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This study was based on a parent project funded by New York State’s Aid to Localities Fund focused on the rail line between the cities of Cortland and Binghamton. In the spring of 2007, New York State Senator Thomas Libous requested a study of the potential benefits and feasibility of this excursion train. The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to use an excursion train as a leisure activity. In order to reach an appropriate sample population a questionnaire survey was administered in four different settings: via telephone, at the Central New York Maple Festival, on the train servicing the Maple Festival and at the Great Cortland Pumpkinfest. A total of 1160 out of 2311 respondents participated. Young adults were defined as those aged 18-30, while older adults were over age 30. The study tested four hypotheses. The first was that young adults will rank lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information highest among their constraints. The second hypothesis stated that constraints will be related to age such that: young adults will be more constrained by lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information than older adults; young adults will be less constrained by lack of an activity partner, concerns for safety, and a previous bad experience than older adults; and young adults’ level of constraint will not differ from older adults on driving distance or lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities. The third hypothesis proposed that interest in themes and destinations will be related to age such that: young adults will be more supportive of those excursions outlining alcohol use than older adults; young adults will be less supportive of those excursions with a family orientation and theatre activities than older adults; and young adults will not differ on their level of support for trains as a shuttle service for paddlers, anglers, or bikers and for excursions to sporting events. The final hypothesis stated that overall, older adults will be more supportive and interested in an excursion train in their community than young adults. Results indicated that young adults were more interested and supportive in almost every single instance. However, young adults were also more constrained than their older counterparts. This information could be valuable to recreation practitioners in the future, giving insight into what young adults are looking for in their recreational pursuits.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 2007 New York State Senator Thomas Libous approached the Recreation, Parks and Leisure Studies Department at the State University of New York (SUNY) College at Cortland about conducting a study of the rail line (New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad) that ran between Cortland and Binghamton, New York. The state Senate agreed to fund the study as part of the 2007-2008 Aid to Localities Fund. SUNY Cortland’s graduate level recreation research and evaluation class utilized part of the grant to implement a study determining the feasibility and desirability of the excursion train, while another portion of the grant provided financial support to the rail line so it could offer tourist excursions during the course of the study. In 2008, Senator Libous extended the grant for a second year. This study was a replication (again looking at feasibility and offering financial support) and an extension of (adding in, for the first time, an economic impact component) the first study.

The present study is an off-shoot of the aforementioned one, focusing on young adults and the constraints they face concerning excursion train use. Given the specificity of the topic, relevant literature was few and far between. However, much research had been conducted in the broader area of leisure constraints (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford, Jackson & Godbey, 1991). This study, in conjunction with the rare
investigations into young adults’ leisure choices (Shinew & Parry, 2005; Stebbins, 1997, 2001) and best practices of existing excursion train lines (Todd, et al., 2008), provided the groundwork for the relevancy of and need for this study.

The body of knowledge on leisure constraints cannot be discussed without mentioning Crawford and Godbey’s 1987 study, in which they made a three-tiered constraint categorization: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural. They proposed that far too much previous research had focused on the linear model that preference and participation had one singular relationship. Their opposition to this way of thinking was the catalyst for them to develop their three-dimensional model. They claimed that a prospective participant was affected by more influences than just preference and presence/lack of barriers, such as: “stress, depression, anxiety, religiosity, kin and non-kin reference group attitudes, prior socialization into specific leisure activities, perceived self-skill, and subjective evaluations of the appropriateness and availability of various leisure activities” (p. 122), spouses, partners, friends, siblings, children, and/or parents, “family life-cycle stage, family financial resources, season, climate, the scheduling of work time, availability of opportunity (and knowledge of such availability)…” (p. 124). Of these varying types, structural constraints, particularly lack of time and lack of money, were cited most often in study after study (Jackson & Dunn, 1991; Mannell & Zuzanek, 1991; Nyaupare & Andereck, 2008; Pennington-Grey & Kerstetter, 2002; Shaw, Bonen & McCabe, 1991; Shores, Scott & Floyd, 2007).

In 1991 Crawford and others developed this idea of categorization further. They proclaimed that a hierarchical relationship exists between intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints. The hierarchical model was three-fold. Negotiation was the
first concept. In order to commit to a recreational activity the participant must navigate and negotiate through the barriers. Not all constraints are created equally is the second idea. The researchers found that perhaps intrapersonal constraints are the most powerful; so powerful in persuading one way or another, in fact, that the participant might never get a chance to be influenced by other types of constraints (interpersonal and structural).

Finally, the last concept in their hierarchy is that social standing of the prospective participant is perhaps more influential than any of the constraint classifications. Although its influence is less direct than intrapersonal, interpersonal, or structural constraints, social standing plays strongly into how participants both perceive and experience constraints.

Though many studies have been conducted on leisure constraints, research was lacking when it came to those specifically influencing young adults. However, Stebbins (1997, 2001) and Shinew and Parry (2005) investigated constraints from a different angle. Rather than investigate what barriers exist for young adults, they examined in which leisure activities young adults seek out and readily participate. Stebbins (1997) proposes the importance of understanding casual leisure in order to decipher what motivates young adults. Casual leisure is an “immediately, intrinsically rewarding, relatively short-lived pleasurable activity requiring little or no special training to enjoy it” (p. 18). Another benefit of casual leisure was found to be the promotion and preservation of interpersonal relationships (Stebbins, 2001). Stebbins thinks that young adults, particularly college students, seek out and enjoy casual leisure. Furthermore, he believes it is this pursuit of enjoyment that separates young adults from other age groups. They want enjoyment and pleasure and they want it immediately; simply put, they are hedonic.
According to Stebbins (1997), recreational alcohol use falls into the category of casual leisure. This idea was the catalyst for Shinew and Parry (2005) to study the roles of drinking in college students' lives as casual leisure. They proposed that recreational drinking is both hedonic and fosters interpersonal relationships. They found that the student participants cited "social reasons" and for "fun" as the top reasons they drink, supporting the notion that young adults seek casual leisure for instant pleasure and to build and maintain interpersonal relationships. Thus, Stebbins (1997, 2001) and Shinew and Parry (2005) made a compelling argument that alcohol could be used to entice young adults to participate in leisure activities.

In 2008 Todd and others interviewed 20 existing tourist train lines to examine best practices. The train companies shared their marketing strategies and user patterns. Consistently families and senior citizens were the targeted audience, and train lines often cited that they were “family-friendly.” The most popular train event was a holiday themed ride while wine tasting event trains were almost nonexistent. Is this theme overlooked because young adults have historically not been interested? Or is it because the train lines have not done enough to interest the young adults? It is difficult to determine which one influences the other, but it is an interesting concept to consider in determining which constraints influence young adults’ desire and ability to ride excursion trains.

Using the foundation laid by leisure constraint models (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford, et al., 1991) in addition to the theories of casual leisure (Stebbins, 1997, 2001), recreational alcohol as casual leisure (Shinew & Parry, 2005), and best practices of existing train lines (Todd, et al., 2008), the present study links the four concepts.
Sufficient research is lacking in the area of young adults and leisure constraints, and is absent in the area of constraints interfering with young adults' desire and ability to ride excursion trains as a leisure activity. The present study intends to fill this void.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between constraints and young adults' desire and ability to use excursion trains as a leisure activity.

**Hypotheses**

(1) Young adults will rank lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information highest among their constraints.

(2) Constraints will be related to age such that:
   a. Young adults will be more constrained by lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information than older adults.
   b. Young adults will be less constrained by lack of activity partner, concerns for safety, and a previous bad experience than older adults.
   c. Young adults’ level of constraint will not differ from older adults on driving distance or lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities.
(3) Interest in themes and destinations will be related to age such that:
   a. Young adults will be more supportive of those excursions outlining alcohol use than older adults.
   b. Young adults will be less supportive of those excursions with a family orientation and theatre activities than older adults.
   c. Young adults will not differ on their level of support for trains as shuttle service for paddlers, anglers, or bikers and for excursions to sporting events.

(4) Overall, older adults will be more supportive and interested in an excursion train in their community than young adults.

Delimitations

The scope of this study was delimited to adult residents of the south central region of New York State, specifically the six counties surrounding the rail line that runs between Cortland and Binghamton, as well as attendees of the 2007 Central New York Maple Festival, which draws a Northeast regional crowd, and The 2007 Great Cortland Pumpkinstfest, primarily serving local residents. On-site train users were delimited to those riding the 2007 Maple Festival Train. The measurement of dependent and independent variables was delimited to an instrument designed by the investigators.
**Limitations**

This study may be limited because of the narrow scope of the sample. The young adults from six counties in Central New York do not speak for all young adults. Nor does the train running to and from the Maple Festival, the Maple Festival itself or the Pumpkinfest represent all excursion trains and potential sites. These shortcomings might hinder the generalizability of the findings.

**Definitions of Terms**

(1) Young Adult- those aged 18 to 30 (Bernard, 1988; Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter, 2002; Shinew & Parry, 2005).

(2) Excursion Train- "a passenger train for which the purpose of the ride is not to get somewhere quickly, but to enjoy viewing scenery, dining, or other special events on the train, or the experience of riding the train on the way to a community event" (Todd, et al., 2008).

(3) Constraints- barriers to leisure participation (Crawford & Godbey, 1987). In this study, constraints are measured on a 3-point scale: 1-“never,” 2-“occasionally,” 3-“frequently.” Three categories of constraints exist:
a. Intrapersonal- "individual psychological states and attributes which interact with leisure preferences.... Examples include stress, depression, anxiety, religiosity, kin and non-kin reference group attitudes, prior socialization into specific leisure activities, perceived self-skill, and subjective evaluations of the appropriateness and availability of various leisure activities" (Crawford & Godbey, 1987, p. 122).

b. Interpersonal- human-to-human relationships (such as lack of a partner). Influence from spouses, partners, friends, siblings, children, and/or parents fall under this category of constraint (Crawford & Godbey, 1987).

c. Structural- those constraints that come from an external, non-human source (lack of information, lack of facility). Examples of these would be “family life-cycle stage, family financial resources, season, climate, the scheduling of work time, availability of opportunity (and knowledge of such availability)…” (Crawford & Godbey, 1987, p. 124) and lack of money (Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter, 2002).

(4) Casual Leisure- an “immediately, intrinsically rewarding, relatively short-lived pleasurable activity requiring little or no special training to enjoy it” (Stebbins, 1997, p. 18).

(5) Interest- Attraction to a specific event, eliciting potential participation. In this study, level of interest is measured for multiple events/themes on a 3-point scale: 1- “no,” 2- “maybe,” 3- “yes.”
(6) Support- Overall general approval, not necessarily eliciting participation. In this study level of support is measured with one question, where participants could choose one of the following three responses: 1- “not supportive,” 2- “slightly supportive,” 3- “very supportive.”
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between constraints and young adults' desire and ability to ride excursion trains as a leisure activity. Therefore, this chapter of related literature will be divided into the following sections: (1) leisure constraints: past research and history; (2) leisure and young adults; (3) constraints and travel/tourism; (4) constraints and excursion trains; (5) best practices of existing excursion train lines; and (6) cost and communication.

Leisure Constraints: Past Research and History

Just as recreation activities have evolved over time, the method of analyzing leisure constraints affecting them has also changed. At their most base level, leisure constraints divide people dichotomously: participants and non-participants. Those who choose to participate in a leisure activity either faced no constraints or overcame the ones they did. Non-participants choose not to engage in a leisure activity or were effectively prevented from doing so. However, leisure constraints have a much wider range, breadth,
and definition. Some theorists categorized constraints (e.g., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural) (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Hawkins, Peng, Hsieh & Eklund, 1999). Others analyzed constraints dichotomously into types, such as motivational versus physical; absolute versus relative; blocking versus inhibiting; temporary versus permanent (Crawford, et al., 1991); antecedent versus intervening (Jackson & Dunn, 1991); or blocking versus circumstantial (Stemerding, Oppewal & Timmermans, 1999).

Many studies also looked not only at the different types of constraints, but at how these constraints interacted with each other, such as in a hierarchical fashion (Jackson, Crawford & Godbey, 1993). Other studies looked at the relationship between constraints and intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and/or amotivation (Alexandris, Tsorbatzoudis & Grouious, 2002).

Crawford and Godbey (1987) point out the flaws in the aforementioned base level of leisure constraints. They mention that too many previous studies focused on one singular relationship between preferences, barriers and leisure participation. In this relationship, one starts with a preference and participates only if no barriers exist. Crawford and Godbey felt that this way of thinking was far too linear, with the assumption that a barrier can only intervene between preference for and participation in an activity. Working from this misrepresentation of leisure constraints, the researchers developed a three-dimensional conceptualization: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural.
Intrapersonal were those constraints that came from within the individual, such as state of mind. Examples of these include “stress, depression, anxiety, religiosity, kin and non-kin reference group attitudes, prior socialization into specific leisure activities, perceived self-skill, and subjective evaluations of the appropriateness and availability of various leisure activities” (Crawford & Godbey, 1987, p. 122).

Constraints that dealt with relationships between people (such as lack of a partner) were called interpersonal. Influence from spouses, partners, friends, siblings, children, and/or parents fall under this category of constraint.

Structural constraints were those that came from an external, non-human source (lack of information, lack of facility). Examples of these would be “family life-cycle stage, family financial resources, season, climate, the scheduling of work time, availability of opportunity (and knowledge of such availability)…” (Crawford & Godbey, 1987, p. 124).

