely unlikely 1	Very unlikely 2	Somewhat unlikely 3	Neutral 4	Somewhat likely 5	Very likely 6	Extremely likely 7
Participate in the 2007 Michigander (mean:5.9)	2.6%	2.6%	3.1%	2.6%	9.3%	33.9%	45.8%
Go back for vacation to some of the trails and route of the 2006 Michigander (mean:4.6)	3.1%	8.4%	7.1%	15.6%	36.4%	23.6%	5.8%

*Perceptions about the 2006 Michigander*

The 2005 respondents who participated in the 2006 Michigander provided their opinions about the event on a set of 13 opposite adjectives. The details of their evaluation are shown in Table 23. Overall, respondents felt that the 2006 Michigander was fulfilling, stimulating, exciting, beautiful, inspiring, healthy and supportive.

Table 23. Respondents' perceptions of the 2006 Michigander as a sport tourism event

	<b>Very 1</b>	<b>Quite 2</b>	<b>Neither 3</b>	<b>Quite 4</b>	<b>Very 5</b>	
Unfulfilling	0%	.05%	4.6%	44.7%	50.2%	Fulfilling
Stimulating	35.3%	35.8%	5.0%	17.0%	6.9%	Unstimulating
Poor	0.9%	0.9%	4.7%	58.1%	35.3%	Excellent
Sad	0.9%	0%	8.5%	51.6%	39%	Joyful
Boring	0%	0%	14.0%	58.1%	27.9%	Exciting
Gloomy	0.9%	1.4%	6.5%	53.0%	38.1%	Cheerful
Valuable	42.3%	43.3%	6.5%	6.0%	1.9%	Worthless
Ugly	1.4%	0.5%	5.1%	39.4%	53.7%	Beautiful
Distressing	1.9%	0.9%	11.1%	44.9v	41.2%	Relaxing
Unadventurous	0.5%	0.5%	13.4%	53.2%	32.4%	Adventurous
Inspiring	30.1%	50.9%	13.0%	3.7%	2.3%	Uninspiring
Healthy	59.3%	31.0%	2.3%	3.2%	4.2%	Unhealthy
Unsupportive	1.4%	0.9%	7.8%	43.8%	46.1%	Supportive

*Image of Northwest Michigan*

One of the purposes of the study was to examine the impact of events on destination image. When respondents were asked how they rated the overall image of northwest Michigan as a vacation destination, almost all respondents (99%) perceived it as very positive (90%) or somewhat positive (9%). The image of northwest Michigan as a bike event destination was also perceived as very positive (78%) or somewhat positive (19%) by most of the respondents.

*Respondents past behaviors with trails and biking in general*

Another goal of the study was to examine the actual behaviors of the respondents between October 2005 and October 2006 regarding biking and trails usage. When respondents were asked how many times they used the Kal Haven Trail during the past year most had not returned to the trail. The same pattern of responses applied for the question regarding the vacation trips they took in the South Haven area. Table 24 depicts these results in more detail.

Table 24. Respondents' behaviors with Kal Haven Trail and South Haven

	<b>Times used the KAL HAVEN trail between October 2005 and October 2006</b>	<b>Vacation trips taken to South Haven between October 2005 and October 2006</b>
0 times	74.2%	74.7%
1-2 times	20.8%	22.9%
3-4 times	1.8%	1.8%
4-5 times	1.5%	0.3%
More than 5 times	1.8%	0.3%

When respondents were asked about whether they used other trails for biking between October 2005 and October 2006 most of them had (72%). When asked about their trips to Michigan to participate in similar events such as the Michigander, 42% of the respondents indicated they did. Most of the respondents (62%) reported that their participation in the Michigander has changed their behavior toward adopting biking as a year around activity. Less than one-third of the respondents (28%) took a vacation trip to South Haven to participate in sport or recreation activities.

