

Exploring Marketing Opportunities for the Florida National Scenic Trail



By:

**Rachel Albritton
Taylor V. Stein**

Presented to:

**USDA National Forests in Florida
Florida Trail Association**

November 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
INTRODUCTION.....	8
STUDY PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	9
METHODS	10
SURVEY SITES	10
DATA COLLECTION	10
DATA ANALYSIS	12
RESULTS	13
VISITOR PROFILES AND TRIP CHARACTERISTICS.....	13
PRODUCT (MOTIVATION).....	17
PLACE (SETTING PREFERENCE)	19
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MOTIVATIONS AND SETTING PREFERENCES	21
FNST KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS	26
CONCLUSION & MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	27
LIMITATIONS	28
FUTURE RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES.....	28
REFERENCES.....	30
APPENDIX I: ON-SITE SURVEY	31
APPENDIX II: MAIL BACK SURVEY	32
APPENDIX III:INDIVIDUAL SITE INFORMATION	42
OCALA NATIONAL FOREST	37
CROSS FLORIDA GREENWAY	39
GOLDHEAD BRANCH STATE PARK.....	41
TORREYA STATE PARK	43
BIG SHOALS STATE PARK	45
O’LENO STATE PARK.....	47
HIGHLAND HAMMOCK STATE PARK.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Socio Demographics.....	14
Table 2. Trip Characteristics.....	15
Table 3. Group Characteristics.....	16
Table 4. Respondent Motivations (All).....	17
Table 5. Principle component analysis results.....	18
Table 6. Motivational differences between FNST visitors and non-visitors.....	19
Table 7. Differences for setting preferences between FNST visitors and non-visitors.....	20
Table 8. Desired motivations associated with preferred setting for FNST visitors.....	22
Table 9. Desired motivations associated with preferred setting for FNST visitors.....	22
Table 10. Relationships between Social Motivations and Preferred Setting for FNST Visitors.....	23
Table 11. Relationships between preferred settings and independent motivations for non-FNST visitors.....	24
Table 12. Relationships between preferred settings and social motivations: non-FNST visitors.....	25
Table 13. FNST knowledge and awareness.....	26
Table 14. Demographic information of Ocala National Forest Visitors (on-site survey).....	37
Table 15. Trip characteristics for Ocala National Forest Visitors.....	37
Table 16. Group Characteristics of Ocala National Forest Visitors.....	38
Table 17. Demographic information of CFG Visitors (on-site survey).....	39
Table 18. Trip characteristics for CFG Visitors.....	39
Table 19. Group Characteristics of CFG Visitors.....	40
Table 20. Demographic information of Goldhead Branch SP Visitors (on-site survey).....	41
Table 21. Trip characteristics for Goldhead Branch SP Visitors.....	41
Table 22. Group Characteristics of Goldhead Branch SP Visitors.....	42
Table 23. Demographic information of Torreya SP Visitors (on-site survey).....	43
Table 24. Trip characteristics for Torreya SP Visitors.....	43

Table 25. Group characteristics of Torreya SP visitors 44

Table 26. Demographic information of Big Shoals SP Visitors (on-site survey) 45

Table 27. Trip characteristics for Big Shoals SP Visitors 45

Table 28. Group characteristics of Big Shoals SP Visitors 46

Table 29. Demographic information of O’Leno SP Visitors (on-site survey) 47

Table 30. Trip characteristics for O’Leno Visitors 47

Table 31. Group Characteristics of O’Leno SP Visitors..... 48

Table 32. Demographic information of Highland Hammock SP Visitors (on-site survey)..... 49

Table 33. Trip characteristics for Highlands Hammock SP Visitors..... 49

Table 34. Group Characteristics of Highland Hammock SP visitors..... 50

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Study Sites 11

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for this research study was provided by the USDA National Forests in Florida. The authors of this report would like to thank all the recreation managers at the participating agencies, Specifically to Florida State Parks and National Forest, for their help and cooperation with this study. Additionally, a special thank you to all University of Florida surveyors who spent countless hours in the field conducting interviews. Explicitly, thank you to Lindsey Eidner, Sam Nagran, Daniel McKeague, Julia Shrader, Vanessa O'quendo, Amanda Brinton, and Taylor Oxahart. Lastly, for all those participants who took time out of their personal lives to complete the surveys, we thank you. Without your participation this study would not exist.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida National Scenic Trail (FNST) expands almost the entire length of Florida, passing through both rural and urban areas, and is no more than 120 miles from most Florida residents. The trails proximity to Florida's diverse and growing population has the potential to provide a multitude of quality opportunities to its visitors. Preceding results indicate that a wide range of opportunities are desired, however the demographic group pursuing these desired opportunities are demographically narrow with the majority of Trail visitors being white males, between the ages of 40-59 years old. Visitors also tend to be employed full-time or retired, and nearly one-quarter of respondents have an annual household income of \$100,000 or more annually (Sanborn *et al.*, 2004; Albritton *et al.*, 2005; Albritton *et al.*, 2006). These results were somewhat surprising given that the FNST traverses through both diverse areas (both urban and rural) and Florida's population itself is diverse. Managers and recreation planners must do more than provide the opportunity to engage in quality opportunities for visitor experiences. They must also get the word out about the opportunities available (Bright, 2000) which entails the need to create a fit between the visitor and the outdoor environment (Knopf, 1990).

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was take a social marketing approach to investigate the product and place components of the marketing mix in order to form a foundational knowledge for future promotion strategies for the FNST. Specifically the objectives of this study were to

1. examine desired motivations of current FNST visitors and non-visitors,
2. examine if FNST visitors and non-visitors differed in these desired motivations,
3. examine the desired setting characteristics of a recreation site when pursuing trail opportunities,
4. examine the relationship between desired motivations and setting preferences, and
5. examine current awareness and knowledge levels regarding the FNST between FNST visitors and non-visitors.

DATA COLLECTION

A combination of on-site and mail back surveys were used to collect information. A total of 375 interviews were completed on-site, a total of 334 mail back surveys were distributed and a total of 193 mail backs were returned for a response rate of 57.78%.

RESULTS

- There are no demographic differences between FNST and non-FNST visitors.
- The results of the study indicate an overall desire to pursue opportunities for individual achievement, environmental appreciation, and social bonding.
- Current FNST visitors are more likely to place a higher importance on individual motivations compared to non-FNST visitors.
- Non-FNST visitors are likely to place a higher importance on opportunities for environmental appreciation compared to FNST visitors.
- More primitive, natural areas are the most preferred physical setting characteristic for both FNST and non-FNST visitors.
- Both groups of visitors place more importance on hiking along dirt or grass trails, but FNST visitors are also more likely to also desire paved trails compared to non-FNST visitors.
- Both FNST and non-FNST place a high importance on little contacts outside their own group, but non-FNST visitors are more likely to be accepting of more frequent social encounters.
- When pursuing opportunities for desired experiences, desired setting characteristics are more likely to contribute to that desired opportunity for FNST visitors compared to non-FNST visitors.
- For FNST visitors, physical settings ranging from primitive to urban are likely to contribute to individual opportunities; more natural, primitive settings are more likely to contribute to environmental appreciative opportunities; and semi-primitive to urban areas are more likely to contribute to opportunities for social bonding.
- For non-FNST visitors, more primitive to semi-primitive areas are likely to contribute to individual opportunities, and either primitive or rural physical settings are likely to contribute to desired opportunities for social bonding.
- FNST visitors are more likely to be aware that Florida has a national scenic trail, however there is an overall lack of knowledge about the trails specific location indicating that a lack of knowledge may be a barrier to trail visitation.

Both FNST and non-FNST visitors are similar demographically and in their overall desires for recreation opportunities, however the level of importance placed on these opportunities as well as the settings in which these opportunities are pursued differ. This knowledge can be useful when developing promotional strategies for each target market.

INTRODUCTION

Recreation trails such as the Florida National Scenic Trail (FNST), provide an opportunity to engage in activities that may result in positive benefits to an individual, to society, to the economy, and to the environment. Pursuing opportunities to experience benefits of parks and recreation areas are generally well known by recreation professionals, leisure academics, and students, however the majority of the larger public will most likely not receive benefits from these areas unless recreation professionals develop creative strategies that educate and influence the public regarding available opportunities (Bright, 2000). Managers and recreation planners must do more than provide the opportunity to engage in quality visitor experiences. They must also get the word out about the opportunities available (Bright, 2000) which entails the need to create a fit between the visitor and the outdoor environment (Knopf, 1990).