Hawkins, et al., (1999) conducted a replication and extension study based on Crawford and Godbey’s 1987 founding work using 118 adults with mental retardation from 34 to 80 years of age. The researchers found a total of 20 specific constraints, all of which could be categorized as intrapersonal, interpersonal, or structural. The top six most cited leisure constraints were as follows: not having the appropriate equipment to do the activity (90 out of 118 cited this), not knowing how to do it (89), having someone else making the decisions (79), something that one does only with friends (therefore won’t do alone) (74), no one to teach the participant how to do the activity (53), and having no
place to do the activity (52). Each of these falls into one of three types of constraints. Not knowing how to do the activity was an intrapersonal constraint, while lack of equipment and having no place to do the activity were structural constraints. The other half of the items fell under interpersonal: something that one only does with friends, having someone else make the decisions, and having no one to teach the activity.

Crawford, et al. (1991) developed their hierarchical model based on an “internal-external dichotomy” (p. 310) classification of leisure constraints. They wanted to study whether or not an order of importance existed within intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints. Therefore, they proposed a hierarchical model of “leisure preferences” leading to “interpersonal compatibility and coordination” leading to “participation/non-participation” (p. 313). In this model, intrapersonal constraints directly influenced leisure preferences; interpersonal constraints came into play between the steps of leisure preferences and interpersonal compatibility and coordination, while structural constraints influenced the path between interpersonal compatibility and participation/non-participation.

Based on this model they established three propositions. First, “The Alignment of Constraints” considered what constraints the successful participant must encounter and overcome in order to continue the desired leisure activity. In order for someone to stick with his/her recreational choices, a fair bit of negotiation must take place, for he/she will encounter various constraints at each and every turn and level. A second proposition called “A Hierarchy of Importance” discussed the idea that not all constraints are equal in
their influence. In fact, intrapersonal are the most powerful and may be powerful enough that the person may never get a chance to be influenced by interpersonal and/or structural constraints. The last of the propositions was “A Hierarchy of Social Privilege.” This one stated that perhaps the most influential of the constraint classifications is the social standing of the prospective participant. Although its influence is less direct than intrapersonal, interpersonal, or structural constraints, social standing plays strongly into how potential participants perceive and experience constraints. This is a concept that Crawford, et al. (1991) feel has been downplayed significantly in previous studies, and as such, is an area for further research.

Jackson and Dunn (1991) focused on another nuance of leisure constraints. Their study proposed two questions: what are the “reasons for ceasing activities in which participation previously occurred on a regular basis?”; and what barriers do people encounter for “activities in which [they] currently do not participate but that they would like to start?” (p. 169). The results from this second question were of particular relevance to the present study.

The 4,044 respondents were asked what stopped them from participating in something they wanted to do. That is, if they desired to start participating in an activity, they were asked to elaborate on the activity, and then rate how important the reasons for their lack of participation were (1= not important; 4= very important). Results revealed that work commitments were cited most often as a reason for ceasing participation (68.9%), followed closely by family commitments (65.8%). Cost of equipment (68.7%)
and overcrowding at recreation facilities (65.8%) were the most common barriers to participation.

Alexandris, et al. (2002) looked at the relationship between various levels of motivation and constraints. The specific purpose of their study was to look at how sport participation was influenced by levels of motivation: intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation. For the sake of their study, the researchers used the notions that intrinsic motivation refers to “doing an activity for its own sake, for the pleasure and satisfaction derived simply from performing it” (p. 236), while extrinsic motivation refers to doing an activity “as a means to an end and not for [its] own sake” (p. 237). Amotivation quite simply refers to a lack of either intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivations. Participants are engaged in an activity for no solid purpose and could drop it at any moment; they have no attachment to it.

The concept of sport participation and motivation was part of a grander investigation. Though a larger number of respondents were contacted, only 257 fit the scope of the study. Using a combination of the leisure constraint scale and the Sport Motivation Scale, the researchers were able to decipher how various constraints affected level of participation through motivation levels. They hypothesized that the most powerful correlation would be found between amotivation and infrequent participation. Lack of knowledge, psychological interest, and time would all directly play into amotivation, causing a person to avoid participation.
However, this hypothesis proved unfounded, for no relationship of any significance was found between amotivation and interpersonal and structural constraints. The only finding was intrapersonal constraints’ significant positive influence on intrinsic motivation. The researchers felt that further study is needed specifically focusing the motivation/constraint relationship on leisure activities (rather than sports participation). In addition, these researchers found a lack of, more universal rating scales for both constraints and motivation.

**Leisure and Young Adults**

Little research has been specifically conducted on leisure constraints affecting young adults. Those studies that were completed could be divided into two basic categories: constraints and leisure choices. Results from the first category, constraints, ranged from the typical time and money (Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter, 2002) to work and family commitments, overcrowding, admission fees, equipment cost, and lack of partners (Jackson & Dunn, 1991). The second category, leisure choices, contained studies that talked not about constraints specifically but rather about what young adults like to do. These studies included research on how leisure fits into development from adolescence to young adulthood (Sylvia-Bobiak & Caldwell, 2006), the roles of
casual and serious leisure (Stebbins, 1997; 2001), and how young people chose to spend their leisure time, with a specific look at alcohol use (Shinew & Parry, 2005).

**Constraints**

Pennington-Gray and Kerstetter (2002) started with a three-fold purpose to their study of nature-based tourism constraints, one of which yielded relevant results for young adults. This purpose was to determine how certain constraints influenced an individual based on age, socioeconomic status, family life cycle and gender. They interviewed a total of 350 people who had a desire to participate in nature-based tourism, but could not do so. Of this total, 71 were between the ages of 18 and 30. The perceived constraints were broken into intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural. Structural constraints were found to be the most significant, encompassing money and time to participate, the weather, conditions of the roads and equipment. These constraints were found to impact respondents 30 years of age and under the most.

Jackson and Dunn (1991) surveyed 7,965 participants in a two-staged (1984 and 1988) interview process. Approximately 40% of those who had ceased participation in a once enjoyed activity were between 18 and 34 years of age. Of those who had a desire to start a new activity but had yet to do so, 37.8% were between 18 and 34 years old. Work commitments, family commitments and having no one to do an activity with were the top three constraints cited by the 18- to 34-year-olds who had ceased participation in
an activity, while equipment cost, admission fees, and over-crowding constrained the second group from starting a new activity.

**Leisure Choices**

While studying college students’ participation in physically active leisure, Sylvia-Bobiak and Caldwell (2006) touched upon some generalizations about this population and leisure. They pointed out that, because of the age and stage in their lives and development, college students have particular influences and motivations. A great deal of freedom of choice is often part of the college experience, and perhaps for the first time a young adult has a chance to make decisions about his or her life, including leisure activities. The researchers gathered their data by administering 874 surveys to undergraduate college students. Based on their findings they developed a structural model of influence and motivation. Not surprisingly, support from peers and family were found to have the most significant effect on the participants. These two concepts almost equally affected the students’ self-efficacy, which in turn impacted their structural and personal barriers as well as their ability to overcome said barriers. All of these factors were found to impact a college student’s participation in active leisure. Although this is not directly related to the purpose of the current study of leisure constraints young adults face, these findings are important to consider because they highlight to which influences young adults respond.
Likewise, understanding the differences between casual and serious leisure lends itself to a better grasp of what motivates young adults, particularly college students (Shinew & Parry, 2005; Stebbins, 1997; 2001). Stebbins (1997) defines both types. Casual leisure is an “immediately, intrinsically rewarding, relatively short-lived pleasurable activity requiring little or no special training to enjoy it” (p. 18). Its opposite, serious leisure, is defined as the “systematic pursuit of an amateur, a hobbyist, or a volunteer activity sufficiently substantial and interesting for the participant to find a career there in the acquisition and expression of a combination of its special skills, knowledge, and experience” (p. 17).

Stebbins (1997, 2001) emphasizes the importance of studying casual leisure, and suggests that perhaps it has been overlooked or minimized too much in previous studies simply as not serious leisure. He further breaks down casual leisure into six types: “play, relaxation, passive entertainment, active entertainment, social conversation, and sensory stimulation” (1997, p. 19). All types of casual leisure have one notion in common: they are all hedonic (pleasurable). Participants in casual leisure report a substantial level of pleasure and enjoyment. Another benefit of casual leisure was found to be the promotion and preservation of interpersonal relationships (Stebbins, 2001).

In sensory stimulation (the last of the six types of casual leisure), activities such as sex, drinking, eating and recreational drug use can be found (Stebbins, 1997). Shinew and Parry (2005) focused on the roles drinking and recreational drug use play in college students’ lives (i.e., as casual leisure). College students (typically between the ages of 18
and 24) have a unique lifestyle. Characteristically, they have moved away from home recently and either live in on-campus dorms or off-campus in an apartment with friends. Perhaps for the first time, they have the freedom to attend to their social lives more so than anything else (Shinew & Parry, 2005). These researchers based their study on Stebbins’ (1997, 2001) principles of hedonism and fostering interpersonal relationships in order to understand the highly participated in leisure activity of drinking and drug use for college students.

They tested these theories by administering questionnaires to 740 undergraduate students. The students were asked questions such as “what are the main reasons you drink?” with answer options including “social reasons, to relax, to escape, reduce stress, fun, peer pressure, and for the effects” (p. 374). Of these answers “social reasons” and “fun” were the most cited responses. Going along with this idea respondents were found to agree with the statement “I believe drinking alcohol is a leisure activity” (p. 375). Having fun and participating in what they call leisure and for overall general pleasure and enjoyment give drinking a hedonistic motivation for college students.

Secondly, this study found that alcohol use among college students fosters relationships with friends and peers. Survey participants cited “social reasons” most frequently as to why they drink. The researchers found that a large number of students had their first drink with their friends. Socializing and having fun while spending time with friends is a significant part of a college student’s life, and it is within this setting that most drinking and drug use takes place. The findings of this study prove that college
students actively pursue casual leisure. They look for social gatherings that build interpersonal relationships and provide almost immediate pleasure. Perhaps these norms can be applied on a grander scale to discover what attracts and/or repels young adults to and from certain leisure activities.

**Constraints and Travel/Tourism**

Very few studies were performed in the realm of constraints applied to travel and/or tourism. One, however, was conducted by Pennington-Gray and Kerstetter in 2002. The purpose of their study was to see how interpersonal, intrapersonal, and structural constraints specifically influenced nature-based tourism.

The researchers conducted a plethora of telephone interviews over several years, resulting in 350 successfully completed interviews. The findings concurred with most leisure research: nature-based tourism was constrained most often by money and time, both of which fall under structural constraints.

The researchers pointed out that further investigation into the topic of nature-based tourism and the specific associated constraints is needed. The suggested constraints they used on their phone surveys were not tourism-focused enough to yield results that could be separated from other leisure constraints. Their study was one of the first of its specific kind; more research on this topic is needed.


**Constraints and Excursion Trains**

Due to the very narrow scope of this topic, virtually no research was found on constraints impacting excursion train users specifically. However, one study did look at trains in the course of a larger investigation of constraints facing those choosing an amusement park. Stemerding, et al. (1999) proposed that potential park attendees were influenced by other fringe attributes. One of those was the type of transportation to, from, and at each park. Variables were broken into positive and negative influences. For a train to positively sway an attendee to visit a certain park, the following variables were needed: “easy parking, no delay, direct train connection, fixed-price shuttle service, free train-ticket upgrade” (p. 152). Items that might turn a potential park visitor away included the following: “parking spaces hard to find, expected delay of 30 minutes, transfers required, no shuttle service, no upgrade” (p. 152). Some of these notions could be applied to excursion trains in general. In particular, lack of parking at the station and delays could be seen as constraints for excursion train users.

**Best Practices**

By interviewing several nationwide excursion train lines, a set of best practices was gathered. Todd, et al. (2008) interviewed 20 existing companies regarding marketing, users, frequency of operation, trip length, average speed, accessibility, special events, pricing, and other revenue. Of particular interest to the current study were the
findings in the marketing and user categories. Families and senior citizens were found to be the targeted audience. Often the train lines cited that they were “family-friendly.” The most popular train event was a holiday themed ride. Even though alcohol has been shown to be an enticing factor for many young adults (Shinew & Parry, 2005; Stebbins, 1997; 2001), wine tasting event trains are almost nonexistent. It is hard to say which one influences the other, but it is an interesting concept to consider in determining what constraints face young adults’ desire and ability to ride excursion trains.