### *Spending patterns of the 2006 respondents*

The respondents were asked to report their spending based on their travel party spending. As far as lodging was concerned the average spending amount was \$96 with most of the respondents (53%) reporting to spend nothing on accommodations, as this is provided as camping in the event fee.

The average spending on food was \$96 with 13% of the respondents reporting to have spend nothing, 13% have spent \$50, and 15% spent \$100, while 8% spent \$40 and another 8% reported they spent \$200.

The average spending on take-out meals was \$37. The most frequently reported numbers spent in take-out meals were \$0 for 21% of the respondents, \$50 for 13% of the respondents and \$20 for 12% of the respondents.

The average spending on biking equipment was \$45. Half of the respondents (50%) spent nothing on biking equipment, while the next most frequently reported amount was \$50 (10%).

For Michigander souvenirs, the average spending was \$35 with 37% of the respondents reporting that they spent nothing. The next most frequent reported amount was \$50 (12%) and \$20 (9%).

For groceries, the average spending was \$33 with 40% of the respondents spending nothing on this category. The next most frequent reported amount was \$20 (12%) and \$50 (9%).

The average spending for gasoline was \$70. Fourteen percent of the respondents spend nothing on gas while 16% reported spending \$50. These two amounts were most frequently mentioned by the respondents.

Table 25 shows the distribution of the range of the spending categories, the mean, the median and the standard deviation.

Table 25. Frequencies of the spending categories for the 2006 respondents

<b>Spending categories</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Lodging (Hotel, Motel, B&B, or Camping)	224	0	\$1200	\$95.98	\$0.00	\$164.98
Sit-Down Meals in Restaurants	228	0	2000	96.35	55.00	157.87
Take-Out Meals & Snacks	227	0	300	36.68	25.00	41.93
Biking Equipment	226	0	900	44.88	2.50	118.55
Michigander Souvenirs	227	0	250	34.62	20.00	45.85
Groceries, Beer & Wine, etc.	226	0	1000	33.84	15.00	88.72
Parking	224	0	200	1.44	.00	14.25
Gasoline & Oil for Your Vehicle(s)	226	0	700	70.40	50.00	89.50

To estimate the generated spending by the Michigander respondents, the complete number of 2006 participants had to be taken into account. The total number of 2006 participants was 916. One-hundred-and-twenty individuals reported they traveled with their family (mean=2.1 median=1), 129 people reported they traveled with friends (mean=3.5 median=2) and 28 people indicated they traveled alone. Based on the median group size, the number used to estimate group spending was 2. The number of travel parties was estimated to be 458.

Table 26 shows the estimated spending patterns of the 2006 Michigander respondents in various categories. The overall 2006 spending is estimated at \$118,736 for 916 participants, which is significantly less than the 2005 estimate of \$212,111 for 992 participants. There are several possible reasons for this: (a) 86 fewer participants in 2006 compared to 2005, (b) in 2005 we asked for total spending for a single person whereas in 2006 we asked for spending by categories and for a travel party – which appears to have possibly led to over estimation of spending in 2005 or under estimations in 2006, (c) in 2005 we had accurate data on two-day versus seven-day participants, however in 2006 we didn't ask that question and do not have names in the database to add this variable from registration information, and (d) by asking about trip spending by travel party we may have left out more individual spending that may not be represented in the 2006 estimate.

Table 26. Economic spending of 2006 Michigander population (N=916)

	<b>% spending</b>	<b>Median for those spent on categ.</b>	<b>Estimate for 2006 Michigander population (N=916 or 458 travel parties)</b>
Spending categories			
Lodging (Hotel, Motel, B&B, or Camping)	52%	\$120	\$28,579
Sit-Down Meals in Restaurants	87%	\$70	\$27,892
Take-Out Meals & Snacks	80%	\$30	\$10,992
Biking Equipment	50%	\$50	\$11,450
Michigander Souvenirs	63%	\$45	\$12,984
Groceries, Beer & Wine, etc.	60%	\$25	\$6,870
Parking	3%	\$20	\$275
Gasoline & Oil for Your Vehicle(s)	86%	\$50	\$19,694
<b>Total spending by segment</b>			<b>\$118,736</b>
<b>Spending by travel party with 2 persons per party</b>			<b>\$259</b>

