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Abstract

My research project began with the goal of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley, that is, the manner in which people who reside in a touristic community negotiate for their own leisure. The Bow Valley includes the two resort communities of Canmore and Banff and is located along the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains in Alberta, Canada. The study of negotiated leisure for residents of a touristic or high amenity place presented a unique opportunity to explore the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography from a leisure perspective. A grounded theory methodological approach was adopted because little was known about leisure negotiation within such unique environments. The research project evolved in accordance with the grounded theory approach and its various data collection-and analysis iterations toward an exploration of negotiated leisure within amenity migration.

The research involved four distinct data collection and analysis phases and relied on numerous theoretical frameworks to ground the emergent data. The research phases included; five focus groups with diverse Banff and Canmore resident groups to initially explore the broader phenomena related to the subject; a separate qualitative semi-structured interview phase of five second home owners; and once more was understood of the broader human-environment, an additional twenty four semi-structured interviews specifically to explore aspects of daily negotiation. A typology of amenity migrants within a nature based tourism community was developed following the qualitative research phases. A quantitative survey (N=363) to explore the emergent themes of mobility, relationship with recreation amenities and change in the community was carried out to extend the working theory of the typology of amenity migrants toward a more comprehensive model of leisure negotiation within amenity migration. Despite the variety of methods employed a grounded theory approach was adopted to integrate all findings toward the development of a theoretical model.

The result of the research project is a model of negotiated leisure within amenity migration which offers insights to and understanding of the environment’s influence on human behaviour and the influence of (human) recreation on the environment. The model allows for a better understanding of the evolution of nature based recreation based communities.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This research began with the goal of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley: that is, the way in which people who reside in a touristic community negotiate for their own leisure. Lived experience refers to an everyday experiential context and negotiated leisure refers to the dynamic relationship that individuals and their environment as they work to balance recreation needs and preferences against their personal resources to meet these needs within the environment.

Figure 1: Map of Study Area

The Bow Valley includes the two resort communities of Canmore and Banff and located along the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains in Alberta, Canada. The study of negotiated leisure within the Bow Valley presented a unique opportunity to explore the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography from a leisure perspective. The research project evolved in accordance with the grounded theory approach and its
various data collection and analysis iterations, toward an exploration of negotiated leisure within amenity migration (the movement of individuals to find places of extraordinary natural and cultural resources not available in the previous residence.

Much is understood about leisure negotiation in general, but research has yet to be undertaken to explore specifically how people who reside in environments containing a high number or wide range of recreation amenities negotiate for individual leisure. Literature has called for the application of leisure constraints research to be applied to atypical environments such as tourist-based communities (Jackson, 2000). The application of leisure negotiation constructs within behavioural geography to improve the explanation of the human-environment relationship is also supported by Cox and College (quoted in Johnston 1991) who state that new methods and theories (inter-disciplinary) are required to understand the complexities of human behaviour. Furthermore, the intertwining of theoretical frameworks from behavioural geography and leisure and tourism with an inductive empirical approach to knowledge creation is what Coles, Hall, & Duval (2005) refer to as a post-disciplinary approach. They claim that it is what is required to understand the complexities of the modern world within the study of leisure, travel and mobility.

One outcome of this research project is a model of negotiated leisure within amenity migration which addresses aspects of the environment’s influence on human behaviour and the influence of (human) recreation on the environment. The model allows for an improved understanding of how recreation or leisure biased environments evolve over time. Within the document the research site of the Bow Valley is referred to as a high amenity community or destination and a resort destination. This is because the Valley exists as both a high recreation amenity destination from the perspective of amenity migrant residents and a resort destination. In this region the primary economy is focused on tourism and that presents both positive and negative attributes to the leisure negotiation process.
1.2 Research Problem

1.2.1 Research Goals and Objectives

The goal of this research project was to use an exploratory methodological approach to address the question “what is the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley?” The objectives of the research project were as follows:

a.) To situate the question “What is the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley?” within the human-environment framework of behavioural geography and to adopt a leisure perspective to examine leisure behaviour within a high recreation amenity or resort environment.

b.) To use the grounded theory methodological approach to address the question and allow for an exploratory investigation.

c.) To employ a variety of theoretical frameworks and specific areas of literature to guide the analysis and organization of emergent data in accordance with grounded theory.

d.) To employ multiple data collection and analysis iterations, mixed methods and a purposeful sampling format to attempt to capture all relevant data, in accordance with grounded theory.

e) To develop a cohesive theory or theoretical model as a result of emergent data collection and analysis, in accordance with grounded theory

1.2.2 Evolution of Research Project

Due to the exploratory nature of this research project, I adopted the grounded theory approach. The inductive nature of grounded theory was well suited to the goal of the research project as it is situated within behavioural geography’s aim of an interpretive approach to understanding the human-environment relationship (Boal and Livingston, 1989). Four distinct data collection and analysis iterations were carried out in the course of the research project, each informing the development of the following iteration through to the final stage of theoretical model development. Over the course of the
eighteen months of data collection and analysis the focus of the research project evolved toward leisure negotiation within amenity migration.

The essence of the initial question “What is the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley?” remained; however, five key developments emerged. First, residents of the Bow Valley are, for the most part, amenity migrants and thus there emerged a connection to the amenity migration literature, especially as it related to motives for residency and overall evolution of the destination. The connection to amenity migration allowed for better understanding and organization of emergent data pertaining to motivation to reside, changes to the environment, and mobility. Second, leisure negotiation within a unique high amenity environment was discovered to involve greater focus on negotiation of the physical, social and structural elements of the place than typical negotiation of internal elements of motivation; thus there was greater emphasis on the relationship between the individual and the place. Third, recreation activities of individuals (from eating at restaurants, to participating in arts, mountain biking, hockey programs for children, etc.) collectively form expressions of recreation demand that over time may affect recreation supply, and recreation supply in the form of altered physical or built features, change the destination. Thus, a more direct focus on an evolving destination was required to understand the broader negotiation process. Fourth, mobility in and out of the destination was identified as a key aspect of the entire negotiation process. A negotiated strategy for some people was to leave the destination as the resultant changes were deemed to be untenable; conversely others would find the same changes to be amenable to entry, thus the need for close attention to mobility. Last, the leisure negotiation strategies were not universal, yet similar patterns of negotiation could be linked to certain groups who would generally act and respond in similar ways to various stressors and facilitators. I chose to adopt a typology and grouping approach to understand the broader dynamic of negotiation within the particular setting of a high recreation amenity environment.
The initial question of this research remained a central focus throughout the investigation, but given the inductive nature of the grounded theory approach, the research question evolved over time to require multiple frameworks to understand and organize the emergent data. The final result is a model of negotiated leisure within amenity migration.

1.3 Overview of Research

Prior to an overview of this research, I would like to provide some background on amenity migration to situate my research. Amenity migration refers to the movement of individuals, on a full or part time basis, to seek out places which are believed to possess extraordinary natural and cultural resources that were not available within their previous place of residence (Moore, Williams, & Gill, 2006). Amenity migration is closely linked to tourism, yet distinct, because the goal of the amenity migrant is to reside, more so than to visit (Stewart, 2000). Leisure and recreation are linked to amenity migration. Motives of for amenity migration can be related to a search for leisure and recreation and choice of destination, and that enhanced leisure and recreation infrastructure is often a result of amenity migration within a destination (Glorioso & Moss, 2006). Amenity migration is reported to be a phenomenon that is witnessed globally, especially prevalent in the North American west, (McMillan, 2006) and in some cases it is said to be radically altering the rural landscape (Buckley, 2009). There are many factors cited as driving amenity migration. Most are related to the post war prosperity of 1950s North America and remain linked to measures of standard of living such as disposable income (Nelsen, 2006). More specific factors have been identified including; an increased value of the natural environment, cultural differentiation, and learning, leisure, and spirituality, coupled with increases in discretionary time, wealth, and technology. Of these it is claimed that leisure is least understood (Price, Moss, & Williams, 1997).

Figure 1.1 presents my theoretical model of negotiated leisure within amenity migration. The model represents the conceptual entirety of the work of this research.
Each component of the model is outlined briefly below, while conceptual support for the model appears in Chapter Two, and explained fully in Chapter Ten.

My model is an interdisciplinary interpretation of the human-environment relationship within behavioural geography as applied to a specific setting of a high recreation amenity destination. The basis of the model (Figure 1.1) is briefly explained beginning at the far left end of the model with the ‘Motivation’ box.

**Motivation.** Individuals are attracted to a particular destination based on a variety of factors such as one’s personal traits and leisure and travel motivation which can be grounded within a broad, conceptual push-pull scenario (Suvantola, 2002). Leisure and recreation are important motives for amenity migrants (Moss, 2006). My model contends that motivation to reside in the Bow Valley includes a desire to balance a mountain recreation lifestyle with work, to be with a friend or partner, to escape, to purchase a second home, to be in a place that suits one’s values, to be next to the mountains (aesthetic lifestyle) and to pursue a career in tourism or parks.
Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure. The leisure negotiation process is framed by the human-environment relationship and remains dynamic due to constant evaluations of one’s ability to negotiate aspects of a changing environment with one’s personal resources. The lived experience component of the model includes the element of leisure and recreation behaviour. Behaviour is important as it is postulated here that leisure/recreation behaviour imprints the destination through the expression of demand. For example, the persistent behaviour of mountain biking may result in the development of additional mountain trails, a built mountain bike park, or even the banning of mountain biking from certain or all trails. Likewise, the presence of upper middle class urban dwellers may bring about a perceived demand for up-scale restaurants and cafes. Or, the presence of families with children may bring increased demand for traditional recreation facilities such as pools and ice arenas. Recreation behaviour is an expression of demand that is posited to impact supply thereby altering the environment.

Environment. The environment within a high recreation amenity destination can be characterized as having significant natural and cultural resources (Moss, 2006), and as involving a strong social component of community and reference groups (Brehn, Eisenhaur, & Krannich, 2004). The social element also may include detractions such as crowding, congestion and other forms of conflict such as that with recent and long time residents (Moss, 2006). The social element also includes structural components such as the economy, housing, roads and health and educational infra-structure which all contribute to the negotiation process (Robertson & Stark, 2006). Physical, social and structural aspects of the environment are assumed to act both as a facilitator to one’s leisure goals, and constraint or stressor at different times. It is assumed also that over time the nature and character of the environment evolves (dotted line) as the physical and social aspects of the destination evolve.

Negotiation Coping Strategies. From a leisure and recreation perspective negotiation with one’s internal and external constraints is widely understood within the Leisure Constraints model that includes three basic levels of leisure constraint: intra-
personal, inter-personal and structural. The Leisure Constraints model is perhaps best suited to understanding what aspect of the internal (personal traits and motivation) and external (physical, social and structural) environments are being negotiated and how (Jackson, 2000). The Recreation Coping model is used to understand the way in which people respond to stressors, such as crowding or traffic, within a recreation setting. The Recreation Coping model posits that individuals will respond using one or more of four possible responses to stress within a recreation environment (which may include a high recreation amenity community). They include two cognitive based responses rationalization and product shift, and two behavioural based responses - displacement and direct action (Miller & McCool, 2003). I postulate that an individual will begin leisure and recreation negotiations relying on leisure constraint negotiations for the selection and pursuit of activities and behaviours. With increased time at the site I further postulate that an individual will rely more heavily on recreation coping strategies as various types of stressors persist and complimentary strategies are learned. However, it is assumed that despite the slight shift in emphasis over time both Leisure Constraint and Recreation Coping negotiation strategies may be present at any one time.

Amenity Migrant Typology. Resulting from motivation and the dynamic of the leisure centred human-environment negotiation is a typology of amenity migrants based on the findings of this investigation which represents a working theory which is well accepted within grounded theory (Glaser & Straus, 1967). The typology includes five distinct types of migrants including:

- those who wish to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle in the Bow Valley, rely on it for their livelihood but cannot negotiate the costs over the benefits and decide to leave;
- those who wish to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle in the Bow Valley and rely on it for their livelihood but negotiate to overcome the costs for the benefit;
• those who live in the Bow Valley to pursue more urban recreation and hospitality and tourism careers within the area;
• those who wish to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle and over time have managed to overcome early constraints and live relatively normal lives; and,
• those who wish to escape to the Bow Valley part-time (second home) and do not rely on the valley for their livelihood.

The typology is a result of different types (what is being negotiated) and levels (intensity) of negotiation within the human-environment. Various amenity migrant typologies appear in the literature (McMillan, 2006; Robinson & Stark, 2006; Perdue, 2004; Easterling, 2005). Each of the groups within my typology is believed to negotiate for their leisure somewhat differently.

Place Attachment, Dependence, and Identity. The relationship the individual recreationist develops over time with a chosen place can be understood using the concept of place attachment including underlying concepts of place dependence and identity (Kyle, Bricker, Graefe & Wickham, 2004). Place attachment is used to characterize the continuous manifestation of the human-environment negotiation as a relationship with place (Johnston, 1989). Place attachment, dependence and identity are assumed to strongly influence one’s decision to stay or leave the destination. Some will leave and others will remain. Those who leave may be seeking other destinations more supportive of their identity, goals and personal resources. Those who remain impact the destination through their behaviour, and in other ways such as policy development, and through ongoing shared discourse that creates a collective understanding of place. However even people who eventually leave a place imprint that destination by their recreation activities, to some degree. Place attachment loops back (dotted line) to motivation as the individual’s relationship with the place will be affected by the continuous negotiation process which is assumed to influence one’s motivation to engage in future negotiations and in what manner. Place attachment loops back as an antecedent to the continuous negotiation process.
Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply. The final component of the model seeks to provide insight into how the leisure based human-environment relationship physically affects a high recreation amenity destination. I propose here that as population increases, urban-type recreation supply increases and backcountry (outside of the town site) recreation supply generally remains stagnant or decreases. This general pattern has been previously observed. For example Glorioso & Moss (2006) discuss the rapid increase of urban amenities in the Santa Fe region during the 1980s to the present in association with amenity migration. Moore, Williams & Gill (2006) report loss of recreation land adjacent to Whistler BC town site as a result of residential and golf course development coupled with increased urbanization. Finally, a dotted line links ‘Effects on Destination and Recreation Supply’ and ‘Motivation’. As the destination evolves including the quantity and quality of urban and recreation supply the result is an equally evolving image of the destination that will serve to attract different types of individuals. This is a simple displacement process similar to Plog’s (2004) model whereby a destination evolves and, as it does, it attracts ‘venturers’ at first and then ‘dependables’ later on. Similarly, early density-crowding-satisfaction models realized that within any one site, varying conditions would attract different groups of people who are more or less comfortable with crowding conditions (Tarrant & English, 1996).