Marketing outdoor recreation opportunities on public lands has often raised concern among recreation professionals and conservationist (Vogt and Andereck, 2002). However when utilized effectively, marketing can introduce the opportunity to achieve benefits for a target audience in which an agency wishes to reach (Havits, 1988). Effective marketing strategies that capitalize on existing desires may also help build relationships between the agency and the visitor thereby providing benefits to both parties involved (Borrie *et al.*, 2002). In particular, the use of social marketing strategies that acknowledge the existing motivations and desired benefits of a target audience may have a larger and more influential effect on existing and potential visitors resulting in broader societal benefits such as a improved quality of life (Bright, 2000).

Social marketing is defined as a process for influencing human behavior using marketing principles for the purpose of social benefit rather than for commercial profit (Smith, 1999). Similar to commercial marketing, social marketing is focused on addressing and meeting the existing desires of a particular target audience. In addition, the social marketing approach is also based in the traditional marketing mix of the four P's; product, place, price, and promotion, but differs from commercial marketing by focusing on social benefits rather than financial gain. It is this reason in particular that social marketing has become adopted and implemented by many non-profit organizations and low budget businesses. For recreation professionals, this focus on beneficial change means understanding the wants, needs, and desires of their target audience, and developing creative solutions to capture that audience's attention and draw them to a specific location to engage in a specific opportunity.

The Florida National Scenic Trail (FNST) expands almost the entire length of Florida, passing through both rural and urban areas, and is no more than 120 miles from most Florida residents. The trails proximity to Florida's diverse and growing population has the potential to provide a multitude of quality opportunities to its visitors. Preceding results indicate that a wide range of opportunities are desired, however the demographic group pursuing these desired opportunities are demographically narrow with the majority of Trail visitors being white males, between the ages of 40-59 years old. Visitors also tend to be employed full-time or retired, and nearly one-quarter of respondents have an annual household income of \$100,000 or more annually (Sanborn *et al.*, 2004; Albritton *et al.*, 2005; Albritton *et al.*, 2006). These results were somewhat surprising given that the

FNST traverses through both diverse areas (both urban and rural) and Florida's population itself is diverse.

In addition to understanding the desired benefits of potential or existing visitors, there must also be an understanding of potential barriers that inhibit the ability to engage in the opportunities being offered (Mah, M.W. *et al.*, 2006). One potential barrier to participation is a lack of knowledge about the place being marketed such as the trail, or the opportunities available (Kerstetter *et al.*, 2002). Previous studies conducted with FNST visitors revealed that most visitors were aware that Florida had a national scenic trail, but were unaware that they were using it (Albritton *et al.*, 2006) suggesting that while many people are aware of the place (i.e the FNST), they are unaware of its specific location (i.e. Ocala National Forest), and perhaps the opportunities to pursue desired benefits at that specific location.

STUDY PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this report was to investigate the product and place components of the marketing mix in order to form a foundational knowledge for future promotional strategies. In relation to the product component of the social marketing mix, the objectives of this study were to

1. examine desired motivations of current FNST visitors and non-visitors, and
2. examine if FNST visitors and non-visitors differed in these desired motivations.

By examining possible motivational differences between users and non-users of the FNST, researchers and managers can begin to identify the wants, needs, and desires of a target market and identify possible marketing strategies to draw the attention of current non-visitors as well as maintain the interest of current visitors. In relation to the place components of the social marketing mix, the objectives of this study were to

3. examine the desired setting characteristics of a recreation site when pursuing trail opportunities,
4. examine the relationship between desired motivations and setting preferences.
5. examine current awareness and knowledge levels regarding the FNST between FNST visitors and non-visitors, and

The investigation of place as it relates to setting preferences, (i.e. physical, trail design, and social characteristics), will help identify public recreation areas along the FNST that best match these setting preferences. The investigation of the relationship between desired opportunities (product) and desired settings (place) will further help focus future marketing efforts that match desired experiences with desired places. Lastly, a major component to marketing a service or opportunity relies on the state of awareness and/or knowledge about the opportunity being promoted. The investigation on the current state of knowledge between FNST visitors and non-visitors will further aid in the facilitation of communication and promotional strategies for both visitors and non-visitors.

METHODS

SURVEY SITES

Given the amount and consistency of information collected on FNST trail visitors from 2003-2007, a total of three FNST survey sites were purposefully selected and re-sampled for of this study. Ocala National Forest, Cross Florida Greenway, and Goldhead Branch State Park, are all high volume use areas located within the North Central Florida Regions and visitors provide a good representation of the typical FNST visitor.

Non-FNST survey locations were chosen based on proximity to the Florida National Scenic Trail and proximity of previous FNST survey sites (within 15 miles). Distance criteria were chosen based on the assumption that the individual had a reasonable choice to visit an area through which the FNST traversed and where it did not, and travel to the site where the FNST was located was not an inhibiting factor. Initially, a total of eight sites were chosen; four state parks, three state forests, and one National Forest. However, early survey periods conducted in late September through mid October were resulting in no obtainable surveys and survey efforts were abandoned at the three state forests resulting on a total of four non-FNST survey sites; Torreya State Park in northern Florida, Big Shoals and O'Leno State Parks located in north central Florida, and Highlands Hammock State Park located in south Florida (**Figure 1**).

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection was achieved through the implementation of on-site interviews and mail back surveys. Trained interviewers were strategically placed at major trailheads, and they randomly select individuals (at least 18 years of age) from each visitor group and ask them to complete a short on-site interview (**Appendix I**). The on-site survey was meant to gather basic information on the respondent's trip characteristics such as length of stay, party size and composition, number of previous visits, other activities engaged in during their visitors and basic demographic information.

At the end of the interview the researcher provided the participant with a mail-back questionnaire which contained a postage paid envelope. The mail back survey was more detailed and inquired further about the participant's motivations, setting preferences, trail preferences, social contact preferences, and knowledge about the Florida National Scenic Trail (**Appendix II**). Dillman's Tailored Method Approach (2000) was used to maximize response rates wherein a follow-up postcard was mailed one week after the original mail back was handed out. Then, if the mail back was not returned after another two weeks, a new mail back survey was sent to the participant.



Figure 1. Study Sites

The idea of product was measured by examining the importance of opportunities that could be pursued within a recreation trail setting. Within the mail back questionnaire participants were presented with 16 possible reasons (motivations) for visiting the trail that day. These reasons were pulled from the recreation experience preference (REP) scales, and respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of those reasons on a scale of one to five with a one representing not at all important and a five representing very important. To examine the meaning and role of place, respondents were given a list of 12 setting characteristics that described physical, social, and trail characteristics, and respondents were asked to rate the importance of each setting characteristic on a scale of one to five when engaged in their primary trail activity of the day. Also regarding place, participants were asked a series of questions regarding their knowledge and awareness about the Florida National Scenic Trail in order to identify if knowledge and awareness were barriers to trail visitation.

From October 1, 2006 – March 31, 2007 a total of 375 on-site interviews were completed. Forty-one people did not wish to take a mail back with them, resulting in the distribution of 334 mail back questionnaires of which 193 were returned for a 57.78% response rate. A chi-square analysis was done to check for non-response rate biases, and revealed that non-FNST visitors were more likely to return the mail back questionnaire than FNST visitors ($X^2 = 24.38$, $p < .01$). In addition, current FNST visitors who had a satisfactory experience on the trail were more likely to complete the mail back surveys than those who had a less than perfect experience ($X^2 = 27.884$, $p < .05$).

DATA ANALYSIS

To facilitate the studies objectives, several different data analysis techniques were used. A principle components analysis with varimax rotation was done in order to reduce the number of motivational variables being evaluated and compared between the two target markets as well as to explore if a common theme for desired opportunities could be identified. In essence, a principle component analysis provides a means of summarizing the most important variables, and filters out repetitive data thereby making the application of the final results more useful.

Chi-square and independent sample t-tests were implemented in order to evaluate differences between FNST and non-FNST visitors. Chi-square analysis permits the investigation of differences between two groups on a given categorical response variable (i.e. do FNST and non-FNST visitors differ in regards to gender). It compares the frequency of cases found in various categories of one variable across the different categories of another variable. The pearson's chi-square statistic (noted within the tables as X^2) is compared to a standardized value. If the studies calculated value is larger than the standardized value, the samples are said to be statistically significantly different.