Based on the duration of the respondents' trip, Table 27 provides an alternative estimation of the spending patterns using both 2006 and 2005 data. Based on the 2006 registration information, the Michigander event population consisted of 916 people. The frequency analysis of the survey respondents showed that 43% were two-day riders and 57% participated in the seven-day event. If we interject that information to the population (N=916), 394 people (43%) were two day riders and 522 people (57%) were seven-day riders. Therefore, an alternative economic calculation shows spending by the two-day riders amounting to \$72,890 and spending by the seven-day riders amounting to \$125,280. The total generated spending is estimated to be \$198,170 for 916 people.

Table 27. 2006 Spending patterns of Michigander respondents based on the duration of their trip

	<b>Number of respondents in that type of trip (sample)</b>	<b>Population (N=916)</b>	<b>Estimated average (mean) spending</b>	<b>Per day estimated spending</b>
0-2 days	148	394	\$185 <sup>a</sup>	\$92 (average spending divided by 2)
3-7 days	196	522	\$240 <sup>a</sup>	\$35 (average spending divided by 7)
Total	344	916		

a. These figures are based on 2005 estimates found in table 16.

## Implications

Overall, the Michigander event left a positive impression on the minds of the respondents with most of them coming back in 2006 and intending to participate again in 2007. One of the most important implications is that the participation in the event positively influences adopting biking as a year around activity. Physical exercise is being targeted through the media as a healthy way to lose weight and lead a healthy life. As a result, events such as the Michigander promote physical exercise and assist indirectly efforts toward obesity reduction and promotion of healthy lifestyles.

Another characteristic is almost one-quarter of respondents returned to the destination for a vacation or for a sport and recreation activity. Consequently, the Michigander stimulated a visitation impact on communities that were part of the event. In addition, the majority of the 2006 Michigander respondents indicated they would revisit the trails where the event took place or go back in the involved destinations for vacation. The Michigander event has the potential to create a strong brand that would boost a destination's appeal as a bike friendly place and attract destinations to support MTGA and its programs.

Finally, respondents take place in the event in groups which emphasizes the social nature of the event, as well as its challenging and fulfilling nature. Event organizers could capitalize on this strength to attract more participants by creating social events, with other bike groups or active living groups in those places the route passes during the weekend and week long rides.



**6. How many days did you ride in the Michigander and how many nights were you away from home? (fill in a #)**

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF DAYS RODE IN EVENT  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF NIGHTS AWAY FROM HOME

**7. How satisfied were you with the 2005 Michigander on the following items? (circle a response per line)**

	Extremely dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Extremely satisfied
Condition of the Kal Haven trail	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Overall Michigander experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Condition of other trails that were part of the event	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**8. In the next two years, how likely are you to...? (circle a response per line)**

	Extremely unlikely	Very unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
Ride the Kal Haven trail	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Visit south haven for a vacation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Visit south haven area to participate in a sport or outdoor recreation activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**This second section includes questions about the Michigander event and the destination of South Haven.**

**9. In the past 5 years how many times have you visited South Haven for vacation purposes (excluding this trip)?**

*(please write the # in the box)*

**10. In the past 5 years how many times have you taken a trip to South Haven area to participate in a sport tourist event (excluding this trip)? (please write the # in the box)**

**11. How would you describe all aspects of the Michigander bike event based on how you feel now about the event? (✓the line for each set of opposite adjectives that is closer to how you feel)**

FOR ME THE MICHIGANDER BIKE EVENT IS....