The proposed model of Negotiated Leisure within Amenity Migration is intended to provide insight into the leisure based human-environment negotiated relationship within a high recreation amenity destination. The model is based on empirical findings within a grounded theory approach and conceptually supported by previous research.

1.4 Overview of Methodology

Grounded theory was used as the overarching methodological approach for the investigation, which was conducted over four phases of data collection, although an additional interview phase was associated with focus group research. Figure 1.2 presents an overview of the methodology. My investigation began with the goal of exploring the
ways in which leisure is negotiated by residents within a tourism destination. Phase 1 consisted of a series of five focus groups with men and women in Canmore, men and women in Banff, and another with Banff seasonal workers. The purpose of the focus group analysis was to conduct an initial investigation of leisure negotiation for residents of the Bow Valley. Theoretical frameworks of behavioural geography leisure constraints and recreation coping research were used to guide the focus groups. The result was a sound understanding of the general environment within which residents negotiate for leisure and basic negotiation processes among some different groups. An additional five interviews were conducted with second home owners as a part of Phase 1. Following the initial exploration, I determined that a more in-depth investigation of the daily or lived experience aspect of the negotiation process was needed.

Phase 2 consisted of a series of twenty-two in-person semi-structured interviews to specifically explore the lived experience or daily aspect of leisure negotiation.
Interviews were conducted with participants of different groups which were determined by their motivation to reside in the Bow Valley. Interviews yielded considerable insight into the negotiation process among different groups. Theoretical frameworks or areas of literature most pertinent to the analysis of Phase 2 included behavioural geography, leisure constraints, recreation coping, and amenity migration. Key findings included:

- the recognition that residents of the Bow Valley are amenity migrants;
- that what is negotiated is predominantly one’s ability to sustain a satisfactory lifestyle within the Bow Valley rather than the traditional notion of access to particular recreation experiences;
- a subsequent typology of amenity migrants in the Bow Valley; and a unique understanding of the relationship between leisure constraints and recreation coping models within negotiation;
- that mobility or absolute displacement out of the region is an important negotiation strategy that affects the nature and character of the development of recreation amenities, which further fuels the arrival of particular types of residents amenable to the evolving recreation and structural environment.

A better understanding of the way that residents view recreation amenities and changes within their broader recreation environment (including social and structural elements that impact daily life) was needed to situate the particular phenomenon of leisure negotiation.

Phase 3 consisted of a quantitative survey conducted throughout the Bow Valley, resulting in 363 usable surveys (a response rate of 31%). What emerged from survey analysis was support for the idea that different groups value recreation amenities differently, and that respondents generally perceive changes to the environment, that is, urban-types of recreation amenities were perceived to have increased while those related to backcountry recreation have decreased. By the end of Phase 3 analysis a wider range of theoretical frameworks were used including behavioural geography, amenity migration, destination evolution, and place attachment. The final outcome of the research
and a result of the three phases of investigation is a Model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration (Figure 1.1).

The next section provides an overview of the theoretical and applied contributions of the investigation.

1.5 Importance of the Research

1.5.1 Contribution to Knowledge

The significance of my theoretical model of negotiated leisure within amenity migration is situated within the context of its contribution to knowledge and planning. Its contribution to knowledge is four-fold. First, this research has added to the understanding of the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography by exploring the role of leisure and negotiation as a component of the relationship, specifically within the setting of a high amenity environment. Second, this investigation has provided an empirically based typology of amenity migrants. Third, and relative to previous literature, this research has extended the leisure constraints and recreation coping models by its application to unique settings in a high recreation amenity destination with its atypical leisure character. Similarly, the application of the recreation coping model to a resident population captures the lived experience or daily aspect of recreation coping represents a unique application. Fourth, by using the grounded theory inductive approach, empirical and conceptual links have been made on an intra and inter-disciplinary level. I have made the intra-disciplinary connection between leisure constraints and recreation coping constructs, and the inter-disciplinary links between recreation coping and place attachment and mobility within behavioural geography.

1.5.2 Practical Applications

My model offers practitioners a tool to practically understand component parts of the dynamic of amenity migration from motivation to arrival, through to every day
negotiation and possible outcomes of that negotiation. This understanding can benefit all forms of local planning by creating a stronger connection between the place and the needs of various groups of amenity migrants. The usefulness of my model may be especially important to agencies such as Parks Canada (and other parks-related land managers) when attempting to anticipate, and plan for considerations of human-related growth. Similar to other destination-change models, my model does not necessarily provide planners and policy makers with a stepwise tool for planning but it does allow them to situate communities within a broader context of variables and anticipate likely changes associated with specific variables. This also assists residents of such communities to envision the type of community they would like to live in and pursue. Presentations I carried out at various conferences (from 2006 to 2008) resulted in positive feedback from practitioners on the transferability of the results. For example, land managers from various communities in British Columbia (e.g. Tofino, Golden, Kelowna, Nelson) reported similar patterns and results leading to the urbanization of small mountain and resort communities and these land managers are keen to improve their understanding of the variables that can explain such patterns. I hope that the proposed model will be further developed and used as a framework for the planning of sustainable amenity migration destinations.

1.6 Research Site and Context

1.6.1 The Bow Valley

The setting for the research is referred to as the Bow Valley within Alberta and includes the two adjacent communities of Canmore and Banff. Both communities are incorporated as towns. Canmore is located along the Trans-Canada Highway approximately 90 kilometres west of Calgary in the front ranges of the Rocky Mountains, while the Town of Banff is located another 21 km further west within the boundary of Banff National Park (see Figure 1.0). Though they are adjacent communities that presently share some similar opportunities and threats in relation to tourism, they are
different in several important ways. Most notably, because the Town of Banff is situated within Banff National Park, it is governed by legislation and policies that limit its growth, expansion, and resident eligibility, while the Town of Canmore does not share similar policies and legislation.

Banff has a long history of tourism development dating back to 1885 when it was first set aside as a park reserve following the discovery of hot springs in the local area (Pratt, 1999). Since that time it has experienced consistent growth in relation to tourism activity. The Town of Banff was incorporated in 1990 and is located in the midst of Canada’s most visited national park which also stands as a UNESCO World Heritage Site – Banff National Park (Town of Banff, 2007). Visitation to Banff has increased substantially from 32,000 in 1950 to just over 4.5 million in 1996 (Banff Bow Valley Report, 1996). Banff National Park, along with the town site, has a long history of attempting to balance human use and ecological pressures (Lovelock, 2002). Since its inception as a park it has maintained strong summer outdoor-based tourism activity, and during the early 1960s the opening of the winter ski industry through the advent of the powered lift and the Trans-Canada Highway culminated to transform the area into a four season tourism destination (Hart, 2003).

Presently the Town of Banff supports a population of just under 8,000 residents (Town of Banff, 2007) and it claims to be different from other municipalities (not located within a national park boundary) including the adjacent Town of Canmore, for the following reasons: it contains no freehold land – all land is leased from the federal government; growth (footprint) is held to 4.87 square km with no opportunity for annexation; residents must demonstrate a need to reside in Banff related to employment; commercial growth is limited to 1.5% annually; population is capped at 10,000 which was expected to be achieved by 2006 but did not, and it has developed an aggressive environmental management program (Town of Banff, 2004).

Canmore’s history is situated in the coal mining industry, with the last mine closing in 1979. Until recently, the town saw little involvement in tourism, despite its
proximity to Banff (Pratt, 1999). In 1980, Canmore had a population of 2,900, and only when the final mine closed and the prospect of the 1988 Winter Olympics became a reality did it shift its focus to tourism (Cheng, 1980). In recent years Canmore has experienced substantial growth on several fronts: general population; part-time resident population; and tourist activity. Its population has grown from 2,900 in 1980 to 6,621 in 1993 and 16,417 in 2006 (Cheng 1980; Town of Canmore, 2007). In 2006 the permanent population was reported to be 11,599 and from 1997 to 2006 the annual average growth rate for this group was 4.2%.

Another aspect of Canmore’s growth rate has been that of part-time residents who own second or vacation homes in Canmore, reside part-time and straddle the boundary between tourist and resident. This group is often referred to as the shadow community or weekend residents. The growth rate of this population sub-set has far exceeded that of the permanent resident population. According to the Town of Canmore 2006 Census, non-permanent residents number at 4,818 or approximately 41% of the total population and their annual average growth from 1998 to 2006 was 18.9% (compared to 4.1% for permanent residents for the same period of time). Canmore maintains short stay tourism activity similar to that of Banff in 2009 it appears to be lesser than Banff’s short stay tourism in terms of overall impact to the community.

1.6.2 Relevant Policy

The Bow Valley and Banff National Park in particular has been the subject of numerous planning exercises and legislation. Two documents of particular relevance to my research are the 1996 Banff Bow Valley Study (BBVS) and the Lands Adjacent to Banff (LATB) draft report. The former has been accepted as legislation while the latter is in its final stages (Pavelka, 2008). The two documents will be briefly reviewed for their relevancy to this research project because they help set the stage for the residential context.
Growing concerns over the impacts of tourism including the presence of the Trans-Canada Highway and to a lesser degree residential development during the 1980s culminated in the comprehensive BBVS report in 1996. The report set forth over 400 recommendations designed to balance human activity with the natural environment. Central to the recommendations was the reinforcement of ecological integrity within all planning related to the study area. This meant that ensuring the ecological integrity of the park would have to be the first consideration in any planning decision (Parks Canada, 1996). Related to this central tenet were various recommendations limiting growth and development for the park and for the Banff town site as well. One such limitation was a reinforcement of the ‘need to reside’ policy mentioned earlier. This policy altered the residential character of the Bow Valley by discouraging recreational property owners in Banff and shifting the demand to Canmore. Thus, in the past fifteen years Canmore has become recognized as a typical amenity migration destination and a place to purchase recreational property in the mountains (Robertson & Stark, 2006), while the town of Banff is recognized more as a traditional tourism destination, albeit uniquely situated in a national park.

The goal of the LATB report was to recognize and manage recreational lands adjacent to Banff in accordance with the BBVS recommendations. The LATB report included lands in the park and outside the park that are known recreational corridors including lands that have tourism focus such as Johnson’s Canyon and those with a residential focus such as the numerous informal trails. Many recommendations have been brought forward to manage these lands and allow for recreational use while protecting ecological integrity. The significance of the LATB report to my research is that it is the first report (known to the author) that formally recognizes both the recreation needs of residents who live in Banff National Park and that resident recreation crosses park boundaries.

Both the BBVS and the LATB provide formal and informal structure in the form of limits, guidelines, and enhancements to the potential for the leisure experience of
residents of the Bow Valley. More specific to my research, the two documents were incorporated informally into my data collection and theory building as it is understood within grounded theory to incorporate all relevant sources (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

1.6.3 Research Considerations

The Bow Valley was selected as the site to undertake this research for a variety of reasons including; Banff and Canmore house vibrant residential communities; although geographically adjacent the two communities are quite different in their character; and that both are accessible both geographically and from an access-to-the-community perspective by this author. Specific considerations of the site as it pertains to my research project are as follows:

a.) Resident recreation and leisure is diverse. Residents utilize tourism-focussed amenities, urban-type recreation amenities (such as the recreation centre, yoga studios, etc.) and lands adjacent to the town sites. This point underscores the need to focus research on the individual and his/her range of behaviours rather than site specific intercept survey work that focuses on use at various sites.

b.) Responsibility for recreation amenities is multi-jurisdictional. Residents of either community recreate in a variety of local spaces which may be managed by The Town of Banff; The Town of Canmore; Alberta Sustainable Development, and Parks Canada.

c.) Management of resident recreation in the Bow Valley can be politically sensitive. Because residents regularly recreate within different jurisdictions and four government bodies are involved, there is no one agency that assumes responsibility for resident recreation (as is more common in larger urban centres) or for the resident recreation experience. The division of responsibility for the resident recreation experience can result in inertia whereby one agency is reluctant to act without the others in step, as well as an overall disinclination of any one group to speak for resident recreation and quality of life in general. This
became apparent to me when, in the early stages of my research, each government agency was approached for funding assistance and each indicated that their role was too small to warrant direct involvement but if others were involved than it would be considered. No funding from local government agencies was secured for this research project.

d.) Residents of the Bow Valley are 'survey-saturated'. At the start of this research project individuals from the area cautioned me to a sentiment among community members that they are constantly being surveyed and that they seldom see any positive results from such research. This consideration was taken into account by the author when establishing the methodology for the research project.

e.) Both communities include a large segment of the permanent resident population that is actually transient. Notwithstanding the seasonal tourism and construction populations, there is a fairly large group (estimated at 20% in the Town of Canmore Community Profile) that is transient to the point where individuals may remain for one to two years and leave. This presented a challenge to me in accessing some groups such as younger populations who are renting and considering a long-term investment in the community but are not yet certain. Of their willingness to do so. The second home population of Canmore was also difficult to access because of uncertainty of exactly when they are in Canmore which challenges door-to-door access and most do not have telephone numbers which challenges any telephone related access (they use mobile phones).

f.) For the purposes of this research project, a resident is defined as someone who has lived in the Bow Valley (Canmore and Banff) for one year or longer.

g.) The goals and objectives of this research project do not require a specific geographic research site to be determined. The focus is the residents of the two communities and includes recreation opportunities and lands in the town site (urban type recreation) and those lands adjacent to the town sites (front country to backcountry). For the purpose of this research the general geographic area is
limited to the general range of daily recreation use of residents, which is not set by a physical boundary. With advances in outdoor recreation related technology the day use range is approximately a 30km to 50km radius surrounding the two communities (Personal communication with Steve Donlan and Mike Murtha, 2007). Thus the geographic site or range is defined more so by reported activities by participants than a pre-determined region.

Following my review of all known attributes and challenges of the Bow Valley in relation to the goal and objectives of my research project it was deemed appropriate to proceed. Note that other considerations such as Research Proposal approval and Ethics approval by the Conjoint Faculty Research Board of the University of Calgary were also obtained prior to proceeding with my research.

1.7 Situation of the Researcher within the Research Project

It is important for readers of my work to understand the underlying factors of the researcher that have influenced this investigation from its inception through to interpretation and presentation of the findings.