Independent sample t-tests (aka students t-test) permits the investigation of differences between two groups on a given continuous variable response by comparing the mean score of that variable (i.e. do FNST and non-FNST visitors differ in regards the importance placed on the desire to enjoy nature, wherein importance was measured on a scale of 1-5). The t-value within the t-statistic is an indication of the probability that both populations from the studies population were randomly selected and have the same mean, and that differences in our sample population means

are due to random fluctuation. As the t-value gets smaller (approaches zero) the probability that the population means are the same gets larger. As the t-value gets larger (in either the positive or negative direction) the probability that the population means are the same gets smaller. The studies computed t-value is compared to a standardized t-value. If the studies computed t-value is larger than the standardized t-value in the means between the two populations are said to be statistically significant from one and other.

Lastly, a multiple regression analysis was done to determine which specific setting characteristics (if any) where likely to contribute to a desired opportunity. Multiple regression allows for the identification of which variable(s), in this case which setting variable(s), are the best predictors or contributors to a defined desired opportunity (motivation.) All data analysis was done in SPSS v 11.5.

RESULTS

VISITOR PROFILES AND TRIP CHARACTERISTICS

Both FNST and non-FNST visitors tended to be white, were more likely to be male, and fall between the ages of 40-59 years old. Participants were also likely to be educated, receiving at least some college education (79.0%). Nearly 64% (63.9%) of all respondents were employed full time and just over 28% (28.4%) were retired. Income was fairly evenly distributed with the largest percentage of respondents indicating they has an annual household income of \$40,000 - \$59,000 (24.5%), and the second largest falling within \$100,000 or more annually (**Table 1**).

Respondents were asked if they had visited the site in which they were contacted at before. FNST visitors were slightly more likely to be a repeat visitor (58.2%) compared to non-FNST visitors (52.4%). Repeat FNST visitors were also more likely to visit the site 12 or more times within the past year compared to repeat non-FNST visitors who were more likely to visit the site none-1 times (34.7%) or 2-6 times (34.7%) in the past year. Non-FNST visitors were more likely to spend less time on the trail, with 69.5% spending an hour or less on the trail compared to 41.3% of FNST visitors. Both FNST and non-FNST visitors were satisfied with their experience on the trail indicating that either trail had the potential to provide satisfactory experiences for visitors. Lastly, FNST visitors were more likely to live within 30 miles of the trail and thereby travel shorter distances to visit the trail, while non-FNST visitors were more likely to travel farther (up to two hours) to reach the area in which they were contacted (**Table 2**).

Table 1. Socio Demographics

Variable	FNST Visitors (%)	Non-FNST Visitors (%)	Total	X ²	P
Gender	n = 95	n = 74	n = 169		
Male	56.8	45.9	52.1	1.98	0.10
Female	43.2	54.1	47.9		
Age	n = 92	n = 73	n = 165		
18-29 years old	8.7	11.0	9.7	3.13	.68
30-39 years old	14.1	13.7	13.9		
40-49 years old	25.0	19.2	22.4		
50-59 years old	25.0	19.2	22.4		
60 -69 years old	18.5	21.9	20.0		
70 years or older	8.7	15.1	11.5		
Education	n = 93	n = 74	n = 167		
> Some high school	3.3	2.7	3.0	5.543	.48
High school diploma	14.0	23.0	18.0		
Some college	22.6	24.3	23.4		
College graduate	25.8	18.9	22.8		
Some graduate school	6.5	10.8	8.4		
Graduate degree	28.0	20.3	24.6		
Employment	n = 90	n = 79	n = 169		
Employed	64.4	63.3	63.9	1.88	0.76
Retired	26.7	30.4	28.4		
Homemaker	4.4	5.1	4.7		
Student	1.1	0.0	0.6		
Unemployed	3.3	1.3	2.4		
Income	n = 68	n = 75	n = 143		
\$19,000 or less	10.3	2.7	6.3	7.51	.19
\$20,000 - \$39,999	22.1	18.7	20.3		
\$40,000 - \$59,999	20.6	28.0	24.5		
\$60,000 - \$79,999	17.6	21.3	19.6		
\$80,000 - \$99,999	2.9	9.3	6.3		
\$100,000 or more	26.5	20.0	23.1		
Ethnicity	n = 74	n = 83	n = 162		
White	93.7	97.6	95.7	7.22	0.13
African American	3.8	0.0	1.9		
Asian American	1.3	0.0	0.6		
Hispanic/Latino	0.0	2.4	1.2		
American Indian/Alaskan	1.3	0.0	0.6		
Native					

Table 2. Trip Characteristics

Variable	FNST Visitors (%)	Non-FNST Visitors (%)	χ^2	P
First Visit	n = 205	n = 170		
Yes	38.5	47.6	8.15	.02
No	58.2	52.4		
Past Visits	n = 205	n = 170		
None - 1	41.3	34.7	62.35	0.00
2-6	22.6	34.7		
7-12	4.8	4.1		
More than 12	27.4	4.1		
Time Spent	n = 199	n = 167		
An hour or less	49.5	69.5	17.81	0.001
A few hours	31.2	19.2		
Half a day	6.9	3.0		
One whole day	2.0	0.0		
More than a day	10.4	8.4		
Experience	n = 199	n = 170		
10	36.2	35.3	2.81	0.73
9	17.1	15.3		
8	25.1	24.1		
7	13.6	18.2		
6	5.0	2.9		
5 or below	3.0	4.1		
Distance Traveled to the Site	n = 167	n = 155		
0-30 miles	66.5	27.1	52.787	.000
31-60 miles	9.6	21.9		
61-120 miles	11.4	27.7		
121- or more	3.6	11.6		
Out of state	9.0	11.6		

Visitors to the FNST were more likely to visit the trail alone (27.2%) compared to non-FNST visitors (8.8%) who were more likely to be traveling in pairs (45.9%). When traveling in groups of two or more, non-FNST visitors were likely to be traveling with family members (56.0%) compared to FNST visitors (46.1%). (Table 3).

Table 3. Group Characteristics

Variable	FNST Visitors (%)	Non-FNST Visitors (%)	X ²	P
Group Size	n = 200	n = 170		
1	27.2	8.8	23.55	0.00
2	34.7	45.9		
3	12.9	10.0		
4	9.4	14.7		
5 or more	15.8	20.6		
Number of Males	n = 192	n = 169		
0	10.3	11.8	4.17	0.38
1	57.4	49.7		
2	17.4	19.5		
3	7.2	5.9		
4 or more	7.7	13.0		
Number of Females	n = 164	n = 169		
0	15.0	11.2	1.23	0.87
1	46.1	48.5		
2	19.2	21.3		
3	10.2	9.5		
4 or more	9.6	9.5		
Group Type	n = 193	n = 166		
Alone	28.1	9.0	28.79	0.00
Family	41.3	56.0		
Friends	18.9	24.7		
Family & Friends	2.6	6.0		
Organized Group	8.2	4.2		
Other	1.0	0.0		

PRODUCT

MOTIVATIONS

All respondents were given a list of 16 possible reasons they may have had for visiting the trail that day, and were asked to rate the importance of each of these possibilities on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = not at all important through 5 = the most important). Overall, “enjoy nature” (mean = 4.49), “explore the area and natural environment” (mean = 4.08), and “reduce stress and tension from everyday life” (mean = 4.03) were viewed as the most important reasons for visiting the trail that day. Conversely, “take risks” (mean = 2.20), “meet new people” (mean = 2.36), and “learn about history and culture of the area” (mean = 3.18) were the viewed as the least important reasons for visiting the trail that day (Table 4).