Communication and Cost

Throughout the reading of related literature for the present study, the roles of communication and cost appeared frequently. Communication deals with how people receive and interpret different types of messages (Manfredo & Bright, 1991), which format is most user friendly for delivering these messages (Proll & Retschitzegger, 2000), and simply having a certain area/topic be made known (Bernard, 1988). The role of cost came up related to “money and time” as one of the most frequently cited constraints in the leisure field (Jackson & Dunn, 1991; Mannell & Zuzanek, 1991; Nyaupane & Andereck, 2008; Pennington-Grey & Kerstetter, 2002; Shaw, Bonen, & McCabe, 1991; Shores, Scott, & Floyd, 2007). Young adults might fall into an income bracket that makes them all the more likely to pass on an activity (Shores, et al.).
Communication

Communication’s role is significant because how people receive and interpret different types of messages might influence how they act on them. Manfredo and Bright (1991) claim that the best way for information to be absorbed and acted upon is through a direct experience. They worked with the notion that “a person (a) attends to a message, (b) processes the message in light of relevant associations, images, and experience accessed from memory, and (c) draws inferences and an overall evaluation about the merits of the conclusions drawn from the message” (p. 2). This is relevant to the present study because as Bernard (1988) suggests, “it seems obvious to say that one cannot use a facility if one does not know of its existence, but providers of facilities often presuppose that they will automatically be known to the catchment population” (p. 135). However, many recreation facilities and opportunities are not advertised in the right manner or to the right target population. Both the facility and prospective participants suffer because of this lack of communication. Proll and Retschitzegger (2000) point out perhaps the most successful way to market events, businesses, activities, and opportunities: the Internet. “The number of tourists who use Web-based tourism information systems for pretrip planning jumped from 3.1 million in 1996 to 33.8 million in 1998, a 1,000% increase in two years. Furthermore is it predicted that within the next 10 years, 30% of the whole tourism business will be done via the Internet” (p. 182).
Cost

Historically, money and/or time are frequently noted as the top constraints for leisure participation (Jackson & Dunn, 1991; Mannell & Zuzanek, 1991; Nyaupane & Andereck, 2008; Pennington-Grey & Kerstetter, 2002; Shaw, Bonen, & McCabe, 1991; Shores, Scott, & Floyd, 2007). In these studies lack of time and lack of money came out in a direct manner. For instance, the participants might be asked a closed-ended question on a survey such as, “What prevents you from participating in leisure more often?” Answers they can choose from include “lack of time,” “lack of money,” or some variation of such. Also, in a somewhat more indirect way, Shores, et al. found that people with an income of less than $20,000 are more strongly influenced by structural constraints. Typically young adults (college students, recent graduates and those starting out in the job market) will fall into this income bracket. The recreation research field has been aware of these top constraints for decades; the problem lies, however, in getting people to realize that they need to make the time for leisure and that there is leisure available for little or no cost at all.

Literature Review Summary

Young adults have their own niche in the leisure world. They live differently, they are influenced differently, they act differently and recreate differently. They are
focused on interpersonal relationships (developing and nurturing them) and they are hedonic: they want immediate satisfaction. Like most leisure participants, they cite time and money as frequent leisure constraints. All of this information is useful and relevant; however, it still doesn’t examine the relationship between constraints and young adults' desire and ability to ride excursion trains as a leisure activity. A wide array of information was found on leisure constraints in general, as well as a few studies on specific constraints influencing young adults in leisure and a few more on travel-based constraints. However, this review of literature showed a significant gap in the existing research. By conducting the present study, a better understanding of the relationship between constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to use excursion trains will be obtained.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter outlines the methods and procedures used to examine the relationship between leisure constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to use excursion trains as a leisure activity. The chapter will be broken down into the following sections: (1) study design, (2) subjects and subject selection, (3) instrumentation, (4) collection of data/procedures, and (5) treatment of the data/data analysis plan.

Study Design

This study employed a descriptive design to reach its goals, purposes, and aims. Data for this study were collected as part of a larger study funded by Senator Thomas Libous (R-Binghamton). The purpose of the primary study was to determine the feasibility of expanding current tourist train use of the New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad (NYS&W) line between Binghamton and Cortland. Also, in order to facilitate the planning and implementation of tourist excursions on the line during the study, operational aid was offered to the NYS&W. Particular attention was paid to discover to what extent citizens in and around Cortland and Broome counties would
support and use a tourist excursion train if one was available (Todd, et al., 2008). The following year the grant and study were extended and replicated, with an additional focus on the economic impact the train has on surrounding communities. The researcher then narrowed the scope for the purpose of the present study: an examination of the relationship between constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to use an excursion train as a leisure activity.

**Subjects and Subject Selection**

The subject selection for this study was two-fold: potential users (those with no necessary prior knowledge of the train’s existence or previous experience riding excursion trains) and active users. In order to reach the potential users three strategies were implemented. The first way was via telephone. In the spring of 2008, a systematic random sample of telephone numbers was generated from public telephone books for the six counties surrounding the cities of Cortland and Binghamton: Cortland, Broome, Tompkins, Onondaga, Tioga, and Chenango. Combining the population of the six counties yielded a sampling frame of over 100,000 individuals; therefore, a goal of 384 completed surveys was targeted. Based on previous telephone survey research, a typical response rate for this type of data collection was one in three. A list of 1,965 numbers was compiled in order to reach this goal.

A second site to reach potential users was at The 2008 Great Cortland Pumpkinfest on October 4-5, an event which could potentially have an excursion train associated with it. Based on attendance records (approximately 15,000) the goal was to
complete about 390 surveys. A systematic random sample of these subjects was conducted, where every tenth adult was asked to participate.

The third strategy to reach potential users was at the 2008 Central New York Maple Festival on April 5-6: attendees of the festival who did not ride the train. The approximate number of Central New York Maple Festival attendees was 30,000; therefore, the overall target sample size was set at 379. A target quota of half of this number (190) was set for Festival attendees, who may or may not have ridden the Festival train. The other half (189) was set as the quota for reaching active users by administering the survey on the Central New York Maple Festival Train. Both Maple Festival groups were systematically randomly sampled; every fifth adult was approached.

The entire study population, whether potential or active users, met the same criteria: adults 18 and older. Between the telephone survey, Maple Festival, and Pumpkinfest, investigators targeted a sample size of 1153.

**Instrumentation**

A descriptive survey offered the best method of instrumentation for this study. The design of the survey served both to educate the respondents about the train and local activities and events in their community and to solicit information from the participants. The four-page questionnaire was specifically designed to be easily understood and to work whether read aloud to respondents over the phone, or read and filled out by participants standing in lines or riding the train. An information sheet highlighting the
details of the events or destinations mentioned on the survey was available so a 
participant could reference it if unfamiliar with something.

A series of steps was taken to produce the final version of the survey. Two panels 
of interested stakeholders gave input on what the aim of the study should be. The first 
panel, held in the fall of 2007, included Ian Bel, Binghamton University marketing 
student; Melanie Boyer, NYS&W Railway Corporation; Kathleen Burke, SUNY 
Cortland Department of Economics; Jim Dempsey, Cortland County Convention and 
Visitors Bureau; Linda Hartsock, Empire State Development Corporation (and formerly 
of Cortland County Business Development Corporation/Industrial Development 
Agency); Ken May, dedicated rail fan; Fran Pizzola, Access to Independence; Wendy 
Thibeault, Central New York Maple Festival; and Jim Thomas, Deputy Chief of Staff for 
Senator Libous. Ken May and Melanie Boyer were the only ones able to attend the 
second panel meeting a year later.

Based on the input from the stakeholders, related literature, and best practices 
from existing excursion train lines, an 18-question survey was developed with six 
different sections: excursion train use (6 questions), willingness to pay (3 questions), 
potential benefits (2 questions), potential barriers (1 question), finding out about events 
and opportunities (1 question), and demographics (5 questions) (see Appendix A for full 
survey instrument and information sheet). This questionnaire was used for the telephone 
interviews and at the 2008 Central New York Maple Festival as well as on the train. The 
questionnaire for The 2008 Great Cortland Pumpkinfest was nearly identical, with only 
one question added about certain types of communication (see Appendix B for survey 
and protocol).
In order to measure the variables of the current study, specific questions were used. Constraints were the dependent variable in the second hypothesis. The potential barriers question asked, "How often would each of the following factors interfere with your ability or desire to ride excursion trains?" For each of the nine potential constraints listed, the respondents answered on a 3-point scale of "frequently" (3), "occasionally" (2), or "never" (1).

In order to measure interest in destinations and themes (the dependent variable in the third hypothesis), two different questions were used. The first focused on possible destinations: "Would you be interested in riding a train with excursions to/from...?" Eleven potential destinations on or around the rail line between Binghamton and Cortland were listed. The second question was aimed at themes or events actually taking place on the train. This question asked, "Would you be interested in riding a train that had...?" followed by a list of eight themes or activities on the train. For both of these questions the respondents were asked to answer on a 3-point scale, either "yes" (3), "maybe" (2), or "no" (1).

In order to measure the dependent variables in the fourth hypothesis (overall interest level and support) the respondents were asked two direct questions. The first was phrased, “How interested would you be to take an excursion train ride that traveled between Binghamton and Cortland?” Again using a 3-point scale, respondents answered “not interested” (1), “slightly interested” (2), or “very interested” (3). The second question asked, “How supportive would you be of an excursion train in your community?” The respondents chose from three scaled responses, “very supportive” (3), “slightly supportive” (2), or “not supportive” (1).
Age was the sole independent variable in the present study. In order to obtain the respondents' age, the survey used an open-ended response format, specifically, "What is your age?" in the demographics section.

Between the steps of the stakeholder panels and the final administration of the survey, several revisions and reviews took place. The draft survey was pilot tested multiple times and internally edited and approved by the Institutional Review Board for Projects Using Human Participants at SUNY Cortland before the final version was administered to participants.

Data Collection

In order to collect data for the study, four different strategies were used. These strategies varied by sample: the telephone sample, the Maple Festival Train users, the sample at the Maple Festival, and the sample at the Pumpkinfest.

Telephone Survey

Once the systematic random sample of Cortland, Broome, Chenango, Tioga, Tompkins, and Onondago counties was generated, researchers were trained and prepared in order to properly administer the survey. The phone calls were completed during a 4-week period between March and April 2008. The researchers all followed the same protocols for survey administering. If a respondent agreed to complete the survey his/her responses were duly recorded. If an individual did not agree to participate, the attempt
was recorded as a refusal. If a call went unanswered, that number was tried back at least twice. Those numbers that were disconnected or no longer in service were also noted, allowing for proper response rate to be calculated (see Appendix A for phone survey).

Maple Festival

The researchers were split into two shifts to cover both days of the Festival: Saturday, April 5, 2008, and Sunday, April 6, 2008. On Saturday half of those researchers rode the train in the morning, surveying the passengers, while the other half surveyed Maple Festival attendants. They then switched in the afternoon. On Sunday the same set-up happened with the other half of the researchers. Each researcher was charged with completing 24 surveys (12 at the festival and 12 on the train), pacing the survey collection throughout the entire day to get a sample of the whole population. Each researcher had the materials (clipboard, survey, information card, and pencil) to administer two surveys simultaneously. Respondents were given a maple candy lollipop as an incentive for completing the survey. See Appendix B for script and procedures used by interviewers.

On the Train

Each researcher stationed on the train rode between Cortland and Marathon a total of three times. They approached every 5th adult passenger and attempted to administer
the survey. If turned away, the attempt was recorded as a refusal, and the next adult was then approached.

\textit{At the Festival}

The researchers at the festival were positioned around the grounds at high traffic areas in order to reach respondents standing in lines: at the Central School, on Peck Street near the Fire Station, at the Sugar Shack, and outside the Maple Museum. The interviewers approached every 5th adult. If the adult refused to participate the researcher recorded the attempt as such and continued on to the next adult.

\textbf{Pumpkinfest}

The data collection procedures at the Pumpkinfest were very similar to that of the Maple Festival. The festival lasted two days, Saturday, October 4, 2008 and Sunday, October 5, 2008, and each researcher was scheduled for one half-day shift. Researchers were positioned around the festival in prime areas of high traffic and line formation: fire station, vendors’ area, fountain/hayride area, and stage/pony rides area. Every 10th adult was surveyed. Each researcher had a goal of administering 17 surveys spread throughout the time period assigned and used small bags of pretzels as an incentive. If turned away, the attempt was recorded as a refusal, and the next adult was then approached.
Treatment of the Data/Data Analysis Plan

After data collection, the quantitative data were coded and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Since the current study focused on the relationship between constraints and young adults' desire and ability to use excursion trains as a leisure activity, the total study population had to be narrowed. Based on the review of related literature, the data was reduced into two age groups: young adults (aged 18-30) and older adults (aged 31+).

In order to test the four hypotheses of the present study, certain statistical tests were run for each one. To test the first hypothesis, descriptive statistics were used to compare the means of constraints influencing young adults.

To test the second hypothesis, an independent t-test was used to compare the mean constraint scores of young adults and those of older adults. A Pearson product-moment correlation was also used to test the relationship between constraints and raw ages in order to reveal any relationships the grouped data may have masked.

To test the third hypothesis, an independent t-test was again used, comparing the mean scores of support/interest level of young adults and older adults. Similarly, a Pearson product-moment correlation was used again to flush out any hidden relationships between support/interest level and raw age.

To test the fourth hypothesis, two tests were run. The first was an independent t-test comparing means of overall support/interest level between the two groups (young and older adults). The second test once again utilized a Pearson product-moment correlation to test the association of raw age and overall support/interest.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

The results of the analysis of data gathered to examine the relationship between constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to use an excursion train as a leisure activity are presented in this chapter. This chapter is composed of the following sections: (1) profile of subjects, (2) dependent variables, (3) independent variables, and (4) hypothesis testing.

Profile of Subjects

In order to adequately provide a profile of the subjects for this study, two areas are described below. First, response rates were calculated for three sub-samples. Second, demographic characteristics are summarized.