Much has been written on the need for, and various approaches to, having the researcher situate him or herself within the research, or to assert the agency of the researcher within the cultural politics of the structure of the research environment (Tribe, 2005). Ateljervic, Harris, Wilson & Collins (2005) claim that researchers need to be more rigorous and open about revealing more of the assumptions underlying social science research. They present four specific entanglements that should be addressed including ideologies and legitimacies of the researcher that guide their work; the research accountability environment that determines what is acceptable or not; the position of the researcher including one’s life and views; and the intersection of the work referring to the researcher’s relationship with the researched. Further, Cutcliffe (2000), Jennings & Junek (2007), and others have stated how important it is within the grounded theory approach that the researcher be involved, if not fully immersed, in all aspects of the
research process. In fact, the Corbin and Strauss (1990) approach to grounded theory adopted for this research project specifically deviated from the original Glaser and Strauss (1967) grounded theory canons partially on this point (Jennings & Junek, 2007). Thus, I will attempt to briefly address this area by generally discussing my motives for this investigation, my background with the topic and region and my relationship with the researched. In so doing I hope to address the general question of “how am I (Joe Pavelka) situated in my doctoral dissertation?”

I am motivated to pursue this research and the doctoral program in general out of curiosity and personal growth, with some secondary career-related motivations. I am currently in a tenured position; therefore it is not a requirement of my employment or directly linked to other career prospects. Conducting research in various forms (professional and academic) has been a part of my career for the past twenty years and the doctoral program offered an opportunity to conduct the highest level of research within a topic I have been interested in for some time. Beyond the intrinsic element, I assume that the completion of this work would offer some enhanced opportunities for career enrichment.

For many years I have held a strong interest in the topic of the human-environment relationship within a leisure context. I have researched and written about the topic in various forms. I have held an equal interest in mountain communities and culture in that same time, thus the PhD program and dissertation offered an opportunity to combine these two interests towards enhanced personal growth. I have been associated with the Bow Valley on a sporadic basis since 1983. At that time I lived in Banff for three months as a typical winter ski industry worker which served initially to create a strong attraction to the place and its culture. During the 1990s I extended my relationship to include consulting work for Parks Canada and with the Town of Canmore in 2004. My consulting work involved areas of tourism and recreation management. During that period I personally recreated throughout many areas of the parks and protected areas surrounding the Bow Valley. I do not believe my background with the topic and region
hinders the grounded theory process in any way. Glaser & Strauss (1967) originally posited that the researcher should enter into grounded theory work with little knowledge of the question and allow data to emerge as the researcher grows to learn more about the topic. Cutcliffe (2000), citing numerous predecessors, notes that it is widely accepted to have the grounded theory researcher possess a strong background in the area and even states it may well result in work of greater clarity in the end.

My relationship with the researched is such that the initial focus group of 'area experts' included several professional associates of mine who fit the requirement (each had professional experience with Bow Valley parks and/or recreation management) and members of this group have supported my interpretive efforts throughout. For the remainder of focus groups and in-person interviews, a recruitment process was used while a sampling approach was used for the quantitative component. My relationship with the researched has been set forth and approved by the Conjoint Faculty Research Ethics Board at the University of Calgary (See Appendix A). Many of the researched, those who took part in focus groups and interviews, have indicated a strong desire to be informed of the results and I have agreed to present the results in public forums, and other forms knowledge mobilization (yet to be determined) at the conclusion of the work.

1.8 Overview of Document

The first chapter (Introduction) provides the reader with an overview of the entire research project with detailed explanations of the research goals and objectives. The next chapter (Framework and Pertinent Literature) provides a comprehensive review of the research question within the broader context of related literature. Chapter Three (Design and Methodology) provides a detailed account of the methodology, rationale, design and execution of the research project.

Chapters four through six present the results of three distinct qualitative research phases including the Initial Focus Group Investigation (Chapter Four), the Second Home Owner interview phase (Chapter Five) and the Lived Experience interview phase
(Chapter Six). Within each chapter I present a summary of the results by concepts and categories, an interpretation of the results and an explanation of how each is linked together toward theory building. Chapter Seven (Qualitative Research Summary: Amenity Migrant Typology) presents a working theory based on the sum of the qualitative research phases.

The next two chapters present the results of the quantitative research phase, Bow Valley Recreation. Chapter Eight (Bow Valley Recreation – Descriptive Results) presents a summary of the descriptive results while Chapter Nine (Bow Valley Recreation – Grouping Statistical Results) focuses on the results of the factor and cluster analysis, or grouping statistics results. Chapter Ten (Model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration) presents the theory derived from the research project in model form with a comprehensive explanation of each component of the model. The final chapter (Conclusion) offers insights into the research in the form of research limitations and possible identifies directions for future research.
2 Framework and Pertinent Literature

2.1 Introduction

My research project began with the initial goal of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley, Alberta, Canada. By virtue of the grounded theory approach, my research evolved into an investigation of amenity migrants within the Bow Valley and their recreation-based attachment with their environment. The purpose of this chapter is to provide scholarly context to the research by demonstrating the conceptual and research linkages among the relevant areas of literature. In the case of this investigation, five distinct but related areas of literature were integrated into three distinct data collection and analysis iterations. These included a series of focus groups, in-person semi-structured interviews and a quantitative survey, in order to provide the basis of support for the development of a grounded theory. The five areas of literature include: grounded theory; behavioural geography; leisure constraints; recreation coping; and a final section referred to as destination evolution.

2.2 Overview of Human-Environment Relationship and Leisure and Tourism Research

The primary theme linking the five areas of research is the human-environment relationship within the context of a high recreation amenity destination. Within such a destination the sub-themes of leisure and negotiation are used within the methodological framework of grounded theory. An overview of the review of literature is presented in Figure 2.1. It begins with a statement of the initial goal of the investigation, which was to explore the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley. The grounded theory approach was adopted because I determined it to be most suited to a subject area where little is known and where I am able to incorporate multiple theoretical frameworks in accordance with emerging data.
Following the grounded theory approach, I determined that three theoretical frameworks would be required to guide the initial data collection and analysis iterations. The three frameworks involved behavioural geography (human-environment relationship), leisure constraints and recreation coping models. Behavioural geography’s focus on the human-environment relationship provided an overarching framework to understand and explore leisure negotiation within a specific setting. Leisure constraints and recreation coping models were used to understand more specific aspects of the leisure negotiation process. Later in the research it became necessary to seek out additional frameworks to situate emerging data regarding the effects of the negotiated leisure process on the broader physical, social and structural elements of the environment.
Literature within the area of destination evolution was used to better understand the process of change on the landscape, mobility and attachment to place.

Behavioural geography provides the overarching framework for the human-environment relationship including the manner in which leisure is negotiated within a high recreation amenity destination. The aim of behavioural geography is to “...identify cognitive processes by which individuals and groups codify, react to, and recreate their environments” (Boal & Livingstone, 1989, p. 9). Johnston (1991) adds that its purpose can be summarized as finding alternative theories to those of ‘economic’ man with a focus on why, rather than what, takes place. To find alternative theories the researcher must be fully engaged in the real world. This point underscores the suitability of the grounded theory approach within behavioural geography. Negotiation is a central theme within behavioural geography. However, my research also involved a recreation focus; thus complementary recreation-based frameworks were required to permit greater exploration of the specific leisure negotiation within the human-environment landscape. Leisure constraints and recreation coping models allow for an in-depth understanding of leisure negotiation while directly linked to the human-environment theme.

Leisure constraints research provides specific insight into how leisure is negotiated through its focus on intra-personal, inter-personal, and structural level constraints. Leisure constraint literature claims that people negotiate for their leisure through a hierarchically ordered series of constraints that involve individual motivation and desire, the role of others and the role of one’s broader environment (Walker & Virden, 2005).

Recreation coping research provides insight into the way people respond to stress within recreation environments; stress that could otherwise detract from one’s recreation experience (Manning & Valliere, 2001). Both leisure constraint and recreation coping literature compliment the broader framework of behavioural geography’s human-environment relationship focus and enable a more specific investigation of the lived experience of negotiated leisure to be conducted.
The final area of literature concerns destination evolution and for the purposes of this chapter I focus on the most relevant areas of literature including destination lifecycle models, resident support for tourism, amenity migration and place attachment. The four frameworks are linked by the theme of how tourism and/or high recreation amenity destinations change over time. Destination lifecycle or evolution models are included because they provide useful over-arching cross-sectional analytical tools to examine progress and change within tourism destinations (McKercher, 2005). Some background on amenity migrants, typologies, and impacts, is required as these elements are viewed increasingly as the agents of significant social, economic and environmental change within tourism destinations (Martin et al., 1997). Literature pertaining to amenity migration which focuses more specifically on the mobility aspect of amenity migrants adds to the understanding of negotiated responses and firmly situates this investigation within behavioural geography.

The human-environment relationship within a high recreation amenity destination involves aspects of place attachment, or the emotive bond between an individual and a place of exceptional physical and/or cultural character (Stokowski, 2002). Place attachment is a complex phenomenon, but within the context of a leisure-based human-environment perspective it can be understood in fairly simple terms. Williams & McIntyre (2001) claim that place creation is rooted in self-identity and, given the mobility brought about by modernity, people seek ‘place’ to reinforce their sense of self and seek to manipulate place to suit the self, and that place almost becomes a point of fashion in our modern world. Stokowski (2002) goes on to claim that place creation is a matter of social discourse, and created and re-created depending on the actors involved. Together, research in destination lifecycle/evolution, amenity migrants, amenity migration and place attachment (broadly defined), provides a suitable framework to understand how a place, an environment, rich in recreation amenities, may change over time.
2.3 Grounded Theory

Grounded theory is a qualitative methodology born from the work of Glaser & Strauss (1967) that has become widely accepted throughout the social sciences (Goulding, 1998). The purpose of this section is to describe the fundamental nature of grounded theory, its relevance to human geography, its relevance to leisure and tourism research and its relevance to the research project.

2.3.1 Grounded Theory Background

Grounded theory is a qualitative methodology, but it is referred to as both a methodology and a method of data analysis (Jennings, 2001). There appears to be some confusion in interpretive research regarding the meaning of the terms, 'methodology' and 'methods'. These two terms often are used synonymously and in an inconsistent manner that can create considerable confusion (Caelli, Ray, & Mill, 2003). A methodology reflects beliefs about knowledge and theoretical frameworks that guide the way in which the research will proceed and the types of knowledge the researcher would like to create. Methods refer to tools used to collect data that will support any number of methodologies (Jennings, 2001; Caelli et al., 2003). For example, common qualitative methodologies within the tourism/recreation field include grounded theory, phenomenology, ethnography and case studies. Typical qualitative methods of data collection may include interviews, focus groups, observation, some types of surveys, photographic and other visual techniques, and the use of secondary materials. A lack of methodological clarity, including associated terminology, is a central problem for interpretive research and researchers (Cutcliffe, 2000).

Grounded theory is an inductive approach that is based on the assumption that social science theory can be built from data that is systematically collected in a social setting (Hardy, 2005). Grounded theory derives its theoretical basis from Pragmatism and Symbolic Interactionism. From these meta-theories, two important principles have been passed on. The first is that phenomena will change over time; thus inquiry should
also be able to adapt to change. The second is determinism, and grounded theory takes a middle-ground position by rejecting both determinism and non-determinism. A person has the means of control but may not choose to use it (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Corbin & Strauss (1990) provide a comprehensive review of grounded theory canons and procedure and stress that they need to be observed carefully so as to not run the risk of lost credibility. These are reviewed in detail in a later chapter but it is important to include a brief overview of the canons and procedure to provide an overall context. Corbin & Strauss (1990) provided eleven procedures in total which I paraphrase as follows.

1. Data collection and analysis are inter-related processes whereby the researcher enters the field with basic questions, data collection and analysis are carried out concurrently, and the researcher is encouraged to absorb data from all relevant sources.
2. Concepts are the units of analysis. Concepts are derived from incidents, events and other happenings that are to be coded into broader categories.
3. Categories must be developed and related to one another and relevant frameworks and eventually formed into theory.
4. Sampling in grounded theory proceeds on theoretical grounds. The researcher’s initial sample is likely to be pragmatic and become more theoretical as theory building progresses. The goal is to address all aspects of the phenomena under study rather than achieve a representative sample.
5. Analysis makes use of constant comparisons of category level data. This guards against researcher bias and also determines whether data has earned a place in the category.
6. Patterns and variations must be accounted for and regularity is important. Data should be assessed for its regularity and deviations from patterns also should be noted.
7. Process must be built into the theory. In grounded theory, process is recognized as the deconstruction of phenomenon into phases, stages and steps or observed activity within the phenomenon as action/interaction, in light of changes in response to changing conditions.

8. Writing theoretical memos is an integral part of doing grounded theory. Memos should be kept throughout; however there are variations on memos and memo-taking.

9. Hypotheses about relationships among categories should be developed and verified as much as possible during the research process. Hypotheses can be developed and brought to the field for verification.

10. Grounded theory researchers should not work alone. It is important to check results and hypotheses with others to achieve optimal interpretation.

11. Broader structural conditions must be analyzed, however microscopic the research. The researcher needs to link the research to broader societal structures such as economics, political trends, movements and events.

According to Cutcliffe (2000), four areas of grounded theory are particularly prone to confusion, they include: sampling, creativity and reflexivity, the use of literature review and precision. He argues that a point of confusion is that grounded theory sampling has been described as theoretical (as earlier identified) or purposeful but he claims the two types of sampling essentially refer to the same procedure.

Another point of confusion is the question of how involved the researcher should be in the research. One view, taken up by the Strauss-school of thought, is that the rigor of the coding procedure should allow the researcher to maintain some distance or objectivity. Another is that creativity within reflexivity is an essential quality of grounded theory research because it “…legitimizes the researchers’ creativity as an integral part of the grounded theory inductive process” (Cutcliffe, 2000, p. 147). Cutcliffe (2000) advocates the latter position, provided the researcher clearly discloses his/her position within the research.
A third point of confusion relates to the timing of the literature review. The traditional approach as set out by Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggests that it should be avoided until later in the research process to better allow for emergent themes. Another position as advocated by Hutchinson (1993; as noted in Cutcliffe, 2000) is that it should be carried out at the beginning of the process to identify gaps in knowledge and propose stronger rationale for the research undertaken. Cutcliffe (2000) advocates either approach depending on how much the researcher already knows about the subject matter, and qualifies his position by stating that in many cases it will be irrelevant given the personal background of the researcher. The final point is that of precision in following the canons and procedures of grounded theory. Cutcliffe (2000) argues that there has been considerable method ‘slurring’ (overlapping with other methodologies and hybrids of the original) and that there is not one proper procedure. He argues that method slurring may be appropriate and it is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. As with all methodologies, the researcher employing grounded theory methodology requires a strong understanding of its nuances.