Table 4. Respondent Motivations (All)

Motivation	n	Most Important	Important	Neutral	Not Important	Not at all important	Mean	Std. Dev.
Enjoy nature	171	56.1	38.6	4.1	0.6	0.6	4.49	0.66
Explore the area and natural environment	167	35.3	47.3	10.2	4.2	3.0	4.08	0.94
Reduce stress from everyday life	172	32.0	50.0	9.9	5.2	2.9	4.03	0.95
Promote physical fitness	174	27.6	51.7	13.2	6.3	1.1	3.98	0.87
Escape noise/crowds	170	31.8	45.9	10.6	8.8	2.9	3.95	1.02
Be in an area where I feel secure and safe	169	23.7	46.7	18.9	9.5	1.2	3.82	0.94
Be with friends and family	171	34.5	35.7	12.3	6.4	11.1	3.76	1.29
Learn about the natural environment	166	18.7	52.4	16.3	8.4	4.2	3.73	0.99
Strengthen family kinship	168	25.6	30.4	20.2	7.7	16.1	3.42	1.37
Engage in personal/spiritual reflection	169	17.2	36.7	23.1	10.7	12.4	3.36	1.24
Feel a sense of independence	171	15.2	30.4	32.2	10.5	11.7	3.27	1.19
Challenge myself and achieve personal goals	171	15.2	29.2	32.2	11.1	12.3	3.24	1.21
Depend on my skills and abilities	167	13.2	31.1	30.5	12.6	12.6	3.20	1.19
Learn about history and culture of the area	164	4.9	42.1	27.4	17.7	7.9	3.18	1.04
Meet new people	167	3.6	13.8	29.3	21.6	31.7	2.36	1.17
Take risks	169	2.4	12.4	23.7	26.0	35.5	2.20	1.13

1 = Not at all important

3 = Neutral

5 = Most Important

In order to simplify the investigation of motivational differences between the two groups, a principle component analysis (PCA) was done to reduce the number of possible motivations being compared, and explore if a common theme between groups differences could be identified. Also, Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($p < .000$) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) (.793) were referenced in order to assure that PCA analysis was appropriate. The results revealed 3 components with eigenvalues over 1, explaining a total of 56% of the variance. Meaning the three principle components revealed within this analysis are not related to each other and could be thought of as individual desired opportunities. The first component tended to represent individual motivations, the second component tended to represent motivations related to environmental appreciation, and the third component was most reflective of social benefits. A cronbach alpha was run to check the reliability and internal consistency of each component, and the results showed all components to be highly reliable (Table 5).

Table 5. Principle component analysis results

Motivations	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
Challenge myself and achieve personal goals	0.836		
Depend on my skills and abilities	0.813		
Promote physical fitness	0.631		
Feel a sense of independence	0.617		
Take risks	0.607		
Engage in personal/spiritual reflection	0.509		
Meet new people	0.456		
Reduce tensions and stress from everyday life	0.413		
Learn about the natural environment		0.896	
Explore the area and natural environment		0.858	
Enjoy nature		0.645	
Learn about history and culture of the area		0.594	
Strengthen family kinship			0.794
Be with friends and family			0.743
Be in an area where I feel secure and safe			0.652
Escape noise/crowds			0.444
<i>Cronbach Alpha</i>	<i>.80</i>	<i>.80</i>	<i>.72</i>

Significant differences were found between FNST visitors and non-visitors on two of the three motivational variables. Current FNST are likely to place higher importance on independent motivations (mean = 3.31) compared to non-visitors (mean = 3.05). On the other hand, non-FNST visitors were more likely to place a greater importance on motivations relating to environmental appreciation (mean = 4.04) than current FNST visitors (mean = 3.71), however the mean score for environmental appreciation for FNST visitors still suggests that this was an important motivation for them. No significant differences were found between FNST visitors and non-visitors regarding social benefits indicating that both groups of visitors place equal importance on these benefits (Table 6).

Table 6. Motivational differences between FNST visitors and non-visitors

Motivation ¹	Mean		t-value	Significance
	FNST visitors	Non visitors		
Independent	3.31	3.05	2.24	.03
Environmental ²	3.71	4.04	-2.67	.01
Social	3.75	3.73	1.36	.89

¹ 1 = not important 3 = neutral 5 = very important

² unequal variance assumed

PLACE

DESIRED SETTINGS

Overall, both FNST and non-FNST visitors preferred more primitive, natural settings, natural trails, and little contact outside their own group. Of the 12 setting preferences presented to the participants, three were significantly different between the two groups. Current FNST visitors were more likely to prefer paved trails (mean = 3.20) compared to non-FNST visitors preference for paved trails (mean = 2.45). Conversely, non-FNST were more likely to prefer dirt or grass trails (mean = 3.80) compared to current FNST visitors preference for natural trails (mean = 3.31). Although these differences for trails (natural or paved) exist between the two market segments, they also exist within the FNST market segment such that current FNST visitors are also more likely to desire dirt or grass trails than paved trails. Meaning, while there are differences between the two groups in how they answered the individual variables, it may be more important to note that overall, more natural settings including natural trails are the most preferred settings for both FNST and non-FNST visitors. Both groups are also more likely to prefer pursuing opportunities along loop trails than linear trails (Table 7).

A significant difference was also found regarding social contact. Non-FNST visitors place more importance on moderate social contact (mean = 2.45) compared to FNST visitors (mean = 2.02). However, a review of the mean scores indicates that both feel that moderate contact is not important. Therefore it can be concluded that both groups have little desire for high social contact. More importantly, both groups shared high preference for little contact outside their own group when engaged in opportunities along a recreation trail (Table 7).

In reference to physical setting preferences, non-FNST visitors are more likely to desire more primitive, natural settings (mean = 3.79) compared to current FNST visitors (mean = 3.39), however FNST visitors still found natural settings desirable. Similarly, non-FNST visitors are more likely to desire slightly modified but natural appearing settings (mean = 3.57) compared to FNST visitors (mean = 3.47), however FNST visitors also find these settings desirable. Both FNST and non-FNST visitors place little importance on more developed settings (Table 7).

Table 7. Differences for setting preferences between FNST visitors and non-visitors

Motivation	n	Mean ¹		t-value	Sig.
		FNST visitors	Non-FNST visitors		
<i>Physical Setting Preferences</i>					
Areas untouched by man	122	3.39	3.79	-1.88	.06
Modified but appears natural	122	3.47	3.57	-.52	.60
Man-made and natural	122	2.56	2.47	.42	.67
Roads & power lines dominate	120	1.30	1.42	-.89	.37
<i>Trail Design Preferences</i>					
Dirt or grass trails*	122	3.31	3.80	-2.32	.02*
Paved trails	120	3.20	2.45	3.48	.00**
Linear trail	116	2.22	2.24	-0.13	.89
Loop trail	121	3.13	3.45	-1.46	.15
<i>Social Setting Preferences</i>					
Very little contact ²	120	3.20	3.53	-0.79	.43
Little contact ³	119	3.00	2.95	0.23	.82
Moderate contact ^{4*}	119	2.02	2.49	-2.31	.02*
Constant contact	120	1.51	1.62	-0.66	.51

¹ 1 = not important 3 = neutral 5 = very important

² contact with 6 groups or fewer

³ contact with no more than 6-15 groups

⁴ contact with no more than 30 groups

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATIONS AND SETTING PREFERENCES

The results of the multiple regression analysis were meant to identify which setting characteristics (if any) were the best predictors for a particular desired opportunity (independent, environmental appreciation, or social). In essence, the data analysis sought to find if relationships existed between desired opportunities and setting preferences. The examination of the beta values (β), is an indicator of how much each of the variables contribute to the regression model when all other variables are held constant. The larger the beta value the greater the variable contributes to the model. The adjusted R^2 values range from 0-1 and explain how much of the variance in the dependent variable (motivation) is explained by the model. The closer the value is to 1, the more the model explains or predicts which setting characteristics contribute to a particular motivation.

For FNST visitors, independent motivations were the most dependent on the respondent's preference to pursue these opportunities in areas that are dominated by roads and powerlines. The second largest contributor were areas that were "modified but appear natural. Areas that were described as man-made but appearing natural were negatively associated with independent motivations (Table 8). Statistically it could be depicted and described as follows

(1) Independent Motivations (FNST visitors) =

$2.51 + 0.26 \times \text{modified areas} + 0.46 \times \text{dominated by roads and powerlines} - 0.23 \times \text{man-made but appears natural}$

- 2.51 is the constant variable
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondent's preference for "areas that are modified but appear natural" a .26 increase in the importance placed on pursuing independent motivations is predicted.
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondent's preference for "areas that are dominated by roads and powerlines" a .46 increase in the importance placed in pursuing independent motivations is predicted.
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondent's preference for "areas that are man-made but appear natural" a -0.23 decrease in the importance placed on independent motivations is predicted.

Table 8. Desired motivations associated with preferred setting for FNST visitors

Settings	β	Std. Error	R ²	Adj. R ²	Sig. of Eq.
Independent					
Areas modified but appears natural	0.26	.09**	.35	.29	.03
Dominated by roads and powerlines	0.46	.15**			
Man-made but appears natural	-0.23	.09*			
Constant Variable	2.51	.33**			

Environmental appreciation motivations were most influenced by the preference to recreate in areas that appeared to be untouched by man, and secondly by the desire to travel along dirt or grassy trails (Table 9).

(2) Environmental Appreciation Motivations (FNST visitors)=

$$1.08 + .36*\text{areas untouched by man} + .33*\text{dirt or grassy trails}$$

- 1.08 is the constant variable
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference to travel in “areas untouched by man” a .36 increase in the importance placed on pursuing environmental appreciation motivations is predicted.
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference for “dirt or grassy trails” a .33 increase in the importance placed in pursuing environmental appreciations motivations is predicted.