Response Rate

Both potential and active excursion train users were targeted. The potential users were reached three different ways. The first way was via telephone. From a list of 1,965 numbers, telephone calls were attempted with no answer for 518 numbers and a disconnected line or otherwise unreachable number for 294. Of the remaining 1,153 numbers, 393 respondents were successfully reached and completed the survey, yielding
a 34 percent response rate. The second way to reach potential users was at the Great Cortland Pumpkinfest. Approaching every 10th adult, 648 attempts were made, yielding 382 completed surveys (response rate of 59 percent). Attendees at the Central New York Maple Festival were the third potential population. A total of 191 out of the 297 people asked complied and completed the survey (response rate of 64 percent).

In order to reach the active users, those riding the train to and from the Central New York Maple Festival were interviewed. Ninety-one percent of those on the train agreed to participate (194 out of 213). The overall response rate, combining both of potential and active users, was 52 percent (1,160 out of 2,311).

Demographics

Of the six counties to which the telephone surveys were administered, the majority of completions came from Cortland County (n=197 or 50 percent). Broome County and Tompkins County had 166 (42 percent) and 120 (31 percent) respondents, respectively. Onondaga and Tioga Counties were equally accounted for (n=81 or 21 percent), while Chenango County represented the fewest respondents (n=63 or 16 percent).

Of the 382 Pumpkinfest respondents, 328 (86 percent) were from the six counties. Cortland County represented the largest group with 260 (68 percent) respondents. Twenty-seven folks (7 percent) from Tompkins County completed surveys, while 19 and 14 from Onondaga and Broome did so (5 percent and 4 percent respectively). Tioga and Chenango Counties combined represented eight total respondents (2 percent).
Combining the respondents from all four sample populations (telephone, Maple Festival, Maple Festival train, and Pumpkinfest) 1,129 people provided their gender. Females made up the majority with nearly 61 percent. The mean age was 46.5 with a median of 46 and mode of 44. The education levels of the respondents included all choices (some high school, high school diploma, some college/technical school, associate’s degree, bachelor’s degree, masters, doctorate, and professional certificate). Over half of the respondents (56.5 percent) had obtained an associate’s degree or higher.

**Dependent Variables**

Relationships between and among variables were analyzed in this study. The two dependent variables used were level/type of constraint and level of interest/support.

**Level/Type of Constraint**

Both the level and type of constraint were measured using one question. Respondents were asked to not only choose the constraints that affected them but to also rate how much each one influenced them. The question read as follows: “How often would each of the following factors interfere with your ability or desire to ride excursion trains?” The answers were coded as 1 = “never;” 2 = “occasionally;” and 3 = “frequently.” As shown in Table 4.1, overall levels of constraint were not high. Only two constraints reached a level where mean scores rose above 2.0 (occasionally): lack of time and lack of information. For driving distance to the train station, having no one to
do the activity with, lack of accessibility, concerns for safety and previous bad experience
the majority of respondents (50 percent or higher) answered “never.”

Table 4.1    Type and Level of Constraint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequent (3)</th>
<th>Occasional (2)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>367 (33.4%)</td>
<td>625 (56.9%)</td>
<td>106 (9.6%)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of info.</td>
<td>355 (32.9%)</td>
<td>577 (53.5%)</td>
<td>146 (13.5%)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of disposable income</td>
<td>200 (18.4%)</td>
<td>579 (53.4%)</td>
<td>306 (26.2%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>105 (9.9%)</td>
<td>507 (48%)</td>
<td>445 (42.1%)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving distance to train station</td>
<td>116 (10.8%)</td>
<td>414 (38.4%)</td>
<td>549 (50.9%)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having no one to do the activity with</td>
<td>85 (7.9%)</td>
<td>432 (40%)</td>
<td>563 (52.1%)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access</td>
<td>114 (10.8%)</td>
<td>271 (25.8%)</td>
<td>667 (63.4%)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for safety</td>
<td>52 (4.8%)</td>
<td>205 (19%)</td>
<td>824 (76.2%)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous bad experience</td>
<td>31 (2.9%)</td>
<td>111 (10.3%)</td>
<td>931 (86.8%)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Interest

Level of interest in various types of excursions was examined in order to determine if young adults’ interest level differed because of their age. Excursions were broken into two categories: journey and destination, each prefaced with a question. For the journey-based excursions the question was, “Would you be interested in riding a train that had…” followed by a series of excursions (see Table 4.2). The destination-based excursion question was asked in a similar manner: “Would you be interested in riding a train that had excursions to…” again followed by a list of potential excursions (see Table 4.3). For both questions the respondents could choose from “yes” (3), “maybe” (2), or “no” (1).

Table 4.2 Interest in Journey Excursions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excursion Type</th>
<th>Yes (3)</th>
<th>Maybe (2)</th>
<th>No (1)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd.</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall foliage or other scenic</td>
<td>826 (72.5%)</td>
<td>218 (19.1%)</td>
<td>95 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>696 (61.3%)</td>
<td>314 (27.7%)</td>
<td>125 (11%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themed or theatre</td>
<td>578 (51.7%)</td>
<td>350 (31.3%)</td>
<td>189 (16.9%)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine and cheese</td>
<td>613 (54.6%)</td>
<td>244 (21.7%)</td>
<td>266 (23.7%)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and family excursion</td>
<td>584 (52.3%)</td>
<td>262 (23.5%)</td>
<td>270 (24.2%)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder mystery dinner</td>
<td>528 (47.7%)</td>
<td>297 (26.8%)</td>
<td>283 (25.5%)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad fan</td>
<td>361 (32.4%)</td>
<td>337 (30.2%)</td>
<td>417 (37.4%)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A shuttle for equip.</td>
<td>335 (30.3%)</td>
<td>294 (26.6%)</td>
<td>478 (43.2%)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 Interest in Destination Excursions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Yes (3)</th>
<th>Maybe (2)</th>
<th>No (1)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd.</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNY Maple Festival</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63%)</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
<td>(14.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiedie Fest &amp; Balloon Rally</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43.2%)</td>
<td>(27.7%)</td>
<td>(29.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland Wine and Arts Festival</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
<td>(25.8%)</td>
<td>(32.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts at Arena Bing.</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.5%)</td>
<td>(29.6%)</td>
<td>(32.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland Pumpkin Festival</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>(29.3%)</td>
<td>(32.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland Celtic Festival</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.1%)</td>
<td>(27.2%)</td>
<td>(38.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick’s Parade Bing.</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
<td>(27.1%)</td>
<td>(42%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Cortland sports/theatre events</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.8%)</td>
<td>(31.8%)</td>
<td>(40.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bing. pro/SUNY sports</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td>(27.3%)</td>
<td>(44.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Night Bing.</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.3%)</td>
<td>(23.6%)</td>
<td>(48.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Night Cortland</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26.6%)</td>
<td>(23.3%)</td>
<td>(50.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, participants recorded higher levels of interest in themed journey excursions than in destination events. As shown in Table 4.2, all but two themes (railroad fan and shuttle) had mean scores above 2.0 (occasionally). Additionally, all but three themes (murder mystery, railroad fan and shuttle) showed 50 percent or more of the respondents answering “yes.”
Table 4.3 shows that level of interest in destination excursions were split fairly equally. Five destinations (CNY Maple Festival, Spiedie Fest, Cortland Wine and Arts Festival, concerts at Binghamton Arena and Cortland Pumpkinfest) all had mean scores above 2.0 (occasionally). Six destinations ranked less than 2.0: Cortland Celtic Festival, St. Patrick’s Parade, SUNY Cortland sports/theatre, Binghamton professional/SUNY sports, First Night Binghamton and First Night Cortland.

**Level of Support**

Each respondent was asked directly about his/her level of support for excursion trains with this question: "How supportive would you be of an excursion train in your community?" They could answer "very supportive" (3), "slightly supportive" (2), or "not supportive" (1). Overall, the vast majority of respondents, almost 95 percent, were either slightly supportive (35 percent) or very supportive (59 percent).

**Independent Variable**

In this study age was the independent variable. In order to compare young adults to older adults, two categories were created. Based on the review of literature, those respondents between the ages of 18 and 30 were classified as young adults, while all those older (ranging from 31 to 90 years of age) were considered older adults (Table 4.4). The vast majority (917 out of 1115) were classified as older adults.
Table 4.4 Age Frequency and Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (18-30)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (31-90)</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses Testing

This section contains the results of the hypotheses tests. Each hypothesis is covered in its own subsection.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis in this study proposed that within young adults lack of interest, lack of time, lack of disposable income, and lack of information would rank highest among their constraints. Through the use of descriptive statistics this hypothesis was supported. Lack of time was noted most often with a mean of 2.37. Lack of information was second with a mean of 2.21. Lack of disposable income was ranked third highest among constraints cited by young adults with a mean of 1.98. Lack of interest had a mean of 1.80, ranking it fourth (see Figure 4.1). The remaining constraints’ mean scores all fell below 1.70 (driving distance, lack of partner, lack of accessibility, concerns for safety, previous bad experience).
Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis looked at how constraints related to age. Specifically, it was hypothesized that:

a. Young adults will be more constrained by lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information than older adults.

b. Young adults will be less constrained by lack of activity partner, concerns for safety, and a previous bad experience than older adults.

c. Young adults’ level of constraint will not differ from older adults on lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities and driving distance.
The results of the independent t-test partially supported the first sub-hypothesis (H2a). Mean scores for lack of time ($t = 3.414, p \leq .05$) and lack of interest ($t = 2.826, p \leq .05$) were significantly different, while those for lack of income and lack of information were not (see Table 4.5). In both cases where differences were detected, young adults experienced significantly higher levels of constraint than older adults. Specifically, young adults had a mean score of 2.37 compared to 2.21 for older adults for lack of time. Similarly, young adults had a mean score of 1.79 for lack of interest, while older adults’ mean score was 1.65 for the same constraint. A Pearson’s correlation acted as partial support for the independent t-test results, but also highlighted a difference that the groupings masked. As age increased, level of constraint with lack of time significantly decreased ($-.21, p \leq .01$). Lack of interest was not significantly correlated with age, but lack of income’s negative correlation with the raw age data, although weak, was significant ($r = -.09, p \leq .01$).

### Table 4.5 Summary Statistics: Independent T-test and Pearson’s Correlation for Hypothesis 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.414*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.826*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sig. at .05
**sig. at .01
H2b stated that young adults would be less constrained than older adults in the areas of lack of activity partner, concerns for safety, and a previous bad experience. The results negated this hypothesis (see Table 4.6). Young adults were found to be significantly more constrained than older adults by having no one to ride with ($t = 3.179$, $p \leq .05$), concerns for safety ($t = 2.077$, $p \leq .05$), and a previous bad experience ($t = 4.454$, $p \leq .05$). The mean scores for lack of partner ranked higher for young adults than for older adults (1.68 versus 1.53 respectively). Young adults’ mean scores (1.36) for concerns for safety were significantly higher than older adults (1.27) as well. A previous bad experience constrained young adults significantly more (1.29) than their older counterparts (1.13). However, Pearson’s correlation found a weak significant negative relationship only between age and previous bad experience ($r = -.13$, $p \leq .01$).

H2c stated that young adults’ level of constraint would not differ from older adults on lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities and driving distance to the train station. This hypothesis was partially supported (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.6  Summary Statistics: Independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation for Hypothesis 2b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No partner</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.179*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for Safety</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.077*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous bad ex.</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.454*</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sig. at .05
**sig. at .01
Table 4.7 Summary Statistics: Independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation for Hypothesis 2c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>constraint</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.304*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sig. at .05
**sig. at .01

No significant difference was found between the two groups on lack of accessibility, but driving distance was found to have a significant difference ($t = 2.304$, $p \leq .05$). Young adults (mean = 1.70) were significantly more constrained than older adults (mean = 1.58). A Pearson’s correlation unmasked a weak significant positive relationship between the groups on lack of accessibility ($r = .10$, $p \leq .01$). As age increased, so did the level of constraint.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three proposed a relationship between age and interest in themes and destinations such that:

a. Young adults will be more supportive of those excursions outlining alcohol use (wine and cheese excursion and Cortland Wine and Arts Festival) than older adults.
b. Young adults will be less supportive of excursions specifically detailing holiday, themed or theatre, child and family, or First Night celebrations than older adults.

c. Young adults will not differ on their level of support for trains as shuttle service for paddlers, anglers, or bikers and excursions to festivals not mentioning alcohol (Spiedie Fest, Maple Fest, Pumpkinfoest, and Celtic Fest).