2.3.2 Grounded Theory and its Relevance to Human Geography

There are two essential questions for qualitative researchers, including human geographers, which concern social structures and individual experiences. An individual’s experience(s) is likely to be influenced to greater and lesser degrees by larger societal structures related to social, culture, economic and environment. It is the role of the human geographer to balance between a focus on structures and on individual experiences (Winchester, 2000). Qualitative research in human geography has the role of elucidating dissident and marginalized voices, to show that the same event or movement may be experienced completely differently by two people. That is, the experiences and meanings of events and places cannot be generalized, but they still construct our reality (Winchester, 2000). Winchester (2000) points out that the geographies’ movement into and through various intellectual paradigms since the early twentieth century has been
driven by qualitative research which has challenged the theoretical propositions of the day towards the development of new propositions. Cox & Golledge (1969 and 1981, cited in Johnston 1991, pp. 136-137) stated that the behavioural approach to geography involved:

a.) “A search for new models of humanity that were alternatives to the economically and spatially rational beings of normative and location theory;

b.) A search to define environments in terms other than the objective physical reality in which human decision-making takes place;

c.) An emphasis on process-based rather than the structural explanations of human activity and the physical environment;

d.) A focus on the psychological, social and other theories of human decision-making and behaviour;

e.) A shift in focus from aggregate populations to individuals and small groups;

f.) A search for methods other than those traditional mathematics and inferential statistics that could aid in uncovering structure in data; and

g.) To merge geographic research into the ever broadening cross-disciplinary investigation of theory building.”

It can be argued that all points made by Cox & Golledge (cited above) provide a case for the use of grounded theory with inductive approach, flexibility to incorporate a wide variety of data and theoretical frameworks, and cross-disciplinary approaches.

The advantage or unique contribution that grounded theory brings to this discussion is that it is able to fit conceptually within environments where there is little known and bring seemingly disparate knowledge together, that is eventually formed into a theory that is built from the ground up. Grounded theory brings the promise of building
empirically and inductively driven theory into two key areas of inquiry: social structures and individual experience.

2.3.3 *Grounded Theory and its Relevance to Leisure and Tourism Research*

Grounded theory methodology is evident in tourism and leisure studies, although other areas such as sociology and nursing have used grounded theory more extensively since its inception. Some researchers in tourism and leisure studies have used the methodology. Hardy (2005) used grounded theory to develop a theory on the relationships between stakeholder analysis, perceptions of tourism induced change, and the principles of sustainable tourism. She justified the approach because so little was known about the area of stakeholder analysis in tourism. Decrop & Snelders (2005) used a grounded theory approach to propose an alternative tourist typology that incorporates both socio-psychological processes and decision-making. They, along with Hardy (2005), provided a detailed description of their process or methodology and both included theoretical sampling and rigid coding practices. Woodside, MacDonald & Buford (2004) conducted an investigation of travel consumer decision-making of 26 family groups to Prince Edward Island. A grounded theory approach was also used to develop theoretical propositions related to a purchase consumption system within travel.

2.3.4 *Grounded Theory and its Relevance to my Research Project*

Grounded theory methodology is an appropriate methodology to frame the investigation of the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley for several reasons. First, the research involves a reliance on knowledge and concepts and research from geography, tourism and recreation which must be brought together in a meaningful yet initially unknown way. Grounded theory works well within environments where little is known or knowledge is disparate (Hardy, 2005). Second, my goal is to develop a theory or theoretical proposition that links geography, tourism, recreation and leisure within the phenomena of a lived experience of leisure in a unique mountain
environment. Grounded theory is adept at allowing the researcher to focus on the concept and phenomena, and less on the discipline. Third, on a process level, grounded theory involves various iterations of data collection and analysis often involving a variety of methods does the methodology for this research project. Hardy (2005), in researching the stakeholder dynamic related to tourism for a small community in Australia, relied on several iterations of data collection utilizing multiple methods. Woodside et al. (2004) relied on only one extended interview to collect data on their grounded theory analysis of travelers to Prince Edward Island. However, Decrop and Snieders (2005) included a series of three pre-planned interview sessions with 26 families to support their grounded typology of vacation decision-making. Finally, amenity migration is a central component of my research project. It is also a relatively new area of research and draws from a variety of disciplines to describe the phenomenon (Moss, 2006). Grounded theory appears to be well suited to guide a rigorous investigation of this subject area as it allows for the integration of multiple frameworks in accordance with emergent data.

My research project’s goal of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley is exploratory, interpretive and inter-disciplinary and to be successful it required a methodological approach that was first inductive, second flexible, and third offered guidelines for rigour that could yield significant insights, all which could be found within the grounded theory methodological approach.

The hegemony of one research style deprives social scientists of a variety of research strategies that have equal, and possibly superior, claims to the mantle of ‘science’ …The complexity of the world around us demands the deployment of a variety of techniques and strong intellectual and methodological discipline, not a commitment to the hegemony of a single research modality (Jennings, 2001, p. 157). The point is that the selection of a methodology, including its advantages and disadvantages, depends on the research question and context.
2.4 Behavioural Geography

2.4.1 Overview of Behavioural Geography

Behavioural geography stands as the centre point of the review of literature as it provides a strong platform for the exploration of the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley within its human-environment scope. This section presents an overview of behavioural geography and demonstrates links to relevant tourism and recreation studies and research, then demonstrate various streams of tourism and recreation research and study that possess strong conceptual and methodological connections with behavioural geography.

By the 1960s, human geography had adapted and embraced a more deductive spatial 'science' approach to the question "What is the nature of man’s relationship with his environment?" relative to the more inductive regional geography of the past. In addition to a broad deductive approach, human geography was characterized by the use of quantitative methods, mathematics and geometry. This unique spatial science resulted in a normative approach to the understanding of human spatial behaviour. Research in the areas of spatial systems, spatial theory, social physics, and spatial science ensued but progress in this area generally did not meet the expectations of becoming a full-fledged hard science. This was due partially to methodological problems such as entropy and auto-correlation, but mostly to a growing realization that the normative approach was too disconnected with actual human behaviour (Johnston, 1991; Livingston, 1992). The spatial geographical sciences of the 1960s and 1970s were concerned primarily with predicting the most efficient methods related to economics and transport, but seldom were their results grounded in the real world (Johnston, 1991). There was a growing recognition of disconnect between the value of the work being carried out by the deductive spatial modellers, and the central question of the relationship between man and the environment. The methods had advanced but the content had not brought the anticipated insights.
This gap resulted in a shift towards a more inductive approach founded on the assumption that human decision-making was based on both internal and external factors. Observed human decision-making did not always appear rational. Very basic questions arose as to what was rational or irrational decision-making and whether researchers were observing rational decision-making within *unstable* environments. Or was the decision-making rational if one understood the individual’s underlying goal (Johnston, 1991)? These questions ushered in a new approach that was to be far more inductive. The period of geographical history from the fall of regional geography through to the early quantitative revolution and the spatial geometry era may appear chaotic and haphazard but it helps to remember that the focus throughout this period remained on the central question of “what is man’s relationship with the environment?” What had changed so dramatically were the world, the world of science, and its associated methods of inquiry and explanation.

William Kirk’s paper, *Historical Geography and the Behaviour Environment* first published in 1952 and reprinted in 1989, is credited with the introduction of behavioural geography but his work was largely ignored at the time because of the physical/human split in the geographic community. It was not until later in the 1970s that his work was noticed (Johnston, 1989). Kirk was not alone. Others such as Cox & Golledge, (1969 and 1981, cited in Johnston 1991) were influential in the development of behavioural geography, but Kirk appears to have taken the lead (Johnston, 1991). Kirk held the relativist perspective and believed that the best way to understand spatial behaviour was to understand the motives of the individual in their engagement with the physical world. Kirk divided the geographic environment into two components: the phenomenological environment of the natural and built physical world, and the behavioural environment of the inner psycho-social world. It was in the behavioural environment that Kirk believed “facts are arranged into patterns…given meanings in cultural context” (Johnston, 1989, p. 235). Kirk’s relativist perspective was evident when he mused “a piece of ground of little value in the behavioural environment of one group may become suddenly desirable in
that of another group” (Kirk, 1989, p. 28). His point, though, is that the value of the phenomenological environment is relative to the behavioural environment and critical in understanding the decision-making process.

2.4.2 Behavioural Geography Defined

Behavioural geography differentiated itself from previous geographical approaches through its focus on psycho-social explanations of the human-environment relationship. This focus meant that the geographer was to engage him/herself with the real world with an inductive empirically driven approach. Behavioural geography includes both the positivist social science methods to study perceptions and decision-making and phenomenological methods focused on the internal world of construction and meaning (Boal & Livingstone, 1989).

The behavioural approach to geography has been defined broadly, for example; Anderson (1989, p. 133) states the “behavioural approach looks to the subjective world of perceptions, feelings, attitudes and beliefs for its contribution to the central aim of geography, the explanation of spatial behaviour.” Boal and Livingstone (1989, p. 9) explain that it “…seeks to identify cognitive processes by which individuals and groups codify, react to and recreate their environments.” Johnston (1991) would suggest the purpose is to find alternative theories to those of ‘economic’ man with a focus on why, rather than what, takes place and for this the geographer must be fully engaged in the real world.

Golledge & Stimson (1987, from Johnston 1991) proposed that spatial behaviour can be explained by understanding how attitudes and perception cognition impact our learning, which in turn influences attitudes and behaviour in relation to the environment. They believe that in order to comprehend any environment people must take in, organize and process critical information which is associated with the everyday task of living.
2.4.3 Behavioural Geography and Specific Links to Leisure Constraints and Recreation Coping Research

The most apparent connection between behavioural geography and tourism and recreation studies and research is the shared focus on understanding human behaviour within spatial, and to a lesser extent, temporal, frameworks. At the broader conceptual level the two fields are linked in several ways. On an epistemological level both behavioural geography and tourism and recreation research took a turn during the 1970s from viewing humans as objects of their structure and environment, to subjects with an ability to enact their will and negotiate and re-create their environments (Anderson, 1989, Samdahl & Jekubovich, 1997). A more obvious connection is the sub-field of recreation geography. Pioneered by the work of Roy Wolf this sub-field was based on spatial analysis of recreation, leisure and travel and demonstrates some early (1970s and 1980s) connections (Smith, 1989).

A more contemporary and existential perspective on the connection between geography and leisure is that leisure, tourism and recreation are largely defined today within the context of freedom and self-expression which is limited in its manifestation by the parameters of time and space. That is, the expression of self involves leisure and travel and the expression of leisure and travel involves space and place (Savantola, 2002). Another perspective on this relationship can be seen with the behavioural approach of recreation.

The behavioural approach postulates that within their free time, people will seek out experiences whose benefits are known, expected and valued (Manning, 1999; Driver & Tocher, 1970; from Rollins & Robinson, 2002). A critical part of this orientation is the combined push and pull which refers to one’s motivation to engage in a recreation activity while the pull element refers to qualities of the setting and/or the activity that ‘pull’ the individual to a specific place (setting) or activity (Rollins & Robinson, 2002).
The push/pull aspect of the behavioural approach provides greater explanatory ability than traditional motivational models because a link can be made to the place and/or form of recreation that is selected. Concepts similar to the push/pull aspect of the model exist elsewhere and offer evidence of the fit of tourism and recreation research within behavioural geography. Iso-Ahola (1989) presented a two-dimensional model of leisure and travel motivation based on seeking and escaping personal and inter-personal situations, whereby seeking and escaping were positioned as working together, for example, one could wish to escape crowded streets (inter-personal situation) by seeking solitude (personal situation) in a solitary walk in a park. Cohen’s Tourist Typology (1979) represents another conceptualization of the push/pull aspect. This typology proposes that discretionary travel can be explained by the push and pull of alienation and authenticity one is more likely to travel if the alienation from one’s centre or home place is perceived as high. Equally powerful is the pull of the desire to seek out authenticity in some ‘other’ place (Wylie, 2000).

The spatial interpretation of one’s environment that is central to behavioural geography is evident in leisure constraints research. The Jackson, Crawford, & Godbey (1993) model of leisure constraints postulated that people negotiate for their leisure through a series of three hierarchically ordered constraints which appear in the form of intra-personal, inter-personal and structural constraints. Walker & Virden (2005) proposed a modified model that includes an additional set of constraints related to the structural level and specific to the interpretation of the environment. These include: environmental structural constraints; social environment structural constraints; territorial structural constraints; and institutional structural constraints. The Walker and Virden (2005) model explicitly recognizes the physical and social managerial (or political) environment as critical aspects of recreation negotiation (this is explained in detail in a later section).
A question arises here as to whether the conceptualizations of the term 'environment' are similar in geography, recreation and tourism. Early writings related to behavioural geography do not offer much insight in terms of whether the external or phenomenological environment, as Kirk presented, included social or managerial elements as is the case in the recreation approach. Later studies within behavioural geography (Anderson, 1989; McNicol, 2004) however, include social and structural elements in their conceptualization of the phenomenological environment. Thus the comparison here appears justified. Raymore (2002) proposed a model of leisure facilitation in reverse logic to the Crawford et al. (1991) model of leisure constraints. Raymore (2002) presents structural 'facilitators' instead of constraints, which appear as specific aspects of the environment that facilitate one's ability to experience leisure, for example, she says "a facility is either there or it's not" (Raymore, 2002, p. 47). The logic follows that an environment with abundant structural facilitators is likely to have greater 'pull' (such as the Bow Valley) and encourage recreation while the opposite is also likely to be true. In her research, Raymore (2002) makes reference to setting affordances as broader societal factors that may affect leisure behaviour. The structural constraints of Walker & Virden (2005) along with the structural facilitators of Raymore (2002) offer a clear conceptual connection into behavioural geography while the concept of setting affordance appear to offer a more vague connection.

Definitions of behavioural geography presented earlier in this section share a central theme that cognitive processes in everyday experience shape our behaviours in relation to our environment — it is the path to understanding the central question of spatial behaviour. The understanding of spatial behaviour is also central to recreation coping research.