	Extremely	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Extremely	
SAFE								UNSAFE
ARTIFICIAL								NATURAL
UNAPPEALING								APPEALING
EASY								CHALLENGING
PASSIVE								COMPETITIVE
STRESSFUL								CAREFREE
ACTIVE								INACTIVE
INEFFICIENT								EFFICIENT
WORTHLESS								VALUABLE
FRIENDLY								UNFRIENDLY
UNSUPPORTIVE								SUPPORTIVE
INDIVIDUALISTIC								COLLECTIVE
DISORGANIZED								ORGANIZED
UGLY								BEAUTIFUL
CLEAN								POLLUTED
GLOOMY								CHEERFUL
BORING								EXCITING
ENERVATING								INVIGORATING
DISTRESSING								RELAXING
SAD								JOYFUL
POOR								EXCELLENT
INSPIRING								UNINSPIRING
UNADVENTUROUS								ADVENTUROUS
UNSTIMULATING								STIMULATING
UNHEALTHY								HEALTHY
UNFULFILLING								FULFILLING
MENTAL								PHYSICAL
EXPENSIVE								INEXPENSIVE

**12. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about participation in the Michigander? (Please circle one answer on each line)**

	Totally disagree	Moderately disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Moderately agree	Totally agree
My friends who are important to me support my participation in the Michigander	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My family disapproves of my participation in the Michigander	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have the <u>financial</u> resources to participate in the Michigander next year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have the <u>physical</u> resources to participate in the Michigander next year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**13. The following statements are about what South Haven offered during your stay. Please indicate your opinion on a seven-point scale from 1=offers very little to 7=offers very much. (Circle a response on each line or check not applicable N/A)**

	Offers extremely little	Offers very little	Offers somewh at little	Neither little nor much	Offers somewh at much	Offers very much	Offers extremely much	N/A
Good nightlife and entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality of infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personal safety	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard hygiene and cleanliness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Suitable accommodations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good quality restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great beaches	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Friendly people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great museums	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interesting historical attractions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beautiful scenery/natural attractions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good value for money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unpolluted/unspoiled environment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good climate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opportunities for sport activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shopping facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great trails	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 14. How do you feel now about South Haven as a vacation destination?**  
*(✓ the line that is closer to the adjective that represents how you feel - provide an answer for each set of adjectives)*

FOR ME, SOUTH HAVEN AS A VACATION DESTINATION IS...

	Extremely	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Extremely	
exciting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	gloomy
unpleasant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	pleasant
arousing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	sleepy
distressing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	relaxing
unfriendly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	friendly

- 15. If you thought of the Michigander as a sport tourism event that has a personality, to what extent would the following personality traits describe the Michigander? (Circle a response for each adjective)**

	Extremely undescriptive	Very undescriptive	Somewhat undescriptive	Neither descriptive nor undescriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Very descriptive	Extremely descriptive
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
spirited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
reliable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
rugged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**This third section includes questions about your general biking interest.**

- 16. How many years have you ridden bikes on roads and trails for recreation?**

*(fill in a #)*

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF YEARS RIDING BIKES

- 17. How often do you bike ride on trails as a recreational activity? (✓ one)**

EVERY DAY (AS WEATHER PERMITS)

ONCE A WEEK

ONCE A MONTH

SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK

SEVERAL TIMES A MONTH

FEW TIMES A YEAR

- 18. How many bikes are in your household? (fill in a #)**

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF MOUNTAIN BIKES

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF ROAD BIKES

- 19. How many bike vacations other than the 2005 Michigander have you taken in the past five years? (fill in a #.)**

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF BIKE VACATIONS IN PAST FIVE YEARS

**20. What groups are you a member of this year? (✓all that apply)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> LEAGUE OF AMERICAN BICYCLISTS           | <input type="checkbox"/> LEAGUE OF MI BICYCLISTS                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RAILS TO TRAILS CONSERVANCY             | <input type="checkbox"/> MICHIGAN MOUNTAIN BIKE ASSOCIATION     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> INTERNATIONAL MOUNTAIN BIKE ASSOCIATION | <input type="checkbox"/> LOCAL BICYCLE ORGANIZATION             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NATIONAL OFF ROAD BICYCLE ASSOCIATION   | <input type="checkbox"/> MICHIGAN TRAILS AND GREENWAYS ALLIANCE |