H3a stated that young adults would be more supportive of excursions specifically outlining alcohol use. This hypothesis was supported (see Table 4.8). The mean scores for wine and cheese excursions were significantly different as shown by the independent t-test \( t = 3.754, p \leq .05 \). Age and interest in these excursions were also inversely related, as shown by the Pearson’s correlation \( r = -.15, p \leq .01 \). Young adults’ mean score (2.50) reflected their higher level of interest than that of older adults (2.26). The Cortland Wine and Arts festival results were similarly significant through both tests \( t = 5.914, p \leq .05 \) and \( r = -.14 \). The mean score for level of interest was significantly higher for young adults (2.41) than older adults (2.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>theme/ destination</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wine and cheese excursions</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.754*</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland Wine and Arts Fest</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5.914*</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sig. at .05
**sig. at .01
H3b proposed that young adults would be less supportive than older adults on holiday, themed or theatre, child and family, or First Night celebration excursions. This sub-hypothesis was partially supported. As shown in Table 4.9, no significant differences were found between the groups for holiday (t = .940, p ≤ .05), themed or theatre (t = .450, p ≤ .05), and child and family excursions (t = 5.47, p ≤ .05). The First Night celebrations were significantly different between the age groups, however not in the hypothesized direction. Young adults were more supportive for both the Binghamton First Night (mean = 2.19 versus 1.70, t = 7.441, p ≤ .05) and the Cortland First Night (mean = 2.12 versus 1.68, t = 6.756, p ≤ .05). Pearson’s correlation showed four significant, relatively weak negative relationships: holiday (r = -.08, p ≤ .01), child and family (r = -.19, p ≤ .01), Cortland First Night (r = -.21, p ≤ .01), and Binghamton First Night (r = -.29, p ≤ .01). As age increased, support for these themes decreased.

Table 4.9 Summary Statistics: Independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation for Hypothesis 3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/destination</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themed/theatre</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; family</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland 1\textsuperscript{st} night</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>6.756*</td>
<td>-21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bing. 1\textsuperscript{st} night</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>7.441*</td>
<td>-29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sig. at .05
**sig. at .01
H3c stated that there would be no difference in the level of support or interest between young adults and older adults on using the train for a shuttle, or for festivals not specifically outlining alcohol (Spiedie Fest, Maple Fest, Celtic Fest, Pumpkínfesť). This hypothesis was mostly not supported (see Table 4.10). Only level of interest for the Maple Festival did not differ between the age groups ($t = .341, p > .05$). The remainder of the themes and destinations were found not only to have significant differences but also to show that young adults were more supportive: shuttle (mean = 2.05 versus 1.83, $t = 2.456, p \leq .05$), Spiedie Fest (mean = 2.28 versus 2.10, $t = 2.631, p \leq .05$), Pumpkínfesť (mean = 2.28 versus 2.00, $t = 4.292, p \leq .05$), and Celtic Fest (mean = 2.18 versus 1.90, $t = 4.053, p \leq .05$). Pearson’s correlation revealed a significant negative relationship for those same four themes/destinations: shuttle ($r = -.13$), Spiedie Fest ($r = -.18$), Pumpkínfesť ($r = -.17$), and Celtic Fest ($r = -.12$). As age increased level of interest decreased.

Table 4.10 Summary Statistics: Independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation for Hypothesis 3c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/destination</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shuttle</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.456*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiedie Fest</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.631*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Fest</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin Fest</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4.292*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic Fest</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.053*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sig. at .05
**sig. at .01
Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis four stated that overall, older adults will be more supportive and interested in an excursion train in their community than young adults. This was not supported (see Table 4.11). No significant difference or relationship was found between the two groups.

Table 4.11 Summary Statistics: Independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation for Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>-.454</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-1.495</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of the examination of the relationship between constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to use excursion trains as a leisure activity will be presented in this chapter. Four hypotheses were tested. The first proposed that young adults will rank lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information highest among their constraints. The second hypothesis tested constraints related to age such that: young adults will be more constrained by lack of interest, lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information than older adults; young adults will be less constrained by lack of activity partner, concerns for safety, and a previous bad experience than older adults; and young adults’ level of constraint will not differ from older adults on driving distance or lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities. The third hypothesis focused on the relationship between level of interest and age such that: young adults will be more supportive of those excursions outlining alcohol use than older adults; young adults will be less supportive of those excursions with a family orientation and theatre activities than older adults; and young adults will not differ on their level of support for trains as shuttle service for paddlers, anglers, or bikers and for excursions to sporting events. Finally, the fourth hypothesis tested overall level of support, specifically stating that older adults will be more supportive and interested in having an
excursion train in their community than young adults. This chapter will be broken into the five following sections: 1) summary of procedures; 2) summary of findings; 3) conclusions; 4) discussion and implications; and 5) recommendations for further study.

**Summary of Procedures**

This section summarizes the various procedures implemented in this study. The strategy for selection of subjects, instrumentation, and the plans for both collection and treatment of data are included.

**Selection of Subjects**

The subjects of this study were both potential and active users of an excursion train running between the cities of Cortland and Binghamton. Potential users were reached using three different strategies. The first way was via telephone. A systematic random sample of 1,965 telephone numbers was generated based on the combined population size of the six counties surrounding the rail line (Cortland, Broome, Tompkins, Onondaga, Tioga, and Chenango), with a goal of completing 384 surveys. The second strategy for reaching potential users targeted the 2008 Central New York Maple Festival: attendees of the festival who did not ride the train. Based on previous attendance records, a goal sampling size of 379 was set. Using a systemic random sample, the researchers approached every fifth adult. The third method used for potential users was at the 2009 Great Cortland Pumpkinst. A goal of 390 surveys was set based on approximate attendance of 15,000. A systematic sample of these subjects was
conducted, where every tenth adult was approached. In order to reach the active users the
survey was administered either on the Central New York Maple Festival Train or at the
festival itself. This group was systematically randomly sampled: researchers asked every
fifth adult to participate in the study. The entire study population, whether potential or
active users, met the same criteria: adults aged 18 years or older.

Instrumentation

Based on past research, a review of relevant literature, and input from various
stakeholders, the investigator developed a descriptive questionnaire to be used with each
sampling method. The design of the survey served both to educate the respondents about
the train and local activities and events in their community and to solicit information
from the participants. The four-page questionnaire was specifically designed to be easily
understood and to work whether read aloud over the phone or filled out by participants
standing in lines or riding the train. The 18-question survey was divided into six different
sections: excursion train use/interest (6 questions), willingness to pay (3 questions),
potential benefits (2 questions), potential barriers (1 question), finding out about events
and opportunities (1 question), and demographics (5 questions). This questionnaire was
used for the telephone interviews and at the 2008 Central New York Maple Festival as
well as on the train. The questionnaire for the 2008 Great Cortland Pumpkinsted was
nearly identical, with only one question added about certain types of communication.
An information sheet highlighting the details of the events or destinations mentioned on
the survey for participant reference (see appendix for full survey instrument and information sheet).

**Treatment of Data**

The treatment of data consisted of two tasks: determining the age categories and splitting data accordingly; and testing each hypothesis. The procedures followed for each are described in the following subsections.

*Determined of Age Categories*

For the purpose of this study, examining the relationship between constraints and young adults’ desire and ability to ride excursion trains as a leisure activity, the total study population had to be recategorized. Based on the review of literature the data were reduced into two age groups: young adults (aged 18-30) and older adults (aged 31+). Analysis was made both among the young adults and between the young adults and older adults.

*Hypothesis Testing*

To test the first hypothesis a basic descriptive analysis, simply comparing means, was run. To test the second, third, and fourth hypotheses the data were treated in a series of ways. The first step was to define two age groups within the data. Next, an independent t-test was run comparing the means of the two groups. And lastly, the data was uncategorized once again and checked using a correlation with the raw age variable.
This last step was taken in order to reveal any significant relationships the age groupings may have hidden.

**Summary of the Findings**

The following subsections summarize the results of this study. Areas discussed included overviews of response rate, the dependent variables and independent variables followed by a summary of hypotheses test results.

**Response Rate**

The telephone survey had a response rate of 34 percent, the Pumkinfest yielded 59 percent study participation, and 64 percent of attendees approached at the Maple Festival and 91 percent of the train riders asked to participate agreed. Therefore, the overall response rate of this study was 52 percent (1,160 out of 2,311).

**Dependent Variables**

Each variable that interacted with or was influenced by age was treated as a dependent variable: level/type of constraint, level of interest and overall level of support. Lack of time, lack of information, lack of disposable income and lack of interest ranked highest among the constraints. Just over 90 percent of respondents cited they were either frequently (33.4 percent) or occasionally (56.9 percent) constrained by lack of time.
Participants were least constrained by concerns for safety and a previous bad experience, picking “never” 76.2 percent and 86.8 percent of the time, respectively.

For level of interest, more than 75 percent of respondents answered either “yes” or “maybe” for five out of the eight themed journey excursions (fall foliage or other scenic, holiday, themed or theatre, wine and cheese, children and family excursions). The themed journey excursion train that yielded the least interest was a shuttle for recreation equipment, where just over 43 percent answered that they had no interest.

Of the eleven destination excursions listed respondents answered either “yes” or “maybe” almost 50 percent of the time in each instance. The First Night Celebrations in Binghamton and Cortland ranked the least favorable; participants said they had no interest 48.2 percent and 50.1 percent of the time, respectively.

When asked about their overall level of support, respondents answered favorably the majority of the time. Almost 95 percent were either slightly supportive (35 percent) or very supportive (59 percent).

**Independent Variable**

Age was the sole independent variable in this study. The study population was broken into two groups: young adults, n=198 (aged 18-30) and older adults, n=917 (aged 31+).
Hypotheses Tests

The results of each hypothesis test are presented below. In all, four hypotheses were tested.

**Hypothesis One**

The first hypothesis in this study proposed that within young adults, lack of interest, lack of time, lack of disposable income, and lack of information would rank highest among their constraints. Through the use of descriptive statistics, this hypothesis was supported.

**Hypothesis Two**

The second hypothesis was partially supported. In support of the hypothesis, only mean scores for lack of interest and lack of time were found to be significantly different between age groups, where young adults had significantly higher constraint scores than older adults. However, in every instance that young adults were predicted to be less constrained (i.e., lack of activity partner, concerns for safety, and a previous bad experience), they actually were found to be more constrained. When it was predicted that there would be no significant difference between the groups (lack of accessibility and driving distance), the results were only partially supported. While lack of accessibility did not show a significant difference between the means, driving distance to the train station was found to have a significant difference, again with young adults having a higher level of constraint.
A Pearson’s correlation both partially supported the t-test but also unveiled a masked difference. As age increased, level of constraint with lack of time significantly decreased. Lack of interest had no significant relationship with age, but lack of income’s negative correlation with raw age data was weak yet significant.

The second part of hypothesis two was tested with a Pearson’s correlation. The only significant relationship with age was found to be a weak negative one for previous bad experience.

Again, a Pearson’s correlation was run on the final segment of hypothesis two. It revealed a weak significant relationship between age and lack of accessibility. As age increased, so did level of constraint.

**Hypothesis Three**

The third hypothesis was partially supported. As hypothesized, young adults were more supportive of excursions specifically outlining alcohol than older adults. However, there was no difference between young and older adults’ mean scores for interest in excursions not involving alcohol. Pearson’s correlation showed that age and interest in these excursions were inversely related.

As far as interest in themed excursions not outlining alcohol, Pearson’s correlation found four significant, relatively weak negative relationships. As age increased, support for the following themes decreased: holiday, child and family, Cortland First Night, and Binghamton First Night.
In the third section of hypothesis three, Pearson’s correlation revealed significant negative relationships for four destinations. As age increased the level of interest in the following uses/destinations decreased: shuttle, Spiedie Fest, Pumkinfest, and Celtic Fest.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four stated that overall, older adults will be more supportive and interested in an excursion train in their community than young adults. This hypothesis was not supported. No significant difference or relationship was found between the two groups.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings and within the limitations of this study, age relates negatively to both level of constraint and level of interest and support. Lack of time, lack of information, lack of income and lack of interest rank highest among constraints facing young adults. Also, as age increases, perceived level of constraint decreases. In every instance except lack of accessibility, young adults experience a higher level of constraint. In addition, young adults are more supportive and interested in events/excursions specifically outlining alcohol use. Descriptively, young adults are more interested in themed journeys than older adults. Descriptively and significantly, young adults are more interested in each specific destination (except the Maple Festival, which interests all groups equally) than older adults. Overall, both young adults and older adults are in support of and are interested in an excursion train in their community.
Discussion

This present study confirmed most previous research on constraints. Crawford and Godbey (1987) pioneered the categorization of constraints with their interpersonal, intrapersonal and structural classifications. The present study supported these groupings as all cited constraints fell within them. Crawford, et al. (1991) proposed that intrapersonal constraints were the most powerful. The current study did not support this; rather, the intrapersonal constraints cited (lack of interest, concerns for safety and a previous bad experience) were some of the lowest ranked. As Hawkins, et al. (1999) and Jackson and Dunn (1991) found, structural constraints actually ranked the highest. Lack of time, lack of information and lack of income were the most cited constraints in the present study.

Within those structural constraints, one stands out in much of the research: lack of money. Shores, et al. (2002) said that those with an income of $20,000/year or less are more apt to be influenced by structural constraints than those in a higher income bracket. Also Crawford, et al. (1991) stated that social standing plays a bigger role in participants’ level of constraint than previously reported, and Pennington-Grey and Kerstetter (2002) found that respondents aged 30 and younger were impacted more by structural constraints. The current study supports these notions, both in the areas of constraints and age. When asked to select their income range, 39.9 percent of young adults were in the $24,999 and under group, while only 18.8 percent of older adults were. In fact, 27 percent of the young adults reported their income as under $10,000. Of the structural
constraints that ranked highest (lack of time, lack of information and lack of money), young adults were significantly more constrained in the majority of instances.