Table 9. Desired motivations associated with preferred setting for FNST visitors

Settings	β	Std. Error	R ²	Adj. R ²	Sig. of Eq.
Environmental Appreciation					
Areas untouched by man	.36**	.14	.53	.51	.00
Dirt or grassy trails	.33**	.10			
Constant Variable	1.08**	.38			

** p < .01

Social Motivations were most influenced by the desire for frequent contact, and secondly by the preference to travel in areas that are modified but appear natural (**Table 10**).

(3) Social Motivations (FNST visitors) =

$$1.65 + .36 \times \text{areas modified but appear natural} + .40 \times \text{contact with 30 or more groups/day}$$

- 1.65 is the constant variable
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference to travel in “areas modified but appear natural” a .36 increase in the importance placed in pursuing social motivations is predicted.
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference to have “contact with 30+ groups/day” outside their own” a .40 increase in the importance placed on pursuing social motivations is predicted.

Table 10. Relationships between Social Motivations and Preferred Setting for FNST Visitors

Settings	β	Std. Error	R ²	Adj. R ²	Sig. of Eq.
Social					
Areas modified but appears natural	0.36**	.09	.34	.40	.01
Contact with 30 or more groups/day	0.40**	.12			
Constant Variable	1.65**	.40			

** p < .01

Areas traditionally described as primitive, with low social contact and natural physical characteristics were closely associated with independent motivations for non-FNST visitors (Table 11).

(4) Independent Motivations (Non-FNST visitors) =

$$.16 + .25*\text{areas untouched by man} + .16*\text{contact with 6-15 groups/day}$$

- .16 is the constant variable
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference to travel in “areas untouched by man” a .25 increase in the importance placed on pursuing independent motivations is predicted.
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference for “contact with 6-15 groups/day” a .16 increase in the importance placed in pursuing environmental appreciations motivations is predicted.

Table 11. Relationships between preferred settings and independent motivations for non-FNST visitors

Settings	β	Std. Error	R ²	Adj. R ²	Sig. of Eq.
<i>Independent</i>					
Areas untouched by man	.25**	.08	.21	.19	.01
Contact with 6-15 groups/day	.16**	.07			
Constant Variable	.16**	.36			

** p < .01

Both natural areas as well as areas dominated by roads and power lines were physical setting characteristics likely to contribute to social recreation opportunities (Table 12).

(5) Social Motivations (non-FNST visitors) =

$$2.27 + .29*\text{travel in areas untouched by man} + .26*\text{travel in areas where roads and powerline dominate}$$

Where:

- 2.27 is the constant variable
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference to travel in “areas untouched by man” a .29 increase in the importance placed on pursuing social motivations is predicted.
- For every preference increase by (1) for a respondents preference to travel “in areas where roads and powerlines dominate” a .26 increase in the importance placed in pursuing environmental appreciations motivations is predicted.

Table 12. Relationships between preferred settings and social motivations: non-FNST visitors

Settings	β	Std. Error	R ²	Adj. R ²	Sig. of Eq.
Social					
Travel in areas untouched by man	.29**	.010	.16	.13	.01
Areas where roads and power lines dominate	.26**	.13			
Constant	2.27**	.38			

** p < .01

There were no variable s shown to be significant contributors for the desire to engage in environmental appreciative opportunities.

FNST KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS

FNST visitors were more likely to be aware that Florida had a national scenic trail than non-FNST visitors. When asked if the participant had participated in any recreation activities along the FNST, FNST visitors were also more likely to be aware of the trail that they were recreating on than non-FNST visitors indicating the current FNST visitors are more knowledgeable about the trail. For those that were aware of the FNST, recommendations from friends and/or family was the main source of information for both FNST visitors (22.5%) and non-FNST visitors (28.1%) (Table 13).

Table 13. FNST knowledge and awareness

Variable	FNST Visitors (%)	Non-FNST Visitors (%)	X ²	P
Does Florida have a NST?	n = 17	n = 85		
Yes	94.1	40.0	18.27	0.00**
No	5.9	3.5		
I don't know	0.0	56.5		
Hike FNST when contacted?	n = 66	n =72		
Yes	65.2	21.4	26.55	0.00**
No	13.6	31.4		
I don't know	21.2	47.1		
Learn about FNST	n = 40	n =32		
Friends/Family	22.5	28.1	5.23	0.63
Website	10.0	12.5		
Road Signs	17.5	15.6		
Guidebook	7.5	9.4		
Brochure	10.0	3.1		
Newspaper	2.5	0.0		
Don't remember	30.0	31.3		

** Significant at the .01 level

CONCLUSION & MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study are meant to provide the USFS and the FTA with an understanding of the current desired opportunities of trail visitors to Florida's public recreation areas, and to segment these visitors based on current use status. The results of this study indicate that there are some significant differences between current FNST visitors and non visitors, and understanding these differences can help develop marketing strategies that directly address each segments desired trail experiences. Additionally, the investigation of the relationship between desired opportunities and settings can further help pair certain experiences with specific places making marketing strategies more effective.

Current FNST visitors showed the highest preference for pursuing social opportunities, followed closely by environmental appreciation opportunities, and lastly by independent opportunities. Although there is an overall preference for more natural, rustic settings with low social contact outside their own group, each desired opportunity is related to varying sets of setting characteristics ranging from primitive to develop which may be useful in identifying specific trail segments that match the current visitors wants, desires and needs. Marketing efforts toward current FNST users should focus on these opportunity/setting relationships. For instance FNST visitors pursuing environmental appreciation opportunities are mostly likely to desire to pursue these opportunities in areas that are primitive, along natural trails. Marketing areas such a Juniper Prairie Wilderness with an emphasis on these setting characteristics and desired opportunities may be beneficial. Similarly, those seeking social opportunities are most likely to prefer to engage in these opportunities within area that are semi-developed and allow for frequent social contact outside their own group. Marketing such as Little Big Econ State Forest or Goldhead Branch State park with an emphasis on these preferred settings and desired opportunities may help to capture the market segments attention.

Current non-FNST users showed the highest preference for pursuing environmental appreciation opportunities, followed by social opportunities, and were fairly neutral about pursuing independent opportunities. Similar to current FNST visitors, non-FNST visitors place an overall high preference on pursuing opportunities within more natural settings, where contact outside their own group was low. However, unlike FNST visitors, preferred setting characteristics as presented within this study were not able to explain as much variance within the data as they did for current FNST visitors. Mainly, there were no significant relationships found between preferences for settings and the desire to pursue environmental appreciation opportunities; the highest desired opportunity for this target market group. Of the two opportunities that did show relationships, the amount of variance the models explained were low, but significant which provides a starting point for understanding what types of settings will best contribute to a desired opportunity. In addition, the relationships found between desired opportunities and desired settings where different (contained a different set of setting variables) than for FNST visitors, indicating that while both target markets share similar preferences for trail settings, the opportunities they seek within those settings differ. Similar to current FNST visitors, marketing efforts toward non-FNST visitors should focus on these known setting and desired opportunity relationships.

In relation to place, the current state of knowledge and trail awareness may be a present barrier to trail visitation. Most FNST visitors were aware that Florida has a national scenic trail, however a third of FNST visitors were unaware that they had been using it. In addition, 60% of non-FNST were unaware that Florida had a national scenic trail. Furthermore, almost one-quarter of non-FNST visitors believed that they were on the trail when contacted when in fact they were not. Both of these results indicate a need to promote awareness about the trails presence at the community level. Currently, trail brochures and kiosk information is used to help disseminate information about the trail at trailheads through which the trail traverses. The current lack of trail awareness may serve as an indicator that other forms of trail promotion, both at sites where the trail is and where it is not, are needed.

LIMITATIONS

The sample size for this study is relatively small in comparison to the known number of visitors in which the Florida National Scenic Trail receives annually (Sanborn et al., 2005; Albritton et al., 2006). Therefore, the results of this study should not be generalized to all visitors to the Florida Trail. Rather, the information contained within this report should be used help gain perspective of who FNST visitors are not, and identify areas of future marketing research interest(s). In relation, response rates were significantly different between current visitors and non-visitors to the trail. Also, FNST visitors who had satisfactory experience along the trial were more likely to complete the mail back survey than those who did not. Therefore, the results of this study may not be entirely representative of all current FNST users. In addition, marketing studies were conducted at state parks only do to an inability to obtain a sufficient amount of surveys from other recreation areas managed by other public agencies. As a result, the findings within this study should only be interpreted as being representative of state park visitors and may not be representative of those non-FNST visitors who pursue desired recreation opportunities at other recreation sites.