**21. Had you previously ridden on the KAL HAVEN Trail before the 2005 Michigander event?**

- NO       YES, HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS? \_\_\_\_\_ (# OF TIMES)

**The final section of the survey asks about spending patterns and demographics. This information will be kept confidential and used for statistical purposes only.**

**22. Approximately, how much did you spend out of pocket on your 2005 Michigander trip, including all expenses (e.g. accommodations, food, etc.) but excluding the entry fee? (fill in a #) \_\_\_\_\_**

**23. How many adults and children live in your household? (fill in a #)**  
\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF ADULTS INCLUDING YOURSELF  
\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF CHILDREN (UNDER 19)

**24. What is your present employment status? (✓one)**

- |  |  |                                     |                                  |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> EMPLOYED, FULL-TIME | <input type="checkbox"/> RETIRED       | <input type="checkbox"/> UNEMPLOYED | <input type="checkbox"/> STUDENT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> EMPLOYED, PART-TIME | <input type="checkbox"/> SELF-EMPLOYED | <input type="checkbox"/> HOMEMAKER  | <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER   |

**25. Which statement best describes your total 2004 annual household income (from all sources and before taxes)? (✓ one)**

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> LESS THAN \$20,000  | <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000 - \$59,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,000 OR MORE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000 - \$39,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,000 - \$79,999 |   |

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it in the provided self addressed envelope to C. Vogt, Michigan State Univ., 131 Natural Resources Bldg., East Lansing, MI. 48824-1222. If there is anything else to add, please include it on an additional sheet.

**Appendix B**  
**Cover letters for the survey administration approved by UCRIHS : IRB # 04106**

---

*First wave survey cover letter*

November 1, 2005

INSERT NAME  
INSERT ADDRESS

Dear NAME,

Michigan State University, Michigan Department of Transportation, Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station and Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance, (former Rails to Trails Conservancy) are cooperating to assess the use and values of rail trails and improve their management in Michigan. Our studies have focused on many trails in Michigan including the Pere Marquette Rail-Trail, the Traverse Area Recreation and Transportation Trails, the Paint Creek Trail, the White Pines Trail and the Lansing River Trail.

One use of the trail is for events, like the recent Michigander. The enclosed questionnaire asks about your experiences in the event, your experiences bicycling in general, the communities you visited, and descriptive information about you and your household. *You will be entered into a drawing held on November 23, 2005 for one of two \$50 price reductions toward your 2006 Michigander participation fee.*

Please take the 10 or so minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your participation in this study may contribute to the shaping of Michigan's trail opportunities and tourism development. There are no known risks associated with participation in this study.

You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing this questionnaire. However, if you choose not to complete all or part of the questions, you will not suffer any penalty.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please mail it back to us in the postage paid envelope provided. Your responses will be kept confidential, your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law and your name will not be associated with any results. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Christine Vogt at (517) 432 0318, or [vogtc@msu.edu](mailto:vogtc@msu.edu). If you have questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish – Peter Vasilenko, Ph.D., Chair of the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) by phone: (517) 355-2180, fax: (517) 432-4503, e-mail: [ucrihs@msu.edu](mailto:ucrihs@msu.edu), or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Sincerely,

Christine Vogt  
Associate Professor  
Michigan State University

Kiki Kaplanidou  
PhD Candidate and research project assistant  
Michigan State University

Nancy Krupiarz  
Executive Director  
Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance

Reminder postcard text

11/9/05

Last week you should have received a survey mailed from Michigan State University titled "Michigander Bike Event Survey." It is part of an important study concerning the study of trails and sport tourism events in Michigan. If you have already returned it, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, we ask that you do so as soon as possible. Your views and information will be very helpful.