Results for one constraint did not support the researcher’s hypothesis. For lack of a partner (having no one to do the activity with), young adults were hypothesized to be less constrained than older adults. The results negated the hypothesis but supported previous research. Sylvia-Bobiak and Caldwell (2006) found that college students are most significantly affected by support of peers and family. Shinew and Parry (2005) and Stebbins (1997, 2001) highlight the importance of interpersonal relationships and fostering said relationships in young adults’ lives. Therefore, the results of this study, where young adults were more constrained by lack of a partner than older adults, is consistent with that research.

Alcohol use, specifically by young adults, was an area of particular interest for this researcher. Previous research found that alcohol plays a big role in young adults' leisure. In fact, as Stebbins (1997, 2001) suggests alcohol use in and of itself is a type of recreation. Shinew and Parry (2005) asked a group of undergraduate college students if they believed that drinking alcohol is a leisure activity. The majority agreed. In the present study, it was hypothesized and supported that young adults would be particularly interested and supportive of excursions that included alcohol.

A limitation of the study was later highlighted by the results. One of the questions of the extension and replication study asked about certain media and technology participants had in their homes. They were asked, “Do you currently own or receive the following items or services at your place of residence?” The items were: cell phone, house phone (land line), newspaper subscription, Internet access, and television
reception (including cable or satellite). The respondent could answer either “no” or “yes.” While this question wasn’t in the scope of the present study, the sampling strategy used highlighted the need for further study in this area. Analysis of the question revealed that while 91.3 percent of young adults own a cell phone, only 48.8 percent own or use a land line. In the original study a telephone sample was used. The researchers called people at home in order to read the survey aloud to them. However, as it became increasingly difficult to reach willing respondents, the thought of cell phone versus landline arose. As technology increases and young adults move out of their parents’ home and into an apartment, are landlines for them becoming a thing of the past? The telephone survey would be something to avoid if given a chance to redo this study.

Internet access and newspaper subscriptions were also analyzed based on this question and in conjunction with another question asked in the original study. Participants were asked, “How frequently have you actually gone to an event after hearing about it via...radio, television, newspaper, website, email, word of mouth?” They could choose from “frequently,” “occasionally,” or “never.” First, looking at media usage, nearly 74 percent of young adults said that they do not receive a daily newspaper while 53.5 percent of older adults did. Internet access for both age groups was pretty similar (87.5 percent and 84.9 percent, young and older respectively.) However, when asked how often one might go to an event after learning about it from these various media sources, some significant conclusions could be drawn. Slightly more than 84 percent of young adults, compared to 92.1 percent of older adults, either occasionally or frequently go to an event from newspaper advertisement. These numbers aren’t too different; however, considering the number of young adults that originally said that they received a
newspaper subscription (26.3 percent), this is a relatively small number of young adults. Meanwhile 80.4 percent of young adults (compared to 65.4 percent of older adults) said they have either occasionally or frequently gone to an event based on information from a website. This is an area for further investigation.

Proll and Retschitzegger (2000) conducted a study about the role the Internet played in tourism planning. They found that in 1996 3.1 million people used the Internet to plan their trips. This number increased by 1000 percent in two years to 33.8 million. Imagine what the number might be currently? Imagine if the question were asked like this instead: How often do you go to an event based on information posted on Facebook?

Consider this: according to Facebook’s press information the number of active users in 2008 (when the majority of this study was conducted) was 100 million. As of July 2010 that number grew to 500 million. This is an area that stakeholders in excursion trains (or any recreational event, for that matter) should look at as a potentially successful way to reach young adults.

**Implications**

The data gathered from and the outcomes of this study could be applied in the future. Information is now available for stakeholders of the New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad (NYS&W). For instance, data pertaining to willingness to pay is available. Of the respondents, 69% said they’d be willing to pay $11 or higher. The price of a Central New York Maple Festival train ticket during the conduction of this study was $8. Information about target audiences could be used. Across the board young
adults showed more interest and support than their older counterparts, yet only 198 out of 1,115 respondents of the survey were young adults. Improved marketing strategies, specifically increased use of Internet, might aid in reaching young adults. Eighty percent of young adults said they have actually gone to an event based on information from a website. Specific themes and destinations offered might entice young adults more than others. Young adults had significantly higher levels of interest than older adults when it came to excursions specifically outlining alcohol use. This study revealed data about constraints facing prospective users. Just as young adults are more interested and supportive, they are also more constrained, particularly by lack of time, lack of information, lack of income and lack of interest. These data can be applied to bolster support and use of the NYS&W, or similar rail lines, in the future.

Recommendations

This study can be helpful in future research in the areas of excursion train use (support, interest, desired themes and destinations), constraints, and the role age plays in recreation. This study showed some significant results between the two age groups; however, much is still left to be discovered. Specifically, information about young adults’ interest in alcohol themed excursion elicits a deeper look at the role alcohol plays in the leisure of young adults. Also, further research could be done in the area of marketing strategies, particularly the role the Internet and social media such as Facebook now play in the communication process between event and participant.
The parent study of the present investigation was not originally designed with these hypotheses in mind, but rather feasibility. A new study could be designed with questions more specifically focused on age-related factors. Further research could be done out of the realm of excursion trains looking more closely at the relationship between age, recreation and constraints, specifically the role alcohol might play. Finally this researcher would like to look more critically at who the young adults are. This study simply split the participants into two groups: those aged 18-30 and those aged 31 and up. No other criteria or influencing factors were taken into consideration. For instance, do any of the participating young adults have children? Are they still in college? Do they live with their parents? Do they live with friends or a partner? Do they own a house or rent a place? Perhaps splitting the data by age was too black and white. These factors would all weigh heavily in the discussion of age and constraints.

As previously mentioned, telephone surveys proved difficult. In future studies this might be something to consider and avoid if possible. Perhaps this change will lend itself to a more even distribution of age, because in the current study 198 young adults were interviewed compared to 917 older adults. Steps would need to be taken in the new study to reach a broader participant base.

This study revealed a great deal about the relationship between young adults’ desire and ability to use an excursion train as a leisure activity. The relationship is a complex one, indicating that young adults were both more constrained and more interested and supportive than their older counterpart. All of the results add data to the ever growing base of research, which serves to better understand the influence constraints have on the recreation community.
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APPENDIX A

Telephone Survey Protocol
Telephone Log
The 2008 Central New York Maple Festival
Survey Instruments
Information Sheets
Cortland-Binghamton Train Project

Phone Interview Procedures

1. Acquire Phone Logs (white sheets) from Phone Survey Group. Each log will include a list of approximately 60 numbers that were randomly chosen from the Verizon Phone Book.

2. To dial off-campus, dial 9 first, followed by the 7-digit number if the number is in the 607 area code, or 9 followed by 1 and the 10-digit number if dialing outside the 607 area code (e.g., 9-1-315-123-4567).

3. ALWAYS be professional, courteous, clear and articulate.

4. Check the appropriate box according to the status of each call. Enter the date and time for each attempt (see examples). When, and only when, an interview is completed, do you enter a Survey # in the appropriate column (incomplete attempts do not count toward your total Survey #). Refer to blue sheet for survey #s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Answered (Survey #)</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Busy</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>2nd No Answer</th>
<th>3rd No Answer</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Invalid #</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>555-1212</td>
<td>#301</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555-1111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>call back at 8:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555-3434</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>5:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you reach an answering machine, read the following script:

“Hello I am ____________, a SUNY Cortland graduate student working on a research project assessing the interest and use of tourist trains by residents in your area. You have been randomly selected to take part in a short anonymous survey as part of our research. I will call back at a later time. Thank you.”

6. If you complete the interview, enter the Survey # and Interviewer Code # (refer to blue sheet) on the top of the survey.

7. Read the survey questions exactly as written. Avoid rephrasing sentences or persuading responses.

8. Please write clearly and legibly as you mark your surveys.

9. Please keep all surveys and information, even if the respondent chooses to discontinue the survey prior to completion. All data that is recorded will be used.

10. Thank you and Good Luck!!! ☺
## TOURIST TRAIN PROJECT

### Interviewer Codes & Survey Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewer Code</th>
<th>Phone Survey #s</th>
<th>Train Survey #s</th>
<th>Festival Survey #s</th>
<th>Room Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Michael</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>401-412</td>
<td>601-612</td>
<td>E329 – own office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barvinchak, Ellie</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>413-424</td>
<td>613-624</td>
<td>E328 – Dale Anderson’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianconi, Melissa</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>425-436</td>
<td>625-636</td>
<td>E330 – Vicki Wilkin’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Shane</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>437-448</td>
<td>637-648</td>
<td>E342 – Julie Lenhart’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett, Tanya</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>449-460</td>
<td>649-660</td>
<td>E327 – Susan Wilson’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs, Amanda</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>101-120</td>
<td>461-472</td>
<td>661-672</td>
<td>E329 – Charlie Yapo’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel, Bert</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>121-140</td>
<td>473-484</td>
<td>673-684</td>
<td>E342 – Julie Lenhart’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalley, Jim</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>141-160</td>
<td>485-496</td>
<td>685-696</td>
<td>E338 – Brian Tobin’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Stephanie</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>161-180</td>
<td>497-508</td>
<td>697-708</td>
<td>E333 – Darleen Lieber’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newland, Jessica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>181-200</td>
<td>509-520</td>
<td>709-720</td>
<td>E335 – Lynn Anderson’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson, Megan-Mack</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>201-220</td>
<td>521-532</td>
<td>721-732</td>
<td>E314 – Josh Bochniak’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry, Dannielle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>221-240</td>
<td>533-544</td>
<td>733-744</td>
<td>E338 – Brian Tobin’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowell, Ben</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241-260</td>
<td>545-556</td>
<td>745-756</td>
<td>E329 – own office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Dan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>261-280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E329 – own office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeter, Josh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>281-300</td>
<td>557-568</td>
<td>757-768</td>
<td>E316 – Sharon Todd’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Allyson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>301-320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E315 – Wayne Stormann’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, Garrett</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>321-340</td>
<td>569-580</td>
<td>769-780</td>
<td>E329 – own office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox, Kelly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>341-360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E311 – Kath Howard’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, Lin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>361-380</td>
<td>581-592</td>
<td>781-792</td>
<td>E331 – Andy Young’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Sullivan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>381-390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Wilcox</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>391-400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>593-600</td>
<td>793-800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Schedules / Instructions

## Saturday
**9am - 1pm**
- Shane
- Bert
- Melissa
- Ben

**12:45pm - 5pm**
- Ellie
- Stephanie
- Megan-Mack
- Tanya

**Location**
- Peck Street near Fire Station
- Central School
- Maple Museum
- Sugar Shack

## Sunday
**9am - 1pm**
- Jessica
- Amanda
- Allyson
- Michael
- Dannielle

**12:45pm - 5pm**
- Garrett
- Josh T.
- Lin
- Jim
- Dannielle

**Location**
- Peck Street near Fire Station
- Central School
- Maple Museum
- Sugar Shack

## Train Schedule
- **DEPART CORTLAND**
  - 10:00 AM
- **ARRIVE MARATHON**
  - 10:45 AM
- **DEPART MARATHON**
  - 11:00 AM
- **ARRIVE CORTLAND**
  - 11:45 AM
- **DEPART CORTLAND**
  - NOON
- **ARRIVE MARATHON**
  - 12:45 PM
- **DEPART MARATHON**
  - 1:00 PM
- **ARRIVE CORTLAND**
  - 1:45 PM
- **DEPART CORTLAND**
  - 2:00 PM
- **ARRIVE MARATHON**
  - 2:45 PM
- **DEPART MARATHON**
  - 3:00 PM
- **ARRIVE CORTLAND**
  - 3:45 PM
- **DEPART CORTLAND**
  - 4:00 PM
- **ARRIVE MARATHON**
  - 4:45 PM
- **DEPART MARATHON**
  - 5:00 PM
- **ARRIVE CORTLAND**
  - 5:45 PM

## If you begin in Marathon
- **9:00 AM**
  - Meet at Marathon train station to get survey materials
- **12:45 PM**
  - Meet at Marathon train station for train instructions
- **4:45 AM**
  - Hand in survey materials at Marathon train station
- **Eat lunch at your convenience**

## If you begin in Cortland
- **9:30 AM**
  - Meet at Cortland train station to get survey materials
- **1:00 PM**
  - Meet at Marathon train station for festival instructions
- **4:45 AM**
  - Hand in survey materials at Marathon train station
- **Eat lunch at your convenience**

Some basic notes:

You are selecting every fifth adult that passes by you or that you come to on the train.

Several festival locations will have people standing in lines. This is a good place to administer surveys as people are waiting already.

Work from the front of the line back.

Each person is responsible for at least 11 surveys at the festival and 11 surveys on the train. However, our goal is to get a sampling of respondents throughout the day, not just a bunch early on. This may mean slowing down your surveying.

If your surveys are taking a long time, you can use the second clipboard to administer multiple surveys at a time. If your surveys are completed very quickly, you may be asked to complete a few more during your shift.

On the train, you may only need to get 2 surveys completed on each one way trip to reach your quota.
If you have questions during the festival, you can call Josh
Cortland-Binghamton Train Project Survey Script

After you have selected your location, begin counting people passing by. You will offer the survey to every 5th person who passes by or who you come to on the train or in a line. After you have selected a potential respondent, continue as follows:

Hello, my name is _________ and I am a graduate student at SUNY Cortland. How are you today?… We have been asked to help conduct a community study to learn about your interest in tourist excursion trains in your area. Would you help us by taking this 10-15 minute survey?