FUTURE RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

The results of this study provided information about the product (opportunities) that can be marketed for FNST trail experiences and the place (setting) in which these opportunities could be pursued. Although this information provides an initial understanding of potential market segments, there are several areas of future research that could be explored based on this study's findings to help pursue the promotion of these opportunities.

- Previous research has supported a relationship between activities, settings, and opportunities, however weak or no relationships were found between these variables for non-FNST visitors. Future research should work to address what desired opportunities for this market segment are dependent on. This knowledge may be more effective in promoting FNST trail opportunities, especially those related to environmental appreciation.

- The results of this study indicated that current on-site awareness promotion of the trail may not be as effective as managers and trail planner's desire. Future research should work to identify which marketing strategies are the most effective at capturing a target audience members attention and which promotional tools are more likely to push them to visit the trail.
- When thinking about positioning the trail for marketing, it must be done in away that considers its competition such as state parks through which the trail does not traverse. This will require in-depth knowledge about all the places through which the trail does traverse in order to identify what makes those areas unique enough to stand apart from the competition. Future research should work to better understand what characteristics draw an individual to visit a site and not to others.
- Lastly, both FNST and non-FNST visitors were demographically similar, with little representation of ethnic minority groups or younger individuals in the 18-39 age range. Future research should examine some of the constraints of this population in order to develop marketing strategies that would allow these non-visitors to overcome these barriers.

REFERENCES

- Activeliving.org (2006). Designing Active Communities; Promoting Healthy Lives. Retrieved online from www.activeliving.org on September 3, 2007.
- Albritton, R., Stein, T.V., and Thompson, T. (2005). Florida National Scenic Trail Visitor Assessment: Annual Report 2004-2005. Submitted to U.S.D.A., Forest Service, National Forests in Florida. Gainesville, FL. School of Forest Resources and Conservation, University of Florida.
- Albritton, R., Denny, C., and Stein, T.V. (2006). Florida National Scenic Trail Visitor Assessment: Annual Report 2005-2006. Submitted to U.S.D.A., Forest Service, National Forests in Florida. Gainesville, FL. School of Forest Resources and Conservation, University of Florida.
- Bright, A. (2000). The Role of Social Marketing in Leisure and Recreation Management. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1): 12-17.
- Borrie, W.T., Christensen, N., Watson, A.E., Miller, T.A., and McCollum, D.W. (2002). Public Purpose Recreation Marketing: A Focus on the Relationships Between the Public and Public Lands. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 20: 46-68.
- Havitz, M.E. (1988). Marketing is not synonymous with commercialism. *Parks and Recreation*, 23(5): 24-36.
- Kerstetter, D.L., Zinn, H.C., Graefe, A.R., and Chen, P. (2002). Perceived Constraints to State Park Visitation: A Comparison of Former-Users and Non-Users. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 20: 61-75.
- Knopf, R. C. (1990). Marketing public lands: Is it the right thing to do? *Parks and Recreation*, 25:56-61.
- Mah, M.W., Deshpande, S., and Rothschild, M.L. (2006). Social Marketing: A Behavior Change Technology for Infection Control. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 34: 452-457.
- Sanborn, A. Belcher, A., Albritton, R. and Stein, T.V. (2004). Florida National Scenic Trail Visitor Assessment: Annual Report 2003-2004. Submitted to U.S.D.A. Forest Service, National Forests in Florida. Gainesville, FL. School of Forest Resources and Conservation, University of Florida.
- Smith, W.A. (1999). *Academy for Educational Development*. Washington, D.C.
- Vogt, C.A., Andereck, K.L. (2002). Introduction to Special Issue on Park Marketing. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 20: 1-10.

APPENDIX I:
ON-SITE SURVEY

Florida Outdoor Recreation Visitor Study

Please take a couple of minutes to fill out this short form. See the letter enclosed in your envelope for details on the study.

To be completed by surveyor if interview given on-site:

Surveyor: _____ **Date:** _____ **Monitoring** ____

Site: _____ **Time:** _____ **Marketing** ____

Access Point: _____ **Mailback #:** _____

1. Did you participate in any recreation activities along the Florida National Scenic Trail today?

___ Yes ___ No ___ I don't know

2. Was this your first time on this particular trail? ___ Yes ___ No (☞ Go to Question 2)

3. Over the past year, how many times have you used this trail?

___ None ___ 13-20 times
___ 2-6 times ___ 21-30 times
___ 7-12 times ___ more than 30 (# ___)

4. Did you enter and exit the trail at the same location?

___ Yes
___ No → Enter _____ Exit _____

5. About how long did you spend on the trail today?

___ 1 hour or less ___ Half a day ___ More than 1 day (____ number of days)
___ A few hours ___ One whole day

6. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the perfect experience, how would you rate your experience on this trail? _____

7. If you did not rate your trail experience as a 10, can you explain why not?

8. Are there any other improvements you would like to see on the trail? _____

9. Including yourself, how many people were you with?

_____ number of people (___ #males, ___ #females)

9a. Gender of participant (Mark don't ask)

___ Male ___ Female

10. What type of group are you traveling with? _____

11. What year were you born? _____

12. From the list of activities, please rank the three activities that best describe the reason you and your group visited the trail today.

a. Hiking/Walking	f. Photography	k. Birdwatching	p. other: _____
b. Biking	g. Backpacking	l. Viewing cultural resources	
c. OHV Riding	h. Nature study	m. Trail maintenance work	1 st : _____
d. Jogging/Running	i. Hunting	n. View Scenery	2 nd : _____
e. Picnicking	j. Camping	o. Fishing	3 rd : _____

Participant Name: _____ **Address:** _____

City: _____ **St.** _____ **Zip Code:** _____ **County:** _____

APPENDIX II:
MAIL BACK SURVEY

Florida Outdoor Recreation Visitor Study

You were recently contacted by an interviewer while visiting one of Florida's public lands. This survey is designed to find out more about your recreation experience in the areas in which you were contacted. Sharing your opinions will help Florida's public land management agencies better plan for your needs. As you fill out this survey, **please think about the visit when you were interviewed by our researcher.** Thanks for your help!

Section 1: Trip Characteristics

1. Please write down the name of the recreation area where you were contacted by our researcher.

2. On this trip, what activity were you participating in when contacted by our researcher? _____

3. On this trip, how many miles did you travel in the area in which you were contacted?

- Less than a mile 3-5 miles More than 10 miles (# of miles _____)
 1-2 miles 5-10 miles

4. On this trip, how much time did you spend in the area where you were contacted?

- Less than ½ a day → Please continue to Section 2
 ½ a day or a whole day → Please continue to Section 2
 More than a day → Please continue to Question 4

5. If you spent more than one day in the area, how many days did you spend? _____

6. If you spent more than one day in the area, where did you stay overnight?

- At a nearby hotel/condo
 At a campground off the trail
 In a tent along the trail
 In an established campground along the trail
 In a nearby residence of friends or family

6. People go to particular areas and participate in recreation activities for any number of reasons. Listed below are some possible reasons you might have had for recreating along the trail the day you were contacted. Please indicate in column A how important each experience was for you during your visit. In column B, please indicate how much you were able to attain this experience during your visit.

Experiences	(A) Importance					(B) Attainment			
	Not at all important	Not very important	Neither	Very Important	Most Important	Did not Attain	Somewhat Attained	Moderately Attained	Totally Attained
Learn about history and culture of the area	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Promote physical fitness	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Reduce tensions and stress from everyday life	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Escape noise/crowds	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Learn about the natural environment of the area	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Be with friends and family	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Feel a sense of independence	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Take risks	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Engage in personal/spiritual reflection	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Explore the area and natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Challenge myself and achieve personal goals	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Depend on my skills and abilities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Enjoy nature	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Strengthen family kinship	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Be in an area where I feel secure and safe	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Meet new people	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4

7. Please indicate how important each of the following items were in choosing your leisure destination for this trip.

Reason for Visit	Not at all important	Not very Important	Neutral	Very Important	Most Important
Historical, military, or archeological sites	1	2	3	4	5
Local crafts or handiwork	1	2	3	4	5
Interesting small towns	1	2	3	4	5
Good fishing	1	2	3	4	5
Good hunting	1	2	3	4	5
Manageable size to see everything	1	2	3	4	5
Wilderness and undisturbed nature	1	2	3	4	5
Chance to see wildlife/birds	1	2	3	4	5
To see the natural water features	1	2	3	4	5
Good environmental quality of air, water, and soil	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of campgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5

8. When participating in the activity that you were engaged in when contacted by our researcher do you generally prefer....