If you did not receive the survey, or it was misplaced, please call me at 517-432-0318 or e-mail me at vogtc@msu.edu. We would be glad to mail you another survey. Thank you for your help.

Christine A. Vogt, Associate Professor, MSU

Second wave cover letter to the survey

November 29, 2005

INSERT NAME  
INSERT ADDRESS

Dear NAME,

Recently you should have received a survey in the mail from Michigan State University. We have not yet received your completed survey and we are very interested in your opinions. If you mailed the survey already we must not have received it when this letter was written.

Your participation in this study is very important because your answers will contribute to the shaping of Michigan's trail opportunities and tourism development. The questionnaire asks about your experiences with the 2005 Michigander and due to its theoretical approach it also features a few questions about your feelings with the event, the trails and destinations that were part of the event. There are no known risks associated with participation in this study. If you have not completed the survey, please take 10 minutes to complete the enclosed survey. If you reply by *December 10, 2005, you will be entered into a drawing for one of two \$50 price reductions toward your 2006 Michigander participation fee.* You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing this questionnaire. However, if you choose not to complete all or part of the questions, you will not suffer any penalty.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please mail it back to us in the postage paid envelope provided. Your responses will be kept confidential, your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law and your name will not be associated with any results.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Christine Vogt at (517) 432 0318, or [vogtc@msu.edu](mailto:vogtc@msu.edu). If you have questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish – Peter Vasilenko, Ph.D., Chair of the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) by phone: (517) 355-2180, fax: (517) 432-4503, e-mail: [ucrihs@msu.edu](mailto:ucrihs@msu.edu), or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Sincerely,

Christine Vogt  
Associate Professor  
Michigan State University

Appendix C  
Follow-up questionnaire for the 2006 survey

## Michigander Bike Event Survey

Sponsored by Michigan State University, Michigan  
Agricultural Experiment Station, and Michigan Dept. of  
Transportation

*Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey about your Michigander bike experience. Please read each question carefully before responding. Answer to the best of your ability and save any additional comments for the end. Your responses will help the organizers of the event, the destinations involved and the organizations which build and maintain trails in Michigan.*

**1. Did you ride in the 2006 Michigander?** (Please check one)

- Yes
- No => Go to question 16

**2. How many times have you participated in the Michigander bike event?** (Please fill in a number.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Number of Michiganders

**3. Who rode with you on your 2006 ride?** (Check all that apply)

- Family => How many? \_\_\_\_\_
- Friends => How many? \_\_\_\_\_
- I attended this event alone

**3. How much influence did the location of the trail's route Michigander (Evert to Mackinaw City) have on your decision to ride in the 2006 Michigander?** (Please check one)

- No influence whatsoever
- Some influence
- A lot of influence

**4. How satisfied were you with the overall condition of the trails and route?** (Please check one)

- Extremely dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Very satisfied
- Extremely satisfied

**5. How satisfied were you with the overall 2006 Michigander event experience?** (Please check one)

- Extremely dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Very satisfied
- Extremely satisfied

**6. How likely is it that you will participate in the 2007 Michigander?** (Please check one)

- Extremely unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Neither likely nor unlikely
- Somewhat likely
- Very likely
- Extremely likely

**7. Has the participation in the Michigander event changed your behavior toward adopting biking as a year around (when the weather permits) activity?** (Please check one)

- Yes
- No

**8. How likely is it that you will go back for a vacation where some of the trails and route for this year's event were?** (Please check one)

- Extremely unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Neither likely nor unlikely
- Somewhat likely
- Very likely
- Extremely likely

Please turn over



**9. As a participant, how did you perceive the 2006 Michigander bike event, on the following set of opposite adjectives? (Check the line that is closer to the adjective that describes how you feel. Please check a line for each set of opposite adjectives)**