Coping is defined as "any behaviour, whether deliberate or not, that reduces stress and enables a person to deal with a situation without excessive stress" (Manning & Valliere, 2001, p. 411). It is generally accepted that people engage in four basic types of
coping strategies in outdoor recreation environments, including displacement (spatial and temporal shift), rationalization (avoidance of cognitive dissonance), product shift (repositioning the environment in line with current experience) and direct action (contact with authorities to alter the situation). Displacement and direct action are behavioural, while rationalization and product shift are cognitive in nature (Schuster & Hammit, 2000). Coping research suggests people will respond to stress in their recreation environments in different ways. In some cases responses involve spatial behaviour (displacement) whereas in other cases responses may involve a cognitive solution (rationalization or product shift) that may act as an antecedent to a future recreation decision involving the environment, or an attempt to recreate the environment (direct action). The practical value of coping research is the ability to understand and predict spatial behaviour, in a specific context of recreation or travel.

Behavioural geography encourages the researcher to go beyond the objective world of facts and interpret it based on one’s motives and cognition. Delving into the world of perceptions, attitudes, feelings, values and beliefs from a positivist or phenomenological approach means that interpretation is critical. Despite one’s most rigorous attempts at definition someone else may, and likely will, see something very different. This is the world of behavioural geography and it is also a part of tourism and recreation studies given that perceptions of the physical or phenomenological world are often contested. Ley (1977) argues that a geographical fact is relational to its subject, while Kirk (1989) explained how a piece of ground may be useless to one and valued to another. This means landscape and environment are relative terms. Johnston (1989) brings this point further with his discussion of people as behavioural environments, whereby community solidarity is linked to patterns of avoidance of ‘other’ and order upon society is maintained through spatial form. Johnston (1989) also discussed the creation of behavioural environments that can be delineated by class including economics, tenure of residency, occupation, and housing.
Behavioural environments as discussed by Johnston (1989) represent an increasingly important issue and a subsequent focus of research within tourism and recreation studies. Stokowski (2002) argues for a shift in leisure research to understand how places are socially constructed from a collective perspective rather than the traditional individual perspective. She argues that places exist in the objective sense, but include political, access, location and equity issues which must be considered in a collective sense, similar to Johnston’s (1989) arguments. Leisure (recreation and travel) is a political act in so much as it is an expression of one’s self (how one sees oneself) and leisure allows individuals to define place, which then takes on a collective sense of place and in turn reinforces individual identities. For example, the Bow Valley can be said to have developed a collective sense of place in-line with mountain culture, while Tofino, British Columbia is developing a collective sense of place in-line with ‘surf’ culture – both leisure based in their definition.

Leisure is an act of freedom and self-expression (Raymore, 2002) which when enacted on a place may result in emotional attachments and even conflict over space. Leisure may represent recreation for some, travel for others, and home place for others. Price, Moss, & Williams (1997) provide a description of the phenomenon of amenity migration that straddles the definition of resident and tourist, and points out that conflict often occurs between old and new residents on a variety of levels including location of residence, economic status, and leisure activities. Their work appears to support Johnston’s (1989) claims of behavioural communities. Jamal & Getz (1999) reported on a study of a community consensus process (collective construction of place) related to tourism development in the town of Canmore, Alberta. Their study focused on the consensus process and its underlying conflict. Much of the conflict was based on contested space related to tourism and resident needs and wants, thereby demonstrating another link between leisure motivation, negotiation, behaviours and the broader human-environment relationship.
2.5 Leisure Constraints

2.5.1 Leisure Constraints Research Background

The area of leisure constraints research has grown substantially in the past forty years to the point where it is considered by some to dominate leisure and recreation research agendas (Raymore, 2002). Leisure constraints research has revealed much about the leisure experience but it is still plagued by two overarching problems; first, that the field is constantly evolving (which is positive but adds to the overall ambiguity of the constraints construct) and second, exactly what is and what is not a leisure constraint (Jackson & Scott, 1999).

The first cohesive model of leisure constraints emerged in 1991 in the form of the Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraint developed by Crawford, Jackson & Godbey (1991), as seen in Figure 2.2.
This model repositioned structural, intra-personal and inter-personal constraints in a hierarchical manner to better explain how and when people experience leisure constraints. The model posited that leisure preferences were formed when intra-personal leisure constraints were absent, or at least under control, and were the first encounter the individual had with constraints. Next, and depending on the activity or leisure preference, the person may encounter a social constraint or inter-personal constraint if reliance on another is required. This represents the second encounter an individual would experience with a constraint. These two types, or levels, of constraints have been referred to as those related to leisure preferences. If the leisure preference managed to bypass, or somehow avoid, the intra-personal and inter-personal level of constraints, a structural or intervening constraint may be encountered. In this case, participation will occur only when structural constraints are absent or avoided. It was conceptualized that the intra-personal constraint acting upon the initial leisure preference was most powerful, followed by the inter-personal level constraints and lastly structural constraints (Crawford et al., 1991). Despite the clarity it introduced to the concept of leisure constraints, it remained challenged by questions of participation versus non-participation, and presence or absence of constraints (Jackson, 2000). Some studies at the time revealed that people participated despite reporting the presence of constraints (Jackson & Scott, 1999).

In 1993, Jackson, Crawford & Godbey proposed a critical refinement to the model in the form of negotiation through six propositions. In summary, they proposed that the presence or absence of constraints is far less important than one’s ability to negotiate through a constraint such that if the leisure preference is low, any constraint may result in non-participation and conversely if the leisure preference is high, then virtually any constraint may be negotiated. The addition of the negotiation component has remained the standard for leisure constraints research since 1993 although new revised models have begun to appear.
Jackson (2000) presented ideas on the future of leisure constraint research and in doing so he summarized what is known about leisure constraints to date. It is important to review this before proceeding further.

1.) There are three types of leisure constraints: intra-personal, inter-personal and structural.
2.) There is strong evidence to conclude that there are constraints around cost of participation, time commitments, availability of facilities, social and geographic isolation, and inadequate skills and abilities.
3.) There are no universal constraints, but a lack of time and money are very common.
4.) Constraints will change with one’s lifecycle, but no group is free of constraints.
5.) Constraints are affected by a variety of variables, including but not limited to income, household structure, and education.
6.) Constraints are not obstacles. People participate despite constraints, and they will modify and adapt their behaviour and choices accordingly.

The negotiation process can be summarized as follows. Once a leisure preference has been established, a person must negotiate negative or limiting psychological (intra-personal) factors or messages. That person must also negotiate around negative or limiting social (inter-personal) factors that may be psychological (e.g. anticipation of negative social situations) or situation related (e.g. loss or absence of a partner for a specific activity). Finally the person must negotiate environmental (structural) factors to maintain participation in the leisure preference. However, the model is predicated on the notion that throughout the negotiation process, the initial leisure preference may have been altered and modified in accordance with a negotiated response.

2.5.2 Overview of Leisure Constraints Research

This section presents a brief overview of selected leisure constraints research to better demonstrate how and when people negotiate through constraints and to
demonstrate the reach of constraints research. The first area of research is that of general constraints research – the investigation of general constraints to leisure in a population, versus investigation of constraints to a specific activity. Hultsman (1995) sampled 32 adults using multi-dimensional scaling to examine the dimensions underlying constraints. Her results yielded three distinct groups of constraints: cost, personal reasons and facilities. She also found that constraints do not function alone, which offered further support for the use of dimensions. A unique post-hoc analysis of leisure constraints was conducted by Samdahl & Jekubuvich (1997), within their original study of factors that affected the everyday leisure of a group of 88 adults. Their results revealed that the three types of constraints were evident, post-hoc, and that their respondents negotiated through constraints in four general ways by making time for self, coordinating time with others, compromising on the activity and sharing leisure with others.

Constraints research also has been conducted with a single activity focus. Hudson & Gilbert (1999 & 2000) conducted a series of qualitative and quantitative examinations of alpine skiing using the Jackson et al. (1993) leisure constraints framework. Hudson & Gilbert (1999) reported on qualitative work that revealed non-participants primarily struggle at the intra-personal constraints level while participants face their greatest constraints at the structural level. Their second (2000) study reported on a more elaborate quantitative examination to further explore leisure constraints related to alpine skiing, but also to challenge the hierarchical proposition of the Crawford et al. (1991) model. Gilbert & Hudson (2000) revealed that non-participants often hold negative attitudes about skiing and skiers. This was speculated to be more of an antecedent constraint than an intra-personal constraint. Furthermore, skiing participants in their study did not necessarily struggle with inter-personal constraints as they moved through the model.

Numerous studies have been carried out to examine leisure constraints within a particular sub-set of a population. Auster (2001) examined the leisure constraints of 453 female motorcycle riders to determine if a rare group (female motorcycle riders) who had
presumably already negotiated a variety of constraints to become motorcycle riders relied on forms of enrichment, or some external form of support, to access their activity. As expected, most did experience some form of external support. Little (2002) conducted interviews and diaries to investigate the negotiation processes of 43 women who had been involved in outdoor recreation in the past and either returned or were considering a return to outdoor recreation. She reported that most women utilized some form of negotiation from minor adjustments, to more significant changes, to vicarious attachments, to remain connected.

In the 1990s considerable research emerged with a critical feminist and cross-cultural perspective. The significance of this work was that it revealed new types of constraints specific to a group, for example, newly identified women’s constraints included family care and body image (Dattilo, Dattilo, Samdahl & Kleiber, 1994). Furthermore, this study revealed that significant differences exist between employed and stay-at-home women, not only in their types of constraints reported, but in the way they conceptualize leisure and self (Harrington & Dawson, 1995). Similarly, new insights have been raised from research on the immigrant experience. Stodolska (1998) reported that recent Polish immigrants to Edmonton experienced constraints in the form of discrimination (Behavioural-Reception Assimilation) which were identified to be the most important, while also reporting that typical constraints were experienced. Tsai (2002) studied constraints of recent Chinese immigrants to Australia and found that the level of acculturation was the greatest predictor of leisure constraints, more than economic or educational status. A study of leisure constraints affecting physical activity of school children in Nova Scotia found, among other constraints, that too much school work (structural) affected participation of those in high school (Rehman et al., 2003).

In recent years, leisure constraints research has been extended to tourism. It can be argued that the work of Gilbert & Hudson (1999, 2000) is touristic in nature although others have applied constraints research to tourism more directly. Hinch and Jackson (2000) made a case for the application of leisure constraints research to address the issue
of seasonality within tourism. McGuiggan (2003) proposed a model of holiday choice utilizing the Jackson et al. (1993) conceptualization, thus emphasizing the relationships among personality, intra-personal constraints and holiday choice. Wang, Norman and McGuire (2004) compared leisure as perceived by younger and older travelers and found some differences even though both groups perceived a seasonal constraint. This brief review of research reported in this section is intended to reinforce the negotiated aspects of leisure constraints and provide a glimpse into the range of subject matter being addressed by leisure constraints research.

Several criticisms have been levied against leisure constraints research. They are:

- It is based on a narrow range of criterion variables such as participation, non-participation, decreased frequency of activity and decreased enjoyment, but more criterion variables are needed (Jackson & Scott, 1999).
- There exists an over emphasis on structural constraints and not enough on intra-personal and inter-personal constraints (Jackson, 2000).
- There is an over emphasis on constraints as obstacles and not enough on the negotiation and adaptive strategies aspects (Jackson, 2000).
- There is an over emphasis on quantitative methods and not enough on qualitative approaches (Jackson, 2000).
- The concept of leisure constraints has been used to explain virtually any aspect of leisure behaviour when it clearly has more limited applicability (Samdahl & Jekubuvich, 1997; Raymore, 2002).

Although these criticisms are similar to those of any area of study attempting to find a balanced direction for the future, the final criticism is of a more profound nature. This criticism suggests the average person does not consider that leisure constraints are their everyday experience of leisure, thereby challenging the relevance of leisure constraints revealed in the post-hoc study of Sandahl & Jekabuvich, (1997). This finding led Jackson & Scott (1999) to speculate that perhaps leisure constraints are an “artificial construct that scholars impose when conceptualizing, conducting and interpreting their research”
Many of these criticisms have been addressed by Jackson (2005) however some
developments specific to my research project will be discussed.

### 2.5.3 Relevant Developments in Leisure Constraint Research

Two variations on the basic model of leisure constraint will be discussed in this
section. They include the concept of leisure facilitators, by Raymore (2002) and a

Perhaps recognizing that leisure constraints were beginning to be used to explain
all forms of leisure behaviour, Raymore (2002), proposed the concept of leisure
facilitators in direct contrast to leisure constraints. Raymore’s proposal was to see if the
constraints concept could be reversed to explain how leisure preference is facilitated. For
example, she proposed that intra-personal facilitators become individual traits and beliefs
that promote the formation of leisure preferences and encourage participation. Inter-
personal facilitators follow a similar, but social theme. Structural facilitators are
proposed to be aspects of the environment that directly support leisure preferences and
participation such as access, facilities, skill, awareness, lower cost, more time, etc. In
light of my research it can be said that a tourism community such as the Bow Valley
contains distinct structural constraints such as cost of living, crowding, and lack of some
types of recreation facilities. There are, for its size, equally distinct structural facilitators
such as a mountain recreation environment and abundant restaurants, cafes and arts for its
size. Structural facilitators may assist in framing the specific environment in which
recreation takes place.

The second development is the Revised Model of Leisure Constraints by Walker &
Virden (2005) as presented in Figure 2.3. The model varies from the work of Jackson et
al. (1993) in several important ways. First, macro and micro level antecedent factors are
introduced to better frame the formation of leisure preferences. Setting affordances are
included, although the authors do not offer a definition. Kleiber, Wade, & Loucks-
Atkinson (2005) define affordances as a counter point to a constraint that is to be found
within one’s environment and that supports leisure preferences, and setting affordances are essentially positioned as such in the Walker & Virden (2005) model, setting affordances offers depth to the description of the recreationists’ environment but unfortunately at present the concept appears to lack clarity.

Modified structural constraints while related to the idea of setting affordances, are of greater relevance to my research. Walker & Virden (2005) propose four additional empirically generated structural constraints related to outdoor recreation settings. They include environmental, social, territorial, and institutional structural constraints.

Environmental structural constraints include a wide range of elements such as weather, terrain, topography and landscape features. For example, the prospect of rain, avalanche conditions, or an unplanned wildlife encounter may act as a structural constraint within an outdoor recreation setting. Social structural constraints refer to conditions in the social environment such as crowding, activity style, and conflict. The authors mention the prevalence of crowding research and displacement but make no mention of recreation coping research in general. Territorial structural constraints refer to informal access to areas of interest. To illustrate this construct, Walker & Virden (2005) use the example of an elderly Chinese man who states that he will not go to that park because it is a “white man’s” park. Examples more relevant to my research include
people who will not climb or paddle in areas that are known to be frequented by ‘experts’, or areas known to be informally set aside for locals, or conversely, for tourists. In this way, territoriality may act as a powerful structural constraint. Institutional structural constraints refer to issues of access that are regulated, and generally concerned with the management of the area, such as trail closures, re-designations (e.g. no mountain biking) park and road closures and even river and rock wall closures. Walker & Virden (2005) inclusion of setting affordances, coupled with the four additional structural constraints, add considerable depth to the description of the recreation environment.