(If NO then:) Thank you and enjoy the rest of your day.

Thank you. The information you provide will help the New York State Senate make decisions about how to support tourism in Central New York, and thus, better serve those who live here. You were randomly selected to participate in this survey. Your participation is voluntary, your answers anonymous, and you can discontinue at any time with no consequences.

Do you have any questions before you get started?

(If no, read:) Great! If you decide that you do have a question, I will do my best to answer it.

(If the answer is yes…) …and they ask who is doing the research, read:)

The graduate research methods class in the Recreation, Parks, & Leisure Studies Department at SUNY Cortland is conducting the study.

If you have any questions about the survey, please call Dr. Sharon Todd at 607-753-4952 or Josh Bochniak at 607-753-2448.

If you have any questions about research at SUNY Cortland, please call Dr. Nancy Aumann, Institutional Review Board, at 607-753-5477.

(If the answer is yes…) …and they ask who are the senate leaders involved, read:)

Funding for this project was initiated by Senator Tom Libous of Binghamton and comes from the 2007-2008 Aid to Localities fund. Senator Libous’ office can be reached at 607-773-8771.

Hand the respondent a clipboard with a survey, a laminated information card, and pen.

The survey is two-sided, so don't forget to complete the back pages. Let me know if you have any questions during the survey.

As they are taking the survey, be available to answer questions or clarify anything about the survey.

When they are finished,

Thank you. Have a great day!

Remember to label the survey with your interviewer ID and your next survey #, and place the survey in your file.
Cortland-Binghamton Train Survey

Thank you for your participation. The information you provide will help the New York State Senate make decisions about how to support tourism in Central New York, and thus, better serve those who live here. You were randomly selected to participate in this survey. Your participation is voluntary, your answers anonymous, and you can discontinue at any time with no consequences.

**Excursion Train Use**

An excursion train is a passenger train for which the purpose of the ride is not to get somewhere quickly, but to enjoy viewing scenery, dining, or other special events on the train, or the experience of riding the train on the way to a community event.

1. Have you ever taken an excursion train ride (including today’s ride, if applicable)? *(Circle one number.)*

   1 no
   2 yes

   If so, which train(s) have you ridden? *(Specify below:)*

2. Please indicate your response for each of the items below. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be interested in riding a train that had…</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>holiday excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themed or theater excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall foliage or other scenic excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder mystery dinner excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wine and cheese excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children and family excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railroad fan excursions? <em>(chances to see and ride trains)</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a shuttle for paddlers, anglers, or bikers on or along the Tioughnioga River?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be interested in riding a train that had excursions to…</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton professional or university sports events?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Binghamton Spiedie Fest &amp; Balloon Rally?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Eve First Night in Binghamton?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerts at Broome County Veterans Memorial Arena?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the St. Patrick’s Day Parade in Binghamton?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Central New York Maple Festival in Marathon?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Cortland sports or theatre events?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Eve First Night in Cortland?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cortland Pumpkin Festival?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cortland Celtic Festival?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cortland Wine and Arts Festival?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Any other excursions you’d be interested in? *(Specify here:)*

   ________________________________________________

   - page 1 -
3. The previous question listed what some excursion train options could be. Now that you’ve read these, how interested would you be to take an excursion train ride that travelled between Binghamton and Cortland? (Circle one number.)

1  Not interested  (Skip to question 6.)
2  Slightly interested  (Go to question 4.)
3  Very interested  (Go to question 4.)

4. How often would you ride this excursion train? (Circle only one response.)
1  weekly
2  monthly
3  a few times a year
4  once a year
5  never

5. What is the maximum length of time you would be willing to ride the excursion train? (Circle only one response.)
1  1 hour
2  2 hours
3  3 hours
4  4 hours
5  over 4 hours

6. How supportive would you be of an excursion train in your community? (Circle one number.)
3  Very supportive
2  Slightly supportive
1  Not supportive

Willingness to Pay

7. Of the following, what do you consider to be a fair price for a standard, adult, round-trip ticket on an excursion train without any extras between Cortland and Binghamton? (Circle one number.)
1  $10 or less
2  $11-$20
3  $21-$30
4  $31-$40
5  over $40

8. Please indicate your response to each of the items below. (Circle one number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be willing to pay extra for …</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meals?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beverages and snacks?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-board entertainment (such as actors, singers, storytellers, historians, naturalists)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>souvenirs?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first-class seating and accommodations?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extra space for a bike, canoe, kayak, etc.?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other extras you’d be interested in? (Specify here:)

9. Would you purchase tickets in advance if they were cheaper?
1  no
2  yes
If so, what would be the easiest way for you to purchase tickets in advance? (Circle only one response.)
1  Internet
2  By phone
3  By mail
4  In person at a store
5  In person at a train station
6  Another way: ____________________________
10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excursion trains would ...</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provide opportunities to meet new people.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer a way to spend time with friends.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit the local economy.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer information about the local environment.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help you get to special events outside your community.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer information about local history.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a unique leisure experience.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to the community spirit.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a family-friendly leisure opportunity.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be entertaining and fun.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer an activity for visiting guests.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a leisure experience for people of all ages.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other benefits you’d like to add? *(Specify here:)*

11. If you are riding (or have already ridden) the train today, what made you choose to ride the Maple Fest Train today?

_________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________

Potential Barriers

12. Please indicate how frequently each of the following factors applies to you. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often would each of the following factors interfere with your ability or desire to ride excursion trains?</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about tourist trains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of disposable income</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having no one to do the activity with</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving distance to train station</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A previous bad experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other factors you can think of that could keep you from riding the excursion train? *(Specify here:)*
Finding Out about Events and Opportunities

13. Please indicate how frequently each of the following items applies to you. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently have you actually gone to an event after hearing about it via…</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>radio?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>television?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspaper?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>website?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word of mouth?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About You

These last few questions will help us summarize information about our respondents. Remember that this information will remain strictly confidential, and you will never be individually identified with your answers.

14. What town or city do you live in? ________________________________________

15. What is your gender? *(Circle one number.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 female</th>
<th>2 male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. What is your age? ____________

17. What is your highest level of completed education? *(Circle one number.)*

   | 1 some high school | 2 high school diploma | 3 some college or technical school | 4 Associate’s degree | 5 Bachelor’s degree | 6 Master’s degree | 7 Doctorate (e.g., Ph.D.) | 8 professional certificate | 9 Other: __________________________|

18. How many people currently live in your household? ________________________

   *If the answer is more than one:* How many are under the age of 18? _________

   *If there is at least one child:*

   - What are the child(ren)’s ages? __________________________
   - Would riding a train be something you think your child(ren) would be interested in? *(Circle one number.)*

   | 1 no    | 2 yes   | 3 don’t know |

Thank you for your thoughtful answers and for your time. We appreciate it very much!
If you have any further comments or concerns that have not been addressed in this survey, feel free to write them in the space below:
Project-related Questions:

Who is doing the research?
The graduate research methods class in the Recreation, Parks & Leisure Studies Department at SUNY Cortland is conducting the study under the direction of Dr. Sharon Todd.

How is the research being funded?
Funding for this project was initiated by Senator Tom Libous of Binghamton and comes from the 2007-2008 Aid to Localities Fund. Senator Libous’ office can be reached at (607) 773-8771.

How can I get the results of the study?
Contact Dr. Sharon Todd at (607) 753-4952 for results.

For questions about the survey:
Call Dr. Sharon Todd at (607) 753-4952 or Josh Bochniak at (607) 753-2448.

For questions about research at SUNY Cortland:
Call Dr. Nancy Aumann, Institutional Review Board Representative at 753-5477.

Definitions of Train Excursions (see first part of Question 2):

- **Holiday excursions:** Trips related to holidays (i.e., Easter Bunny train, Polar Express train, Santa Claus train)
- **Themed or theater excursions:** Trips offering themed parties or theater type entertainment
- **Fall foliage and scenic excursions:** Tours focused on enjoying the natural environment and scenery
- **Murder mystery dinner excursions:** Excursions with a dinner theater where passengers participate in the story
- **Wine and cheese excursions:** Excursions with a social emphasis that serve wine and cheese
- **Rail fan excursions:** Trips that provide an opportunity for railroad fans to see trains
- **Tioughnioga River shuttle:** The Tioughnioga River is a 70-mile long tributary of the Chenango River. The river runs along the rail line from Cortland to Marathon, and the train could potentially serve as a means of transporting paddlers, anglers, and bikers and their equipment back up river.

Event Information (see second part of Question 2):

**Binghamton professional or university sports events:**
- **Binghamton Senators Hockey**
  - www.binghamtonsenators.com
  - For tickets: (607) 722-SENS
  - The Binghamton Senators is the American Hockey League team in Binghamton, NY.

- **Binghamton University Athletics**
  - www.bubearcats.com
  - Binghamton University is home to Division I athletics including basketball, soccer, lacrosse, tennis, baseball, softball, swimming and diving, volleyball, wrestling, golf, cross country, and track and field.

**Spiedie Fest & Balloon Rally**
- www.spiediefest.com
- Otsegingo Park, Binghamton
- August 1, 2, and 3
- The Spiedie Fest & Balloon Rally is a community festival that attracts more than 100,000 people. Celebrities, food vendors, a chicken Spiedie Cooking Contest, concerts & music acts, crafters, non-profit organizations, and hot air balloon crews from all over the globe participate.

- over -
New Year’s Eve First Night in Binghamton
A New Year’s Eve alcohol-free celebration of the arts.

Broome County Veterans Memorial Arena
Located in downtown Binghamton off State Street.
Arena Box Office Information 607.778.6626
As well as being home for the American Hockey League Binghamton Senators and annual STOP-DWI Holiday Classic Basketball Tournament, the Arena hosts family shows, concerts, trade shows, and many other professional, scholastic and amateur sporting events. Seating capacity is approximately 6,800.

St. Patrick’s Day Parade in Binghamton
The parade was held this year on March 1, 2008.
After a celebration of Holy Mass at St. Mary of the Assumption Church, corner of Court and Fayette Streets, the parade began at 1:30 and was followed by a Post Parade Pipers Concert at Seton Catholic Central High School on Seminary Avenue.

Central New York Maple Festival in Marathon
www.maplefest.org
April 5-6, 2008
For more information about the CNY Maple Festival, or about the daily Train service from Cortland to Marathon:
call 607-745-7710
e-mail: tac@odyssey.net
Mailing address: PO Box 381, Marathon, NY 13803

SUNY Cortland sports or theatre events:
   SUNY Cortland Athletics
   www.cortlandreddragons.com
   SUNY Cortland offers the following athletic events: basketball, field hockey, ice hockey, baseball, football, golf, gymnastics, swimming and diving, tennis, volleyball, soccer, cross country, and track and field.

   Dowd Fine Arts Theatre
   www.cortland.edu/performingarts/performanceschedule.htm
   Phone: (607) 753-5719
   Located at SUNY Cortland at the corner of Graham Avenue and Prospect Terrace. Home to both the Department of Theatre and the Department of Music. Performances held throughout the year.

New Year’s Eve First Night in Cortland
A New Year’s Eve alcohol-free celebration of the arts.

Cortland Pumpkin Festival
www.cortlandpumpkinfest.org
For more information please call (607) 753-8463 or toll-free 1-800-859-2227.
Courthouse Park, Cortland
This fall festival offers something for everyone: crafters, children’s games, entertainment, food, 5K race or walk, antique tractors, hay rides, tons of pumpkins, exhibits and displays.

Cortland Celtic Festival (Cortland Irish Festival)
Courthouse Park, Cortland
August 24, 25, and 26
A celebration to increase the awareness of Celtic cultural language, music and history. The festival is host to a great variety of vendors, performers and events, including musicians, traditional athletics, dancers, animals and foods.

Cortland Wine and Art Festival
www.cortlandartsandwine.com
Courthouse Park, Cortland
Saturday, August 2, 2008, from 10am to 6pm
The 2007 festival featured 16 wineries, over 70 artists, six food vendors and live music all day; all these aspects are expected to increase in 2008.
APPENDIX B

The 2008 Great Cortland Pumpkinfest
Survey Protocol and Script
Survey Instrument
Information Sheet
Cortland Pumpkinfoest Schedule

**Saturday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:00 a.m. – Noon</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristiana</td>
<td>Court Street near Fire Station (A)</td>
<td>Stefanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Court Street near Fire Station (A)</td>
<td>Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette</td>
<td>Vendors Area (C)</td>
<td>Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess B.</td>
<td>Fountain/Hayride Area (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noon – 4:00 p.m.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>2:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandi</td>
<td>Vendors Area (C)</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen C.</td>
<td>Stage/Pony Rides Area (D)</td>
<td>Frances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>Fountain/Hayride Area (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sunday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Noon – 4:00 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>Fountain/Hayride Area (B)</td>
<td>Julia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobit</td>
<td>Vendors Area (C)</td>
<td>Kota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Stage/Pony Rides Area (D)</td>
<td>Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendors Area (C)</td>
<td>Gene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Fountain/Hayride Area (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Vendors Area (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Stage/Pony Rides Area (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Notes:**
- All students should plan to meet Ellie and/or Brandy at the Fountain on Church Street at the Courthouse Park.
- You are selecting every 4th adult that passes by you.
- Several festival locations will have people standing in lines. This is a good place to administer surveys, as people are already waiting – work from the front of the line backwards.
- Each person is responsible for 17 surveys at the festival. Since our goal is to get a sampling of respondents throughout the day (not a bunch early in your shift), you may need to slow down your surveying. You may also administer multiple surveys at a time.