Statement	Not at all Important	Not very Important	Neutral	Very Important	Most Important
To travel in areas that seem to be completely natural, untouched by humans	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas that are somewhat modified but appear natural	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas that are substantially modified with human-made and natural features	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas where roads, buildings and power lines clearly dominate	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas that allow pedestrian use only	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas that allow multiple non-motorized uses; hiking, biking, horseback riding	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas that allow a mix of motorized and non-motorized use	1	2	3	4	5
To travel in areas that allow only motorized use	1	2	3	4	5
To travel on trails that are natural; dirt or grass	1	2	3	4	5
To travel on trails that are paved	1	2	3	4	5
To travel on trails that are linear	1	2	3	4	5
To travel on loop trails	1	2	3	4	5
To have very little contact with people outside my travel group (less than 6 people)	1	2	3	4	5
To have little contact with people outside my travel group (6-15 groups per day)	1	2	3	4	5
To have moderate contact with other people outside my travel group (30+ groups per day)	1	2	3	4	5
To have constant contact with other people	1	2	3	4	5

10. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements **about the place you were contacted.**

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Few people know this place like I do	1	2	3	4	5
This place is very special to me	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that I can really be myself at this place	1	2	3	4	5
When I am at this place others see me the way I want them to see me	1	2	3	4	5
I feel a sense of pride in my heritage when I am at this place	1	2	3	4	5
This place is a special place for my family	1	2	3	4	5
Many important family memories are tied to this place	1	2	3	4	5
This place contributes to the character of my community	1	2	3	4	5
My community's history is strongly tied to this place	1	2	3	4	5
My community's economy depends on this place	1	2	3	4	5
My family's income or livelihood depends on this place	1	2	3	4	5
Florida's economy depends on this place	1	2	3	4	5
This place is important in protecting the landscape from development	1	2	3	4	5
This place is important for providing habitat for wildlife	1	2	3	4	5
This place is important in protecting water quality	1	2	3	4	5
I am very attached to this place	1	2	3	4	5
No other place can compare to this place	1	2	3	4	5
This place means a lot to me	1	2	3	4	5
I feel this place is a part of me	1	2	3	4	5
Visiting this place says a lot about who I am	1	2	3	4	5
This place is very special to me	1	2	3	4	5
I identify strongly with this place	1	2	3	4	5
This place is the best for what I like to do	1	2	3	4	5
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than any other	1	2	3	4	5
The things I do at this place I would enjoy just as much at a similar site	1	2	3	4	5
Doing what I do at this place is more important to me than doing it in any other	1	2	3	4	5
I wouldn't substitute any other area for doing the types of things I do at this place	1	2	3	4	5

Section 3: Recreation Opportunities

1. To the best of your ability, please provide us with a list of other recreation areas within Florida that you may have visited within the past 12 months.

2. Does Florida have a National Scenic Trail?

- Yes
 No → go to question 4 in this section
 I don't know

3. Did you hike on the Florida National Scenic Trail on the day that you were contacted?

- Yes → Go to question 3 of this section
 No → Go to question 4 of this section
 I don't know → Go to question 4 of this section

3. Other than the trail you were hiking the day our researchers contacted you, have you hiked any other sections of the Florida National Scenic Trail?

- Yes → Please name the section(s) hiked: _____
 No

4. If you have heard of the Florida National Scenic Trail, please indicate how you first learned about it? (check only one)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or Family | <input type="checkbox"/> Roadside Signs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Website, please specify:
_____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Guidebook |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Travel Agent | <input type="checkbox"/> Brochure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Magazine, please specify:
_____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper Article |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't remember, not sure |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify _____ |

5. Are you a member of the Florida Trail Association?

- Yes → If yes, how long have you been a member of the Association?
 1 year or less 6-10 Years
 2-5 Years More than 10 Years
 No

6. Are you familiar with the Florida Trail Association?

- Yes → If yes, how did you learn about the Florida Trail Association? (check all that apply)
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or Family | <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper Article |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Website, | <input type="checkbox"/> Guidebook |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Travel Agent | <input type="checkbox"/> Brochure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Magazine | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't remember, not sure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Signs | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: _____ |
- No

Section 4: Community Benefits

Regardless of how far you live from the site in which you were contacted, we would like to know your opinion about how this place benefits local communities. Please read each benefit item in the list below. In column A, please indicate how important you think this benefit is to communities. In column B, please indicate the degree to which you think **YOUR** community attains each benefit from this place.

Benefit	(A) Importance					(B) Attainment			
	Very Unimportant	Unimportant	Neither	Important	Very Important	Does Not Attain	Somewhat Attains	Moderately Attains	Fully Attains
A stronger sense of community togetherness or cohesion	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A stronger sense of family bonds within the community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A greater ability to preserve small-town feeling of the community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A natural setting in which the community takes great pride in	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A greater retention of distinctive natural landscape features	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
More community involvement in recreation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Heightened sense of community satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Better maintenance of community infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Greater retention of community's distinctive architecture	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A feeling of community pride	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Improved care for community aesthetics	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Feeling that the community is a special place to live	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Living in a healthy environment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A greater concern for the natural environment among residents	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Increased knowledge about the area's cultural resources	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A chance for local people to maintain an outdoor-oriented lifestyle	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Opportunities for residents to grow spiritually	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Opportunities for exercise that improve people's health	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Having a better sense of place within the community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Providing a good quality of life	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Having a more stable economy within the community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Increased job opportunities within the community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Attracting tourism dollars to the community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Having a more stable economy for the surrounding region	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A sense of security that the natural environment will not be lost	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A place to conserve various natural and unique ecosystems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Knowing conserved natural resources exists for future generations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
A higher quality of life	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX III:
INDIVIDUAL SITE INFORMATION

Ocala National Forest

Table 14. Demographic information of Ocala National Forest Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	40	60.0
	Female		40.0
Age	60 or older	42	22.0
	50-59 years old		26.8
	40-49 years old		19.5
	30-39 years old		7.3
	18-29 years old		24.4

Table 15. Trip characteristics for Ocala National Forest Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	42	56.1
	No		43.9
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	42	57.1
	2-6		28.6
	7-12		0.0
	13 or more		11.9
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	42	16.7
	A few hours		28.6
	Half a day		21.4
	One whole day		7.1
	More than a day		26.2
Experience	10	41	14.3
	9		23.8
	8		26.2
	7		16.4
	6 or below		1.5
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	27	22.2
	31-60 miles		25.9
	61-120 miles		14.8
	121 miles or more		3.7
	Out of State visitors		33.3

Table 16. Group Characteristics of Ocala National Forest Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	42	31.0
	Significant Other		14.3
	Friends		7.1
	Organized Group		16.7
	Family		31.0
Group Size	1	41	31.0
	2		33.3
	3		7.1
	4		11.9
	5 or more		16.7
Number of Males	0	41	2.4
	1		63.4
	2		14.6
	3		17.1
	4 or more		2.4
Number of Females	0	41	0.0
	1		55.6
	2		33.3
	3		7.4
	4 or more		3.7

Top 3 primary activities engaged in along the trail

1. Hiking
2. Exercise
3. Backpacking

Top 3 motivations for visiting the trail

1. Enjoy Nature
2. Escape noise and crowds
3. Explore the natural environment

CROSS FLORIDA GREENWAY

Table 17. Demographic information of CFG Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	93	48.1
	Female		41.9
Age	60 or older	92	30.4
	50-59 years old		14.1
	40-49 years old		18.5
	30-39 years old		17.4
	18-29 years old		19.6

Table 18. Trip characteristics for CFG Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	94	26.6
	No		73.4
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	93	21.5
	2-6		17.2
	7-12		8.6
	13 or more		52.7
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	94	70.2
	A few hours		26.6
	Half a day		3.2
	One whole day		0.0
	More than a day		0.0
Experience	10	94	50.0
	9		10.6
	8		23.4
	7		12.8
	6 or below		3.2
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	84	84.5
	31-60 miles		2.4
	61-120 miles		6.0
	121 miles or more		2.4
	Out of State visitors		4.8

Table 19. Group Characteristics of CFG Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	90	37.8
	Significant Other		4.4
	Friends		14.4
	Organized Group		1.1
	Family		37.8
	Friends & Family		3.3
Group Size	1	93	36.9
	2		41.1
	3		12.6
	4		4.2
	5 or more		5.2
Number of Males	0	91	18.7
	1		61.5
	2		14.3
	3		4.4
	4 or more		1.1
Number of Females	0	84	25.0
	1		51.2
	2		15.5
	3		6.0
	4 or more		2.4