Lastly, Walker & Virden (2005) also propose five additional concepts to help researchers better understand the negotiation process. They describe how specific attitudes, place attachment, primary and secondary control, self-construal theory and capitalizing on setting affordances may better explain the negotiation process in outdoor settings.

This section concludes by briefly presenting some alternative perspectives on the idea of leisure constraints, then providing a clear link into the following section of recreation coping research. First, it should be noted that Samdahl & Jekubuvich (1997) stated that the average person does not necessarily ponder leisure constraints in the course of everyday leisure. Constraints may appear in less obvious ways. Stebbins (2005) conducted extensive qualitative research with a group of climbers, kayakers, and snowboarders in the Bow Valley within the framework of serious and casual leisure and optimal leisure lifestyle. He cited a variety of quotations describing types of leisure constraints from crowding, to cost of living, and to a lesser extent gender issues, but respondents did not frame them as leisure constraints. Similarly, Andereck & Jurowski (2006) studied how tourism impacts the quality of life of residents in several tourism communities in Arizona. They found that “tourism development directly affects residents’ habits, daily routines, social lives, and benefits and values which may lead to psychological tension” (p. 140). Though not stated as such, tourism development too appears to be a constraint to everyday leisure. There are a variety of ways to
conceptualize leisure constraints, so it is not difficult to understand the previous comment attributed to Jackson & Scott (1999) where they state that one of the problems is that we still do not know what is, and what is not, a leisure constraint.

2.5.4 Leisure Constraints Research Links to Recreation Coping Research

I proposed here that there is a clear conceptual link between leisure constraints research, as presented by Walker & Virden (2005) and recreation coping research as defined by Manning & Valliere (2001, p. 411) as “any behaviour, whether deliberate or not, that reduces stress and enables a person to deal with a situation without excessive stress.” Miller & McCool (2003, p. 261) provide a description of the concept. “The recreation literature suggests that, when confronted with undesirable conditions, recreationists are likely to either change their behaviour, change their environment, or change the way they evaluate the situation.” It is widely accepted that there are four basic types of coping strategies which include, displacement, rationalization, product shift and direct action (Miller & McCool, 2003).
Aspects of the environment that may cause stress are varied, however a typical list may include the items found in Figure 2.4 which were used as the basis of a measure for the assessment of coping strategies by backcountry users in Glacier National Park (Miller & McCool, 2003). Figure 2.4 presents the list of nine setting elements from Miller & McCool (2003) with corresponding items from Walker & Virden’s (2005) modified structural constraints, to demonstrate a conceptual connection with the two constructs. They suggested that the two combined constructs provide a more robust measure since the coping elements and structural constraints appear to address similar phenomena but from slightly different approaches. For example, recreation coping research appears to offer greater explanatory strength to the response stage, while the leisure constraints model offers more insight into the conditions leading up to the activity.
2.6 Recreation Coping

2.6.1 Background to Recreation Coping Research

The element of negotiation is central to the human-environment focus of behavioural geography (Anderson, 1989; Golledge & Stimson, 1987, from Johnston 1991) and similarly, within recreation settings, the human-environment relationship often includes the element of negotiated stress (Schuster & Hammitt, 2000). Stress within outdoor settings is often associated with forms of conflict (Schnieder, 2000) or goal interference (Miller & McCool, 2003), the latter referring more specifically to situations whereby one’s recreation goals are disrupted by an aspect of one’s environment. Conflict and goal interference in outdoor recreation settings has been an area of concern for managers and a focus for researchers for several decades (McCool & Lime, 2001). Outdoor recreation conflict is defined as a “disruptive stressful occurrence in the visitors’ recreation experience involving a person-environment relationship that taxes a person’s psychological resources” (Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; quoted in Schuster & Hammitt, 1995, p. 168). A primary reason for the concern over conflict and goal interference for managers and researchers alike is that at the centre lies negative stress which is said to detract from the possible individual and societal benefits of outdoor recreation participation. Recreation coping strategies are a way to gain insight into this investigation by understanding the behavioural and cognitive responses to stress within the human-environment relationship, because as the recreation literature suggests, when confronted with undesirable conditions recreationists will change behaviour, try to change their environment or change the way they evaluate the situation (Miller & McCool, 2003).

There are three objectives for this section: to provide a background including definitions for recreation coping; to discuss recreation coping literature relevant to this investigation; and to highlight key aspects of recreation coping literature that extend to others areas of this literature review.
Recreation coping research origins are attributable to the broad field of carrying capacity research, which itself arose out of biological background and later managerial concerns over maintaining quality outdoor recreation experiences amid increased visitor use (McCool & Lime, 2001). Wagner's (1964) early work on carrying capacity has been cited as a conceptual precursor to Lazarus & Folkman's (1984) model of stress and coping which has acted as a theoretical framework for much of the work in this area (Stewart & Cole 2001, Miller & McCool, 2003). A variety of research directions or sub-fields have been pursued in the past to address the conflict in outdoor recreation settings (Miller & Lime, 2001). One such direction was to explore the relationship between the quality of the experience, or trip satisfaction, by the effect of density and number of trip encounters (crowding and conflict). Over time, it was determined that this approach produced weak results. That is, despite obvious crowding and stress both observed from a managerial perspective and reported in findings, overall satisfaction remained relatively high (Stewart & Cole, 2001; Dawson & Watson, 2000; Schuster & Hammitt, 2000). A possible explanation for this dilemma was that those individuals who were particularly sensitive to such stressors had chosen another area, or had been displaced, while those individuals who were less sensitive to crowding and congestion were present at the research sites (Robertson & Regula, 1994).

Today it is widely accepted that the weakness of the density-crowding-satisfaction model is largely explained by the behavioural response of displacement (Dawson & Watson, 2000; Robertson & Regula, 1994; Manning, 2003). Displacement was postulated to be a strategy employed by recreationists to negotiate the negative effects of stress within one's recreation setting. Later, the concept of substitution was added to the broader concept of displacement. Substitution was based on four possible behavioural responses: to visit the site at different times; to maintain the activity but change the site; to maintain the same resource but change the activity; and to change the resource and the activity (Miller & McCool, 2003).
At present the recreation literature generally identifies four possible coping strategies including displacement, rationalization, product shift, and direct action, all with some variation. The majority of literature tends to cite three of the categories, often omitting direct action (Manning & Valliere, 2001; Schneider, 2000; Johnson & Dawson, 2004; Peden & Schuster 2004). Miller & McCool (2003) used seven categories (although four were sub-categories of displacement) and added direct action as the fourth. Individual recreation coping strategies are defined below.

Displacement can be defined as changing one’s location (spatial displacement) or time (temporal displacement) of participation to respond to or avoid stressful situations. One could also simply decide to leave the location with no intention of resuming the activity (absolute displacement) (Miller & McCool, 2003). This would include, for example, avoiding Johnston’s Canyon in Banff during peak summer months (spatial), or choosing not to ski over the Christmas break (temporal) or choosing to relocate to Golden, BC because the Bow Valley is too crowded (absolute).

Rationalization is a cognitive response that is based on one’s level of investment in the activity, to reduce internal conflict brought about by stress the individual may choose to rate the activity highly regardless of actual conditions (Manning & Valliere, 2001). For example, a person who has re-located from Eastern Canada to live in the Bow Valley may experience stress within recreation experiences in the mountains but choose to explain it as “Well what do you expect, it is the Rocky Mountains”. Product shift suggests that visitors may alter the definition of the recreation opportunity in congruence with the conditions experience (Manning & Valliere, 2001). For example, one may claim that “Banff used to be so quaint and now it’s too touristy” or that “Canmore used to be such a dull mining town and it’s so cosmopolitan now”. These hypothetical statements highlight how the products of Banff and Canmore shifted in people’s perception. Direct action, as used by Miller & McCool (2003), suggests that the coping strategy involves the individual contacting a peer, or more likely an authority figure, to seek remedial action to a stressful situation (this is also referred to as environmental change). For example, a
Canmore resident may contact local Parks staff to seek an area to be designated a no-dog zone because of the perceived nuisance of wandering dogs disrupting her/his recreation experience.

There is considerable variation within the literature as how researchers refer to coping strategies. Substitution is generally referred to as a sub-set of displacement (Schneider, 2000). Further, Peden & Schuster (2004) refer to displacement as a problem-based response and product shift and rationalization as emotion-based responses, while Hoss & Brunson (2000) refer to displacement as a behavioural response, and product shift and rationalization as cognitive responses. For the purposes of this literature review and research project, behavioural responses will include displacement (including substitution as a sub-set of displacement) and direct action, and cognitive responses include rationalization and product shift.

Peden & Schuster (2004) and Miller & McCool (2003) use a theoretical model of coping adapted from the earlier work of Lazarus & Folkman (1984) to demonstrate the
overall process of coping behaviour. It is posited that the stress and coping process occurs in three stages. First, environmental factors influence the perception of stress. Second, an appraisal process occurs which mediates one's response to the existing stressors. Third, the appraisal process influences the response and possible outcomes of the experience. Figure 2.5 presents a modified version of the model presented by Peden & Schuster (2004). The model begins with influencing factors which represent individual and situational attributes that give rise to the perception of stress. Stress appraisal acts as a mediating variable that influences the coping stage. Coping mechanisms are referred to as behavioural and emotional. Outcomes are seen as short term (or immediate) that is, a determination of the success of the response, and long term or what changes may be required in the future. I have modified the Peden & Schuster (2004) model by replacing the emotional response to cognitive responses and by adding the sub-categories of coping responses of displacement and direct action under 'behavioural' and rationalization and product shift under 'cognitive' for further clarification.

2.6.2 Recreation Coping Research Relevant to the Research Project

Recreation coping research has been applied to a variety of outdoor recreation settings with fairly consistent results given the variation in methodological approaches. The two studies most relevant to this investigation are Miller & McCool (2003) who use Transactional Stress Theory as a conceptual framework and Manning & Valliere (2001) because of their unique application of recreation coping to a group of residents rather than the more common approach of visitors at a specific site.

Miller & McCool (2003) used a Transactional Stress Model to better understand how recreationists respond to negative stress elements during a recreation experience. The Transactional Stress Model contends that "stress is the result of perceived imbalance between the demands of a person's environment and the available resources a person has to respond to them" (p. 259). The model tends to differ from other models as it considers
even minor hassles and annoyances as a part of the stress process. As well it accepts that stress can be both internal or external in its origin, but regardless the individual must negotiate with her/his environment. Miller & McCool (2003) also hypothesized that as perceived stress increased, the individual would be more likely to use cognitive coping responses at first and then move towards behavioural responses, and ultimately absolute displacement although no specific continuum or model was provided.

The Miller & McCool (2003) study included a sample of 840 visitors to Glacier National Park. They used a two part survey anchored by a 21-item scale of negative situations and conditions that focused on nine possible negative situations (number of people encountered, rude visitor behaviour, etc.). Factor analysis revealed five distinct coping factors as follows: in order of strength: resource substitution; temporal substitution; absolute displacement; cognitive adjustment (both rationalization and product shift); and environmental change (direct action). They concluded that there was strong support for their proposition that as stress is perceived to increase, individuals move from cognitive to behavioural coping strategies and ultimately to absolute displacement.

Manning & Valliere (2001) conducted a study to examine the level of displacement, rationalization, and product shift for residents adjacent to Acadia National Park in Maine, and to explore the relationship between perceived levels of use and coping strategies. They chose to examine residents because "local residents may comprise an especially interesting population for a study of coping in outdoor recreation because they are likely to use their local park often and they are likely to have used the park over a relatively long period of time" (p.414). They applied a two part questionnaire, focusing on perceived changes in use and coping strategies with a final sample of 377. Perceived changes in use were especially high for 'increased visitation' and 'problem behaviours'. Nearly half reported forms of displacement, while 35% reported rationalization and only 6% reported no use of coping strategies. They concluded that recreation coping strategies are real and people do engage in them.
Other researchers have produced similar results although studies vary in objectives and methodological approaches. Peden & Schuster (2004) used a qualitative approach with visitors to High Peaks Wilderness Area in New York and reported that emotion-based responses, or in this case rationalization, was the most common form of coping followed by displacement. Schneider (2000) examined recreation conflict and coping strategies in urban proximate wilderness areas in the American southwest. She used a quantitative method and reported that forms of distancing or spatial and temporal displacement were most prominent. Johnson & Dawson (2004) examined the use of coping strategies for visitors to wilderness areas in New York's Adirondack Park. They used a mixed method and within their sample of 102, 58% used one or more coping strategies with temporal displacement being the most common, followed by spatial displacement, product shift, and rationalization.

2.6.3 Recreation Coping Research Links to Destination Research

The recreation coping research, or model, as it sometimes referred to (Miller & McCool, 2003), provides a strong approach to explore the human-environment relationship within a recreation setting. This final section will highlight three key areas of recreation coping research; evolutionary behaviour, mobility and place, and human-environment negotiation, and leads into the next section of the literature review, destination evolution.

Evolutionary behaviour. I suggest here that recreation coping concepts provides unique insight into the idea of evolutionary behaviour from a recreation perspective. For example, what happens following a negative-stress incident or a negotiated situation? What is the long term implication for such a situation? Though not completely clear in the literature, it appears that recreation coping offers a unique ability to understand and explain the longer term implications as, in general, one may move from cognitive responses to behavioural responses and ultimately for some absolute displacement (thus
implying that the entire process could begin at a different and perhaps less crowded or more remote site).

**Mobility and Place.** The combination of cognitive and behavioural responses implies a certain level of mobility through spatial, temporal and absolute displacement - that people move within (intra-site mobility) or outside (inter-site mobility) of a site as a result of the recreation negotiation. Further, that place creation in the form of creating cognitive and emotional definitions of a place that are shared and collectively understood (Stolowski, 2002) are central to the rationalization and product shift coping responses. In essence, rationalization and product shift offer strong insights into how one may create a sense of place, especially given a resident population where the effect of time.