BRANDY’S CELL: 607-555-4321      ELLIE’S CELL: 607-555-1234
**Pumpkinfest Train Project Survey Script**

After you have selected your location, begin counting people passing by. You will offer the survey to every 3rd or 4th person who passes by (or who you come to in a line). After you have selected a potential respondent, continue as follows:

Hello, my name is __________ and I am a graduate student at SUNY Cortland. How are you today?…

We have been asked to help conduct a community study to learn about your interest in tourist excursion trains in your area. Would you help us by taking this 10 minute survey?

*(If NO then:) Thank you and enjoy the rest of your day.*

Thank you. The information you provide will help the New York State Senate make decisions about how to support tourism in Central New York, and thus, better serve those who live here. You were randomly selected to participate in this survey. Your participation is voluntary, your answers anonymous, and you can discontinue at any time with no consequences.

Do you have any questions before you get started?

*(If no, read:)*

Great! If you decide that you do have a question, I will do my best to answer it.

The graduate research methods class in the Recreation, Parks & Leisure Studies Department at SUNY Cortland is conducting the study.

If you have any questions about the survey, please call Dr. Sharon Todd at 607-753-4952, Brandy Boden at 607-753-4119, or Ellie Barvinchak at 753-4848.

If you have any questions about research at SUNY Cortland, please call Dr. Nancy Aumann, Institutional Review Board, at 607-753-5477.

*(If the answer is yes…)*

…and they ask who is doing the research, *read:*

…and they ask who are the senate leaders involved, *read:*

Funding for this project was initiated by Senator Tom Libous of Binghamton and comes from the 2008-2009 Aid to Localities fund. Senator Libous’ office can be reached at 607-773-8771.

Hand the respondent a clipboard with a survey, a laminated information card, and pen.

The survey is two-sided, so don’t forget to complete the back pages. Let me know if you have any questions during the survey.

As they are taking the survey, be available to answer questions or clarify anything about the survey.

When they are finished,

Thank you. Have a great day!

Remember to label the survey with your interviewer ID and your next survey #, and place the survey in your file.
The Great Cortland Pumpkinfest 2008 Survey: Train Project

Thank you for your participation. The information you provide will help the New York State Senate make decisions about how to support tourism in Central New York, and thus, better serve those who live here. You were randomly selected to participate in this survey. Your participation is voluntary, your answers anonymous, and you can discontinue at any time with no consequences.

### Excursion Train Use

An excursion train is a passenger train for which the purpose of the ride is not to get somewhere quickly, but to enjoy viewing scenery, dining, or other special events on the train, or the experience of riding the train on the way to a community event.

1. Have you ever taken an excursion train ride? *(Circle one number.)*
   - 1 no
   - 2 yes
   If so, approximately how many have you ridden? __________
   Which excursion train(s) were they? *(Specify below:)*

2. Please indicate your response for each of the items below. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be interested in riding a train with excursions to/from...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Great Cortland Pumpkinfest?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Eve First Night in Cortland?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Cortland sports or theatre events?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cortland Celtic Festival?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cortland Wine and Arts Festival?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Central New York Maple Festival in Marathon?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton professional or university sports events?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Binghamton Spiedie Fest &amp; Balloon Rally?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Eve First Night in Binghamton?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerts at Broome County Veterans Memorial Arena?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the St. Patrick’s Day Parade in Binghamton?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be interested in riding a train that had...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>holiday excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themed or theater excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall foliage or other scenic excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder mystery dinner excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wine and cheese excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children and family excursions?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railroad fan excursions? <em>(chances to see and ride trains)</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a shuttle for paddlers, anglers, or bikers on or along the Tioughnioga River?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other excursions you’d be interested in? *(Specify here:)*
3. The previous question listed what some excursion train options could be. Now that you’ve read these, how interested would you be to take an excursion train ride that travelled between Binghamton and Cortland? (Circle one number.)

1  Not interested (Skip to question 6.)
2  Slightly interested (Go to question 4.)
3  Very interested

4. **How often** would you ride this excursion train? (Circle only one response.)

1  weekly
2  monthly
3  a few times a year
4  once a year
5  never

5. What is the **maximum length of time** you would be willing to ride the excursion train? (Circle only one response.)

1  1 hour
2  2 hours
3  3 hours
4  4 hours
5  over 4 hours

6. How supportive would you be of an excursion train in your community? (Circle one number.)

1  Not supportive
2  Slightly supportive
3  Very supportive

---

### Willingness to Pay

7. Of the following, what do you consider to be a fair price for a standard, adult, round-trip ticket on an excursion train without any extras between Cortland and Binghamton? (Circle one number.)

1  $10 or less
2  $11-$20
3  $21-$30
4  $31-$40
5  over $40

8. Please indicate your response to each of the items below. (Circle one number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be willing to pay extra for …</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meals?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beverages and snacks?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-board entertainment (such as actors, singers, storytellers, historians, naturalists)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>souvenirs?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first-class seating and accommodations?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extra space for a bike, canoe, kayak, etc.?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other extras you’d be interested in? (Specify here:)

9. Would you purchase tickets in advance if they were cheaper?

1  no
2  yes—If so, what would be the **one easiest way** for you to purchase tickets in advance? (Circle only one response.)

1  Internet
2  By phone
3  By mail
4  In person at a store
5  In person at a train station
6  Another way: ____________________________
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Potential Benefits

10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excursion trains would …</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provide opportunities to meet new people.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer a way to spend time with friends.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit the local economy.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer information about the local environment.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help you get to special events outside your community.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer information about local history.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a unique leisure experience.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to the community spirit.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a family-friendly leisure opportunity.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be entertaining and fun.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer an activity for visiting guests.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a leisure experience for people of all ages.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other benefits you’d like to add? *(Specify here:)*

Potential Barriers

11. Please indicate how frequently each of the following factors applies to you. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often would each of the following factors interfere with your ability or desire to ride excursion trains?</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about tourist trains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility for persons with physical disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of disposable income</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having no one to do the activity with</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving distance to train station</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A previous bad experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other factors you can think of that could keep you from riding the excursion train? *(Specify here:)*

Finding Out about Events and Opportunities

12. Please indicate how frequently each of the following items applies to you. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently have you actually gone to an event after hearing about it via…</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>radio?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>television?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspaper?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>website?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word of mouth?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Please indicate if each of the following items applies to you. *(Circle one number for each statement.)*
Do you currently own or receive the following items or services at your place of residence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House phone (land line)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper subscription</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television reception (including cable or satellite)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About You

These last few questions will help us summarize information about our respondents. Remember that this information will remain strictly confidential, and you will never be individually identified with your answers.

14. What city and county do you live in?
   (city) ____________________________ (county) ____________________________

15. What is your gender? (Circle one number.)
   1 female  2 male

16. What is your age?

17. What is your highest level of completed education? (Circle one number.)
   1 some high school
   2 high school diploma
   3 some college or technical school
   4 Associate’s degree
   5 Bachelor’s degree
   6 Master’s degree
   7 Doctorate (e.g., Ph.D.)
   8 professional certificate
   9 Other: ____________________________

18. What is your approximate household income before taxes? (Circle one number.)
   1 under $10,000
   2 $10,000 to $14,999
   3 $15,000 to $24,999
   4 $25,000 to $34,999
   5 $35,000 to $49,999
   6 $50,000 to $74,999
   7 $75,000 to $99,999
   8 $100,000 to $149,999
   9 $150,000 and above

19. How many people currently live in your household?
   If the answer is more than one: How many are under the age of 18?
   If there is at least one child:
     What are the child(ren)’s ages?
     Would riding a train be something you think your child(ren) would be interested in? (Circle one number.)
     1 no  2 yes  3 don’t know

Thank you for your thoughtful answers and for your time.
We appreciate it very much!
**Project-related Questions:**

**Who is doing the research?**

The graduate research methods class in the Recreation, Parks & Leisure Studies Department at SUNY Cortland is conducting the study under the direction of Dr. Sharon Todd.

**How is the research being funded?**

Funding for this project was initiated by Senator Tom Libous of Binghamton and comes from the 2008-2009 Aid to Localities Fund. Senator Libous’ office can be reached at (607) 773-8771.

**How can I get the results of the study?**

Contact Dr. Sharon Todd at (607) 753-4952 for results.

**For questions about the survey:**

Call Dr. Sharon Todd at (607) 753-4952, Brandy Boden at (607) 753-4119, or Ellie Barvinchak at (607) 753-4848.

**For questions about research at SUNY Cortland:**

Call Dr. Nancy Aumann, Institutional Review Board Representative at 753-5477.

**Event Information (see first part of Question 2):**

**The Great Cortland Pumpkinfest**

www.cortlandpumpkinfest.org

For more information please call (607) 753-8463 or toll-free 1-800-859-2227.

Courthouse Park, Cortland

This fall festival offers something for everyone: crafters, children's games, entertainment, food, 5K race or walk, antique tractors, hay rides, tons of pumpkins, exhibits and displays.

**New Year's Eve First Night in Cortland**

A New Year's Eve alcohol-free celebration of the arts.

**SUNY Cortland sports or theatre events:**

**SUNY Cortland Athletics**

www.cortlandreddragons.com

SUNY Cortland offers the following athletic events: basketball, field hockey, ice hockey, baseball, football, golf, gymnastics, swimming and diving, tennis, volleyball, soccer, cross country, and track and field.

**Dowd Fine Arts Theatre**

www.cortland.edu/performingarts/performanceschedule.htm

Phone: (607) 753-5719

Located at SUNY Cortland at the corner of Graham Avenue and Prospect Terrace. Home to both the Department of Theatre and the Department of Music. Performances held throughout the year.

**Cortland Celtic Festival (Cortland Irish Festival)**

www.cortlandcelticfestival.com

Courthouse Park, Cortland

August 22-24, 2009

A celebration to increase the awareness of Celtic cultural language, music and history. The festival is host to a great variety of vendors, performers and events, including musicians, traditional athletics, dancers, animals and foods.

**Cortland Wine and Art Festival**

www.cortlandartsandwine.com

Courthouse Park, Cortland

Saturday, August 1, 2009, from 10am to 6pm

The 2007 festival featured 16 wineries, over 70 artists, six food vendors and live music all day; all these aspects were expected to increase in 2008.
Central New York Maple Festival in Marathon  www.maplefest.org
March 28-29, 2009
For more information about the CNY Maple Festival, or about the daily Train service from Cortland to Marathon:
call 607-745-7710
e-mail: cnymaplefest@gmail.com
Mailing address: PO Box 381, Marathon, NY 13803
The Central New York Maple Festival includes displays, exhibits, demonstrations, arts and crafts, souvenirs, food, contests, rides (horse drawn wagon, train, helicopter) and much, much more.

Binghamton professional or university sports events:

Binghamton Senators Hockey
www.binghamtonsenators.com
For tickets: (607) 722-SENS
The Binghamton Senators is the American Hockey League team in Binghamton, NY.

Binghamton University Athletics
www.bubearcats.com
Binghamton University is home to Division I athletics including basketball, soccer, lacrosse, tennis, baseball, softball, swimming and diving, volleyball, wrestling, golf, cross country, and track and field.

Spiedie Fest & Balloon Rally
www.spiediefest.com
Otsiningo Park, Binghamton
July 31, August 1-2, 2009
The Spiedie Fest & Balloon Rally is a community festival that attracts more than 100,000 people. Celebrities, food vendors, a chicken Spiedie Cooking Contest, concerts & music acts, crafters, non-profit organizations, and hot air balloon crews from all over the globe participate.

New Year’s Eve First Night in Binghamton
A New Year’s Eve alcohol-free celebration of the arts.

Broome County Veterans Memorial Arena
Located in downtown Binghamton off State Street.
Arena Box Office Information 607.778.6626
As well as being home for the American Hockey League Binghamton Senators and annual STOP-DWI Holiday Classic Basketball Tournament, the Arena hosts family shows, concerts, trade shows, and many other professional, scholastic and amateur sporting events. Seating capacity is approximately 6,800.

St. Patrick’s Day Parade in Binghamton
The parade was held this year on March 7, 2009.
After a celebration of Holy Mass at St. Mary of the Assumption Church, corner of Court and Fayette Streets, the parade begins at 1:30 and is followed by a Post Parade Pipers Concert at Seton Catholic Central High School on Seminary Avenue.

Definitions of Train Excursions (see second part of Question 2):

Holiday excursions: Trips related to holidays (i.e., Easter Bunny train, Polar Express train, Santa Claus train)
Themed or theater excursions: Trips offering themed parties or theater type entertainment
Fall foliage and scenic excursions: Tours focused on enjoying the natural environment and scenery
Murder mystery dinner excursions: Excursions with a dinner theater where passengers participate in the story
Wine and cheese excursions: Excursions with a social emphasis that serve wine and cheese
Rail fan excursions: Trips that provide an opportunity for railroad fans to see trains
Tioughnioga River shuttle: The Tioughnioga River is a 70-mile long tributary of the Chenango River. The river runs along the rail line from Cortland to Marathon, and the train could potentially serve as a means of transporting paddlers, anglers, and bikers and their equipment back up river.