Top 3 primary reasons (activities) for visiting the trail that day

1. Hiking/Walking
2. Exercise
3. Biking

Top 3 Motivations for Visiting the Trail

1. Promote Physical Fitness
2. Enjoy Nature
3. Be in a Safe Area

GOLDHEAD BRANCH STATE PARK

Table 20. Demographic information of Goldhead Branch SP Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	64	67.2
	Female		32.8
Age	60 or older	66	19.7
	50-59 years old		15.2
	40-49 years old		27.3
	30-39 years old		28.8
	18-29 years old		9.1

Table 21. Trip characteristics for Goldhead Branch SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	67	49.3
	No		50.7
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	66	65.2
	2-6		28.8
	7-12		3.0
	13 or more		1.5
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	67	40.3
	A few hours		40.3
	Half a day		3.0
	One whole day		1.5
	More than a day		14.9
Experience	10	67	29.9
	9		20.9
	8		26.9
	7		26.4
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	60	58.3
	31-60 miles		15.0
	61-120 miles		18.3
	121 miles or more		5.0
	Out of State visitors		3.3

Table 22. Group Characteristics of Goldhead Branch SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	65	12.3
	Significant Other		9.2
	Friends		7.7
	Organized Group		12.3
	Family		56.9
Group Size	1	67	11.9
	2		23.9
	3		16.4
	4		16.4
	5 or more		31.4
Number of Males	0	64	3.1
	1		45.3
	2		23.4
	3		7.8
	4 or more		23.5
Number of Females	0	57	7.0
	1		33.3
	2		19.3
	3		17.5
	4 or more		22.9

Top 3 primary reasons for visiting the trail that day

1. Hiking
2. Camping
3. Viewing Scenery

Top 3 Motivations for Visiting the Trail

1. Be with friends and family
2. Explore the environment
3. Escape noise and crowds

TORREYA STATE PARK

Table 23. Demographic information of Torreya SP Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	28	39.3
	Female		60.7
Age	60 or older	28	25.0
	50-59 years old		17.9
	40-49 years old		39.3
	30-39 years old		10.7
	18-29 years old		7.1

Table 24. Trip characteristics for Torreya SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	28	60.7
	No		39.3
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	24	70.8
	2-6		25.0
	7-12		4.2
	13 or more		0.0
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	28	28.6
	A few hours		50.0
	Half a day		14.3
	One whole day		0.0
	More than a day		7.1
Experience	10	28	53.6
	9		10.7
	8		10.7
	7		21.4
	6 or below		3.6
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	28	7.1
	31-60 miles		67.9
	61-120 miles		14.3
	121 miles or more		10.7
	Out of State visitors		0.0

Table 25. Group characteristics of Torreya SP visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	25	8.0
	Significant Other		8.0
	Friends		16.0
	Organized Group		8.0
	Friends & Family		4.0
	Family		56.0
Group Size	1	28	7.1
	2		53.6
	3		10.7
	4		10.7
	5 or more		17.8
Number of Males	0	28	10.7
	1		53.6
	2		17.9
	3		7.1
	4 or more		10.7
Number of Females	0	28	3.6
	1		60.7
	2		21.4
	3		3.6
	4 or more		10.7

Top 3 primary reasons (activities) for visiting the trail that day

1. Hiking/Walking
2. Bird watching
3. Picnicking

Top 3 Motivations for Visiting the Trail

1. Enjoy Nature
2. Explore the environment
3. Be with friends and family

BIG SHOALS STATE PARK

Table 26. Demographic information of Big Shoals SP Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	11	81.8
	Female		18.2
Age	60 or older	11	27.3
	50-59 years old		0.0
	40-49 years old		9.1
	30-39 years old		45.5
	18-29 years old		18.2

Table 27. Trip characteristics for Big Shoals SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	11	45.5
	No		54.5
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	8	25.5
	2-6		50
	7-12		12.5
	13 or more		12.5
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	11	36.4
	A few hours		63.6
	Half a day		0.0
	One whole day		0.0
	More than a day		0.0
Experience	10	11	9.1
	9		18.2
	8		36.4
	7		27.3
	6 or below		9.1
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	10	20.0
	31-60 miles		10.0
	61-120 miles		40.0
	121 miles or more		30.0
	Out of State visitors		0.0

Table 28. Group characteristics of Big Shoals SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	11	9.1
	Significant Other		9.1
	Friends		36.4
	Family		45.5
Group Size	1	11	9.1
	2		72.7
	3		9.1
	4 or more		9.1
Number of Males	0	11	0.0
	1		63.6
	2		18.2
	3		9.1
Number of Females	4 or more	11	9.1
	0		36.4
	1		54.5
	2		0.0
	3 or more		9.1

Top 3 primary reasons (activities) for visiting the trail that day

1. Hiking/Walking
2. Biking
3. Bird Watching

Top 3 Motivations for Visiting the Trail

1. Enjoy Nature
2. Explore the Environment
3. Reduce Stress and Tension from Everyday Life

O'LENO STATE PARK

Table 29. Demographic information of O'Leno SP Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	20	60.0
	Female		40.0
Age	60 or older	20	30.0
	50-59 years old		20.0
	40-49 years old		25.0
	30-39 years old		15.0
	18-29 years old		10.0

Table 30. Trip characteristics for O'Leno Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	20	45.0
	No		55.0
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	13	30.8
	2-6		61.5
	7-12		0.0
	13 or more		7.7
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	19	57.9
	A few hours		21.1
	Half a day		5.3
	One whole day		0.0
	More than a day		15.8
Experience	10	20	45.0
	9		15.0
	8		25.0
	7		15.0
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	18	27.8
	31-60 miles		11.1
	61-120 miles		27.8
	121 miles or more		16.7
	Out of State visitors		16.7

Table 31. Group Characteristics of O’Leno SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	20	15.0
	Significant Other		5.0
	Friends		35.0
	Friends & Family		5.0
	Family		40.0
Group Size	1	20	15.0
	2		50.0
	3		5.0
	4		15.0
	5 or more		15.0
Number of Males	0	20	10.0
	1		55.0
	2		15.0
	3		5.0
	4 or more		15.0
Number of Females	0	20	20.0
	1		50.0
	2		15.0
	3		10.0
	4 or more		5.0

Top 3 primary reasons (activities) for visiting the trail that day

1. Hiking/Walking
2. Biking
3. View Scenery

Top 3 Motivations for Visiting the Trail

1. Reduce Stress and Tension
2. Enjoy Nature
3. Explore the Environment

HIGHLAND HAMMOCK STATE PARK

Table 32. Demographic information of Highland Hammock SP Visitors (on-site survey)

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Gender	Male	105	54.3
	Female		45.7
Age	60 or older	104	22.1
	50-59 years old		18.3
	40-49 years old		26.9
	30-39 years old		16.3
	18-29 years old		16.3

Table 33. Trip characteristics for Highlands Hammock SP Visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
First Time Visiting the Trail	Yes	104	42.3
	No		57.7
Past Visits in the last 12 months	0-1	84	39.3
	2-6		48.8
	7-12		6.0
	13 or more		8.0
Time spent on the trail	An hour or less	105	86.5
	A few hours		4.8
	Half a day		0.0
	One whole day		0.0
	More than a day		8.7
Experience	10	105	30.5
	9		17.1
	8		26.7
	7		16.2
	6 or below		9.6
Approximate distance traveled to site	0-30 miles	98	33.7
	31-60 miles		11.2
	61-120 miles		30.6
	121 miles or more		9.2
	Out of State visitors		15.3

Table 34. Group Characteristics of Highland Hammock SP visitors

Variable	Label	n	Valid %
Group Type	Alone	104	6.7
	Significant Other		6.7
	Friends		14.4
	Organized Group		4.8
	Friends & Family		6.8
	Family		60.6
Group Size	1	105	6.7
	2		41.9
	3		10.5
	4		17.1
	5 or more		23.8
Number of Males	0	104	13.5
	1		46.2
	2		22.1
	3		3.8
	4 or more		14.4
Number of Females	0	104	9.6
	1		42.3
	2		25.0
	3		12.5
	4 or more		9.6

Top 3 primary reasons (activities) for visiting the trail that day

1. Hiking/walking
2. Bird Watching
3. Photography

Top 3 Motivations for Visiting the Trail

1. Enjoy Nature
2. Explore the Environment
3. Reduce Stress and Tension