**Human-environment negotiation.** There is support (Miller & McCool, 2003) for the contention that individuals move through a possible spectrum of coping responses from cognitive through to behavioural and even to absolute displacement. What are the implications for such a concept within a population of residents within a high recreation amenity community? Some leave (absolute displacement) while many others do not and learn ways to cope, while others may not even require coping strategies. How does one adapt or cope over the long term? Does the site or community change over time to meet the needs of the residents? Do residents seek out more congruent sub-communities? Is the product (within product shift) eventually shared by all through community discourse, for example, that we all agree we are mountain community of ‘hard-core’ and healthy mountain people. And, what if that shared sense of place is challenged by a new group of residents who do not share, agree or fit that particular notion of place? Recreation coping research appears to offer a sound approach to explore the leisure negotiation within the human-environment relationship.
2.7 Destination Evolution

2.7.1 Introduction

Previous leisure/recreation models demonstrated that the leisure negotiation process and recreation stress coping process involve continuous decision-making surrounding activity choices, personal resources, motives, and spatial and temporal negotiations. This dynamic implies intra and inter-site mobility of individuals, and over a longer time the potential for the loss of, and emergence of new recreation products or choices. The dynamic of the human-environment relationship implies a recreation driven evolution of the destination.

The theme for this section is destination evolution of tourism and high recreation amenity destinations, so the following areas of literature will be highlighted for their relevant contributions. First, basic models of tourism or resort destination lifecycle/evolution are discussed to provide an overall conceptual framework for the area. Second, resident support for tourism and tourism development is discussed in light of the effect residents create in supporting or not supporting tourism driven change. Third, amenity migration literature will be reviewed to specifically highlight the potential of amenity migration to effect change within destinations. Fourth, relevant place attachment literature will be discussed to add depth of understanding to the relationship between longer temporal frames associated with amenity migrants and place creation and recreation associated with destination evolution.

2.7.2 Destination Lifecycle/Evolution Research

Butler’s (1980) Tourism Area Lifecycle (TALC) model is perhaps the most widely used and robust conceptual framework in tourism (Baum, 1998). The model contends that resort or tourism destinations pass through various distinguishable stages, from the introduction of tourism through to some later stage involving the possible outcomes of decline or rejuvenation. The model contends that communities engaged in tourism will encounter six stages including:
1. **Exploration**: few visitors particularly those who are attracted to the area’s natural features with few if any tourism provisions;

2. **Involvement**: limited interaction between local residents and tourists, but basic tourism provisions are provided;

3. **Development**: tourist facilities grow, as does control of the industry by outsiders, and at peak times tourists can easily outnumber local residents;

4. **Consolidation**: tourism is a major part of the economy but growth levels off. Local efforts are made to extend the tourist season due to greater reliance on the tourism economy;

5. **Stagnation**: erosion of existing accommodation stock is high. Peak tourist numbers are reached and destination, while established, is losing appeal;

6. **Post stagnation**: reflects a series of five possible outcomes ranging from extreme rejuvenation or reinvention through to extreme decline (Agarwal, 1997).

Butler's tourism area lifecycle model has been used extensively, and some claim it has stood up well to empirical testing (Baum, 1998) while others claim that it is difficult to operationalize (Agarwal, 1997) and others claim it has been referenced in the literature as a conceptual framework but seldom tested (McKercher, 2005). Butler's model has set the standard for the way tourism destinations are thought to change or to evolve as a result of engagement with tourism. Major criticisms of the model from an application perspective include that it is destination specific, it exhibits temporal discontinuity or overlap, its spatial scope is ambiguous, lack of standardization, and it is difficult to determine stages or unit points of change (Agarwal, 1997). McKercher (2005) provides a more complete criticism of the model and concludes that the term 'lifecycle' is misleading as it actually represents an evolution of continuous change, rather than a staged progression with a clear end and re-starts. Furthermore, he claims that Butler's lifecycle model has been shown to have less value as an operational and predictive tool,
than a conceptual model for identifying potential community risk factors and potential changes related to tourism development.

Other models of destination evolution often focus on a single factor such as environmental degradation, as appears in Johnston & Tyrrell’s (2005) Model of Sustainable Tourism or Duffins & Deardren’s (1990) conceptual framework for wildlife tourism borrowing on Butler’s 1980 work or Plog’s Model of Ventureres and Dependables (Plog, 2004). Although less well known is another model of relevance to this investigation, useful because of its wider applicability. The Boomtown Tourism model devised by Perdue, Long, & Kang (1999) takes a different position from Butler because they contend that another form of growth or change can occur quickly if, for example, a large mega-type project is implanted within a relatively small community, thereby forcing residents to adjust rapidly to established tourism. This model contrasts the slow growth of Butler and others (Davis & Morris, 2004). Examples of Boomtown Tourism are large scale casino developments or cruise port developments within smaller non-tourism communities. The Boomtown model conceivably could be applied to amenity migration if one considers the impact of large scale residential projects such as Three Sisters and SilverTip in Canmore. A link between the Boomtown Tourism model and amenity migration has yet to be discovered in the literature.

2.7.3 Resident Support for Tourism Research

Within the idea of tourism destination evolution, it is important to consider the literature surrounding resident support for tourism and tourism related development. This is a broad area of study with partial relevance to this investigation, however it is important to consider that tourism-based change within a destination is at some level, guided by its residents, to what extent this occurs is variable, but by expressing support or non-support for tourism, residents become active participants in the ensuing change. Participation by residents can subtly dictate the nature and character of a tourism destination, through to overtly affecting policy towards significant change (Purdue,
Resident support for tourism research often examines resident views of tourism after the establishment of a tourism economy (Easterling, 2005; Perdue, Long & Allen, 1990; Haley, Snaith, & Miller, 2004) and in some cases it examines support for tourism prior to the establishment of a tourism economy (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Getz, 1994).

What is evident within this area of literature is that there is seldom ever consensus support for tourism, although it seems to move forward nonetheless. Easterling (2005), within a study of an established tourism based island in Virginia, examined resident support by first segmenting residents into groups of 'born-heres', 'come-heres', 'retired-heres', and 'second-home-heres'. She reported significant differences among the groups in some areas, but there was consistent support for tourism despite persistent negative attitudes towards tourism and tourists. Residents reported forms of displacement, anger related to over-building, and high cost of living among other concerns, yet there was heavy reliance on tourism with satisfactory distribution of wealth throughout the community.

Perdue, Long & Allen (1990) examined views of residents in communities in the American west and found that residents generally were confident that policy and planning could mitigate the negative impacts of tourism, and support for tourism was highly related to the potential for economic re-generation. That tourism support is highly related to the perceived potential for new or continued economic growth, despite widespread recognition of tourism impacts, is a fairly consistent conclusion within the literature and often linked to Social Exchange Theory; (Easterling, 2004; Getz, 1994; Yooshik, Dogan, & Chen, 2001). Andereck & Vogt, (2000) conducted a study to understand what types of tourism would be more or less supported within a group of seven rural communities in Arizona, prior to the planned introduction of tourism. They concluded that residents were generally supportive of tourism development, sceptical of tourism’s ability to produce positive benefits often claimed and understanding of negative impacts. Forms of tourism that received the greatest support included: outdoor recreation, historic and cultural tourism, festivals and special events, restaurants, and
retail, while any form of tourism involving bars and taverns was least supported. Within the topic of destination evolution, the introduction of tourism is often viewed as being imposed externally upon a community requiring its residents to adjust in some way, although there is considerable variation on this scenario. Support or non-support for tourism is conceptualized as another form of negotiation within the human-environment relationship, while tourism has been associated as a precursor to amenity migration (Stewart, 2000).

2.7.4 Amenity Migration Research

Amenity migration research is now reviewed in order to identify who amenity migrants are, and the role they play in affecting destination evolution. With some variation, amenity migration is generally defined as the migration of people to rural areas, motivated to experience natural and cultural amenities unique to those areas (Price, Moss, & Williams, 1997). Amenity migration is sometimes defined as a relatively modern phenomenon in contrast to historically entrenched forms of economic migration (Waltert & Schlapfer, 2007) and is considered a significant phenomenon that has, and continues to re-shape, much of rural, mountainous and coastal landscapes globally, with significant activity in the North American west (Buckley, 2009; Nelsen, 2006, Stewart, 2000,).

Amenity migration is considered an important feature of change within this investigation's study area, and specifically in Canmore, Alberta (Robertson & Stark, 2006).

Many explanations are offered for the growth of amenity migration globally. Most researchers tend to link this growth to post World War 2 prosperity and technological advancements. Price, Moss & Williams (1997) offered six factors to explain the growth of amenity migration including, increased value of the natural environment; cultural differentiation; value of learning, leisure and spirituality; increases in discretionary time, increases in discretionary wealth; and increased access to
communications, technology and transportation. Later, Moss (2006) added increased access to comfort amenities such as roads and public services and energy costs.

It is important to understand who actually makes up amenity migrants, and here the literature is somewhat vague, as there are several different notions or typologies of amenity migrants, but few are empirically and theoretically grounded. First, amenity migrants are sometimes referred to as tourists (Price, Moss, & Williams, 1997). Although not explicitly stated, the literature tends to consider amenity migrants those who take up some form of residence however defined. Perdue (2004), in an analysis of ski industry towns in Colorado, claims six types of migrants or locals, including: traditional ski bums, new ski bums, migrants (seasonal workers), trust fund babies, techies, and entrepreneurs, all of which he claims have significant impact on forming the nature and character of ski industry town in Colorado. His typology was developed as a result of on-going research and observations, but was not specifically empirically based. McMillan (2006) presents three types of recreation based amenity migrants to the New Mexico area based on her observations. They include traditional users or those seeking simple self-propelled recreation activities, non-traditional users or those seeking more technology reliant but largely self-propelled activities such as white-water kayaking, rock climbing or even resort skiing, and motorized users or those who seek motorized forms of recreation. She claims that each type of amenity migrant has a distinct impact on the local and regional social and physical environment. Lynch (2006) claims that amenity migrants to Jackson Hole, WO fall into two categories: young people who may or may not stay, and retirees. Robertson & Stark (2006), in their review of amenity migration in Alberta, reported the results of a focus group style meeting conducted with real estate agents in Canmore, Alberta. They concluded that five different types of people were purchasing homes in the Canmore area including: wealthy baby boomers over 40 years of age; valley workers buying their first home; investors seeking to speculate; ‘lifestylers’ and usually from Alberta; and second home owners. There appears to be little empirical evidence to define and type amenity migrants in any comprehensive manner.
Little has been offered in the literature to further attempt to explain the process of amenity migration, other than to link mobility motives and factors such as those put forth by Moss and others. Stewart (2000) provides an overview of possible theoretical perspectives on amenity migration including those related to wages, place utility models, business location decisions, regional re-structuring and individual preference and choice. She concludes that amenity migration is a complex phenomenon that is highly individual. There is support linking tourism and amenity migration anecdotally and conceptually. Kuentzel & Ramaswamy (2005) concluded in their work in the United States that tourism development comes first to a destination, followed by permanent homes, followed by bursts of seasonal home development, and further tourism development. The link between tourism and amenity migration exists in the literature (Moss, 2006) and in a model presented by Stewart (2000). Figure 2.6 presents a model of stages representing various levels of familiarity and commitment to a chosen place.

Moss (1996); Price, Moss, & Williams (1997), Stewart (2000) and others agree that amenity migration brings about changes within community and adjacent natural
areas. As such, amenity migration is well situated within the human-environment focus of behavioural geography. Furthermore, the link between tourism and amenity migration (made earlier in the section) necessitates consideration of amenity migration as a force of destination evolution. Amenity migration, however, distinguishes itself from tourism in that amenity migrants are, by definition, residents. The difference is temporal in nature - that is, the tourist’s impact is brief, even when considering the constant flow of tourists it must be allowed that their attachment to place is minimal, thus changes can be made to the destination without due consideration of future tourists. That is, in fact, the basic premise underpinning models such as Butler’s Tourism Area Lifecycle model which points to changes to the destination over time but no continuous attachment by any particular tourists. Amenity migration implies permanent change through residential development and further change through economic growth required to create or maintain employment for new residents; but as residents, it is implied that the duration of attachment by may vary.

The effects of amenity migration on destination evolution indicate a pattern of change and that amenity migration tends to alter destinations in substantive ways, even to radically transform communities (Buckley, 2009). A common theme in the literature is that communities inevitably gain more commercial services, public services such as education and health care facilities, and improved roads and general infrastructure as new migrants arrive (Reeder & Brown, 2005; Moss, 2006). McMillan (2006) claims that the arrival of later migrants brings with it the development of ‘comfortable facilities’ designed to meet the needs of a more urban in-migration group, which in turn attracts more migrants seeking similar levels of facilities. Glorioso & Moss, (2006) reported on a case study in Santa Fe, NM and concluded that amenity migration radically altered the community in a twenty year period beginning in the mid-1980s. The essence of the change was heightened urbanization marked by increases in population growth, jobs, income, cost of living, as well as increased numbers art galleries, retail, restaurants, and museums. McMillan (2006) adds that amenity migration leads to the development of a
broader range of recreational amenities to suit a broader range of lifestyles. Moore & Gill, in their review of amenity migration in Whistler, BC, also report a transformation towards urbanization and ensuing loss of character - “the traditional ski culture of Whistler is gradually giving way to a broader and more urban lifestyle” (2006, p. 137).

Other reported effects of amenity migration include loss of open space, recreational land and wildlife habitat, given to residential and golf course development (Buckley, 2005; Robertson & Stark, 2006). Lynch (2006) reports on Jackson Hole, and states that amenity migration “may be affecting wildlife about their choices of where to live and play” (2006, p. 99). He goes on to state that development also encroaches on recreational lands including the development of publicly accessible ranching lands for golf course development. Moore & Gill report a similar pattern whereby “in some destinations, amenity migration leads to reductions in public access to valued natural landscapes” (2006, p. 138). They add that the urban transformation can lead to the displacement of certain groups, including seniors. Robertson & Stark (2006) claim that the shift to urban type amenities within the Canmore, Alberta area is related to the in-migration of urban dwellers not satisfied with minimal levels of service and infrastructure and seek to alter the community in ways that will ensure increased levels of service and infrastructure.

Jobs tend to increase, but a question remains as to whether increased jobs and wages can keep pace with the inevitable cost of living increases. Reeder & Brown (2005) claim that new jobs and earning potential generally does increase while other researchers such as Nelson (2006) claim that in-migrants tend to outnumber jobs and that cost of living is a factor which causes many to leave their choose communities. To date, no empirical evidence to support either claim has been found. Another important effect of amenity migration is the sense of community and social relations. Moss (2006) reports that amenity migration can lead to social disruption and conflict within communities
between 'old' and 'new' residents, but the situation is complex given that many 'old' residents grow to rely on the presence of 'new' residents for their livelihood.