**For me the 2006 Michigander bike event was:**

	Very 1	Quite 2	Neither 3	Quite 4	Very 5	
Unfulfilling	___	___	___	___	___	Fulfilling
Stimulating	___	___	___	___	___	Unstimulating
Poor	___	___	___	___	___	Excellent
Sad	___	___	___	___	___	Joyful
Boring	___	___	___	___	___	Exciting
Gloomy	___	___	___	___	___	Cheerful
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Ugly	___	___	___	___	___	Beautiful
Distressing	___	___	___	___	___	Relaxing
Unadventurous	___	___	___	___	___	Adventurous
Inspiring	___	___	___	___	___	Uninspiring
Healthy	___	___	___	___	___	Unhealthy
Unsupportive	___	___	___	___	___	Supportive

**10. In general, how would you rate the overall image of northwest Michigan as a vacation destination? (Please check one)**

- Very negative
- Somewhat negative
- Neither positive nor negative
- Somewhat positive
- Very positive
- Don't know

**11. In general, how would you rate the overall image northwest Michigan as a bike destination? (Please check one)**

- Very negative
- Somewhat negative
- Neither positive nor negative
- Somewhat positive
- Very positive
- Don't know

**12. In total, how much do you estimate that you and your party spent on the following items during your 2006 Michigander trip?**

For example, if you and your spouse attended the Michigander event with your children, then include everything that your family spent. If you attended the Michigander with several friends and you bought lunch, then report what you spent on lunch, and also include other items that you purchased.

<u>Type of Spending</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>
Lodging (Hotel, Motel, B&B, or Camping)	\$ _____
Sit-Down Meals in Restaurants	\$ _____
Take-Out Meals & Snacks	\$ _____
Biking Equipment	\$ _____
Michigander Souvenirs	\$ _____
Groceries, Beer & Wine, etc.	\$ _____
Parking	\$ _____
Gasoline & Oil for Your Vehicle(s)	\$ _____

**Now we would like to know how other people think about your participation in the event and how your resources influence your decisions.**

**13. How much would you agree with the statement “my family thinks I should participate in the Michigander event next year.” (Please check one)**

- Totally disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Totally agree

**14. How much would you agree with the statement “I have the financial resources to participate in the Michigander next year.” (Please check one)**

- Totally disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Totally agree

15. How much would you agree with the statement "If I had family obligations that placed unanticipated demands on my time, it would make it more difficult for me to participate in the Michigander next year." (Please check one)

- Totally disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Totally agree

Now we would like to know a bit more about your actual behavior during the past year regarding biking and vacation patterns.

16. During the past 12 months how many times did you use the Kal Haven trail, excluding the 2005 Michigander ride? (Please check one)

- 0 times
- 1-2 times
- 3-4 times
- 4-5 times
- More than 5 times

17. During the past 12 months, did you use any other rail-trails for biking? (Please check one)

- Yes => please specify \_\_\_\_\_
- No

18. During the past 12 months how many vacation trips did you take to South Haven area? (Please check one)

- None, skip to question 20
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 4-5
- More than 5

19. During the past 12 months, did you visit the South Haven area to participate in other sport or outdoor recreation activity? (Please check one)

- Yes, which type of activities \_\_\_\_\_
- No

20. In the past 12 months have you traveled to other Michigan areas to participate in bike events other than the Michigander? (Please check one)

- Yes
  - No
- What Michigan areas? a)

\_\_\_\_\_

b)

\_\_\_\_\_

c)

Finally we would like to know a bit more for statistical purposes only and it will remain confidential.

21. Which category best describes your 2005 annual household income before taxes? (Please check one)

- Under \$20,000
- \$20,000-\$39,999
- \$40,000-\$59,999
- \$60,000-\$79,999
- \$80,000 or more

22. What is your gender?  Male  Female

23. What is your age? (Please check one)

- Under 25
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 or older

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it in the provided self addressed envelope to C. Vogt, Michigan State Univ., 131 Natural Resources Bldg., East Lansing, MI. 48824-1222. If there is anything else to add, please include it on an additional sheet.