Amenity migration tends to result in the urbanization of high recreation amenity communities with ensuing losses of natural and/or public landscape which are given to related forms of development. Urbanization is reported to lead to increased recreational opportunity within the issues of social disruption, increased cost of living as well as employment and economic related opportunities, all leading to transformation of the character of the destination. For different subsets of the population such transformations are desirable and undesirable. The human-environment relationship related to amenity migration results in palpable changes to the environment over relatively short periods of time.

The final section of the literature review is concerned with place attachment. Place attachment is defined broadly to also include discussion of the way individuals create and identify with place. The preceding section demonstrated that certain places (high recreation amenity communities) can be altered by new residents and the final section examines the process of attachment to, and re-creation of, such places.

2.7.5 Place Attachment Research

Place attachment literature is broad and highly multi-disciplinary, as it has been approached from the perspectives of geography, anthropology, economics, and other social sciences. Yet some of the earliest references to place attachment arose from human geography's "sense of place" (Brehm, Eisenhauer, & Krannich, 2004). For the purposes of this review, literature is limited to that which is relevant to the investigation and with the following objectives: to broadly define place attachment and related concepts in relation to recreation settings; to explain the process of place attachment; and provide links to other areas of literature discussed within the chapter.

Place attachment generally is considered a term that captures various elements of the emotive aspect of the human-environment relationship. For example, Stolowski
describes place attachment as feelings of attachment to particular settings that are based on attentiveness and emotion. Kyle, Bricker, Graefe, & Wickham (2004, p.1) define place attachment from a recreation perspective as “the extent to which an individual values and identifies with a particular natural setting.”

Place attachment may be complex and dynamic. Williams & McIntyre (2000) claim that place attachment is central to understanding the phenomenon of amenity migration. Given the complexities of modernity humans have lost attachment to place in the traditional sense and must now seek out places to attach to their identity, which itself has become unmoored by modern life. They make the point that place meanings previously attached to home, work, leisure and tourism have blurred. They can be interchangeable or integrated. Brehm et al. (2004, p. 407) state that place attachment can be especially evident within communities with a number of amenities and place attachment consists of two key dimensions “…involves social ties particularly in high amenity settings, it may also involve attachment focussed on physical attributes” Brehm et al. (2004) hypothesized that upon arrival to a high recreation amenity destination, amenity migrants are first attached to the physical attributes of a place and over time social attachment becomes more important.

To understand place attachment within a high recreation amenity destination, aspects of individual and collective attachment need to be considered in light of leisure concepts. Kyle et al., (2004) claim that place attachment has been linked conceptually to leisure satisfaction, demand, substitution, displacement, conflict and use behaviour, but little is understood on how recreationists develop such attachments. They claim that for the individual recreationist, place attachment is largely a function of place dependence and place identity. Place dependence refers to the importance of a particular place or resource for providing the amenities necessary for the pursuit of a particular activity. Place identity is defined as “those dimensions of the self that define the individuals’ personal identity in relation to the physical environment by means of a complex pattern of conscious and unconscious ideas, beliefs, preferences feelings, values, goals,
behavioural tendencies and skills relevant to this environment” (Proshanshsky, 1978, p. 155, quoted in Kyle et al., 2004, p. 2). Kyle et al (2004) add that place dependence can lead to place identity over time.

Similarly, within a recreation context, Stokowski (2002) agrees that individuals give meaning to, and gain identity from, the subjective interpretation of place. However, she argues for a circular type relationship whereby individuals are attracted to a place that holds potential to support one’s identity. Once there, she argues, the identity of a place is generated through social discourse and action, that place creation is a social task. Further, she states that it is the social creation of place that reinforces personal identity. Her emphasis on social aspect of place creation, re-creation and attachment is widely shared (Kyle et al., 2004; Brehn et al., 2004; and Williams & McIntyre, 2000). Stokowski (2002) contributes an important aspect to the broader understanding of destination evolution from the psycho-social perspective by emphasizing that places are always being created and re-created toward some sort of preferred reality. It is a phenomenon that can be linked clearly to the cognitive recreation coping strategies of rationalization and product shift. Tourism and high recreation amenity destinations evolve, and while physical evidence of change in the form of tourist and urban-style development tends to be apparent, the underlying forces of such change are often less apparent. The concept of place attachment, including place creation and re-creation, must be included as a significant force of change and one largely attributable to resident actors.

2.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter set out to provide scholarly context to my research by demonstrating the conceptual and research linkages among the relevant areas of literature through a central theme of the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography. Chapter 2 has demonstrated that the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of high recreation amenity destinations can be examined through the theoretical framework of
human-environment relationships and the methodological framework afforded by
grounded theory. Furthermore, I have shown that related leisure constructs of leisure
constraint and recreation coping models provide depth to the understanding of
negotiations in such environments. The leisure based negotiation process within such
destinations has been conceptually linked to concept of destination as a way to provide
explanation on how such destinations change over time. Further links have been drawn
between leisure constraint and recreation coping models.
3 Research Design Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology for my research project. The chapter begins by presenting the overall research strategy, followed by a detailed description of the grounded theory approach. Section 3.2 provides methodological rationale for the selection of the research site. Section 3.3 details the focus group methodology, 3.4 presents the methodology for the two qualitative interview research phases of the Second Home Owner interviews and the Lived Experience interviews, respectively. Section 3.5 will present the methodological procedure for the mail back survey, the Bow Valley Recreation Survey research phase. Research validity is presented in Section 3.6, while 3.7 provides a chapter summary. All ethical considerations pertaining to the research project were approved by the Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board at the University of Calgary on October 19, 2005 (see Appendix A). Changes to an earlier version of the methodology were submitted to and approved by the same body at the interim stage, and approval was given on June 6th 2007 (see Appendix B).

3.1.1 Research Strategies

The research strategy for my project is based on the grounded theory methodological approach as described in Corbin & Strauss (1990). Within the grounded theory methodological approach, I employed data collection methods of the focus group, qualitative interviews and quantitative survey research. Data collection and analysis iterations were approached from the grounded theory perspective and involved key principles of exploration, multiple iterations, theoretical sampling (qualitative research), inductive analysis and theory building (Jennings, 2001; Corbin & Strauss, 1990). As noted Chapter Two, there are numerous interpretations of grounded theory (Jennings & Junek, 2007) in my research like that of others method slurring is acceptable provided it can be supported within the broader context of the research goals (Cutcliffe, 2000).
It is important also to distinguish between the grounded theory and the mixed methodology approaches. Mixed methodology refers to a study that “…involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given priority, and involve the integration of data at one or more stages in the process of research” (Creswell quoted in Creswell, Clark, Gutman, Hanson, 2003, p.212). Mixed methodology is a distinct methodological approach and may be approached in different ways, it may be exploratory and even have the goal of theory building (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Mixed methodology and grounded theory appear strikingly similar but there are important distinctions relevant to this research project that are discussed below.

The most important distinction between mixed methodology and grounded theory involves how qualitative sampling and data analysis procedures. Grounded theory claims that sampling should be theoretically based on emergent data and comparisons. Data analysis within grounded theory should be inductive and focus more on the extraction of variables than word counts associated with traditional content analysis (Turner, 1981). Jennings (2001) summarizes such subtle nuances best when she describes grounded theory, summarizing several others thoughts by claiming grounded theory is a way of thinking of research, of analyzing data, and a way of thinking about research and realities. This point is important in understanding the methodology of my research project for several reasons. First, the reader should understand that the canons, and even more-so the spirit of the grounded theory methodological tradition (Jennings, 2001) has been employed throughout, and secondly, that data collection and analysis methods have been adopted and modified in accordance with grounded theory. For example, data collection methods for focus group and interview research within this project closely followed procedures set by Berg (1998), Dunn (2000), and Edmunds (1999) for overall procedures and instrument design, but utilized theoretical sampling and the inductive analytical procedures of grounded theory.
The second distinction I make between mixed methodology and grounded theory is the manner in which multiple research iterations relate to each other. Within mixed methodology, research iterations or phases may be carried out concurrently or sequentially, and one iteration must take priority over the other (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Grounded theory suggests, though it is not prescribed, that the researcher carry out multiple iterations, often with the same participants, and that each iteration should inform the development of the other, and thus builds towards theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Turner, 1981). This research project followed the grounded theory approach more closely whereby multiple iterations were carried out, sequentially for the most part, and such that one iteration could inform the development of the other towards theoretical model building.

The third distinction I make is that mixed methodology appears more inclusive of a qualitative and quantitative mix than traditional interpretations of grounded theory which emphasize qualitative methods. However, Jennings & Junek (2007), in their review of grounded theory, call for more innovative use of methods including quantitative methods. My research included a quantitative survey component within the grounded theory methodology.
Figure 3.0 provides an overview of the methodology for my research project. The research project began with focus group research (far left) and progressed through four data collection and analysis iterations culminating in the development of theory, the model of negotiated leisure within amenity migration. The basic progression of the research presented in Figure 3.1 reflects the grounded theory approach of inductive knowledge creation.

Figure 3.0 underscores the connection to grounded theory given the four data collection iterations (second home interview research as distinct from focus group research), the progressive manner in which the research project was undertaken, the numerous connections between and among data collection and data analysis iterations, the influence of relevant theoretical frameworks, and subsequent theoretical modelling. Continuous lines represent direct links as with the focus group analysis research having
direct influence on the development of the interview data collection tool. Broken lines represent the influence of theoretical frameworks. The following sub-section will provide a detailed description of grounded theory canons and protocols.

3.1.2 Grounded Theory Methodology and the Research Project

On a process level, grounded theory involves various iterations of data collection often involving a variety of methods. Hardy (2005), in researching the stakeholder dynamic related to tourism for a small community in Australia, relied on several iterations of data collection utilizing multiple methods. Woodside et al. (2004) relied on only one extended interview to collect data on their grounded theory analysis of travelers to Prince Edward Island. Decrop & Snleders (2005) included a series of three pre-planned interview sessions with 26 families to support their grounded typology study of vacation decision-making. Hoss and Brunson (2000) employed a grounded theory method in the analysis of semi-structured interviews of their investigation of environmental judgement and decision-making in the backcountry. In each case the grounded theory approach was used to explore an area where little was known.

Grounded theory is a qualitative methodology, but it is referred to as both a methodology and a method (of data analysis) (Jennings, 2001). Grounded theory is an inductive approach that is based on the assumption that social science theory can be built from data that is collected systematically in a social setting (Hardy, 2005). My research project employed grounded theory as both a methodology to guide the overall research project and as a method in the analysis of qualitative research.
The ability of grounded theory to be generalized is achieved through an abstraction so that the wider the abstraction the wider is the theory's' reach. The theory's ability to be reproduced is limited in the sense that various aspects of the theory can be tested but the case is made that no theory that deals with social science is actually reproducible in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Schematic List of the Stages in the Development of Grounded Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sense that an exact match can be found (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Table 3.1 outlines Turner's (1981) summary of stages in the development of grounded theory. Turner's work is a variation of the work of Glaser & Strauss (1968) with his own interpretation. Turner's (1981) work is included in this section because his test of stages illustrate that
within grounded theory, data collection and analysis are linked inextricably and informal analysis begins at the time of data collection.

Cuttcliffe (2000) argues that there has been considerable method 'slurring' (overlapping with other methodologies and hybrids of the original) and that there is not one proper procedure. He argues that method slurring may be appropriate and it is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. As with all methodologies, the research employing grounded theory methodology requires a strong understanding of its nuances.

Figure 3.1 Methodological Overview presents the overall methodology for the research project in accordance with grounded theory procedures recommended by Corbin & Strauss (1990) with some variation as is considered acceptable (Cuttcliffe, 2000). Below is a summary of the grounded theory procedure employed for my research in relation to the 11 procedures presented by Corbin & Strauss (1990) in Section 3.1.2.

Data collection and analysis was a highly inter-related process conducted within an exploratory approach where little was known about the potential outcome of results in accordance with Procedure 1. Basic units of analysis following the open coding stage were first formed as concepts and later reduced to two levels of categories (see Chapter Four, Section 4.1) in accordance with Procedure 2. Categories of data were developed and related to one another in the summaries and in the rationale for theory development (see Chapter Four) in accordance with Procedure 3. Initial sampling for focus group research was based on a hybrid of theoretical and convenience sampling while sampling for Second Home Owner interviews and Lived Experience interviews were both theoretical as per Procedure 4. Constant comparison of the data as concepts and categories and to theoretical frameworks was a procedure imbedded into analysis as per Procedure 5. Patterns, variations and regularity of data were accounted for and presented within Chapter 4, 5, and 6 summaries in accordance with Procedure 6. Observed process was built into theory as is evident by the evolved nature of the research project as per Procedure 7. Theoretical memos were written, altered, discarded, and re-written and so on. The writing of theoretical memos was an informal process of constant comparison.
carried out by the researcher in accordance with Procedure 8. Hypotheses about relationships among categories were constantly developed and verified towards the goal of theoretical model building. For example the Typology of Amenity Migrants in a Mountain Resort Community is a theoretical model born of constant comparisons of emergent data (categories, patterns, etc.) with theoretical frameworks (Procedure 9). The typology represents working theory at the conclusion of the qualitative stages of research. I sought the input of others from within a broad research community as needed; although no one formal reference group was established in reference to Procedure 10. Broad structural conditions were included for analysis as per procedure 11, in fact the conditions of the research dictated inclusion of nuances of the environment, resultant mobility, and the presence of alternative communities in relation to the potential for mobility. The outcome was a rich and evolved research project.

3.1.3 Grounded Theory and Behavioural Geography

The conceptual link between grounded theory and behavioural geography was established (Section 2.3.2). The purpose of this section is to demonstrate, if not reinforce, the methodological link between the two specific to the inductive approach.

Grounded theory is an inductive approach to knowledge creation (Hardy, 2005) inclusive of a variety of different data collection methods (Cutcliffe, 2000). The origins of behavioural geography are framed by a shift towards an inductive approach to understanding unstable environments (Johnston, 1991). Cox & Golledge (1969 and 1981, cited in Johnston 1991, pp. 136-137) stated that the behavioural approach to geography involved several objectives including:

h.) “A search to define environments in terms other than the objective physical reality in which human decision-making takes place;

i.) An emphasis on process-based rather than the structural explanations of human activity and the physical environment;
j.) A focus on the psychological, social and other theories of human decision-making and behaviour;

k.) A shift in focus from aggregate populations to individuals and small groups

l.) A search for methods other than those of traditional mathematics and inferential statistics that could aid in uncovering structure in data; and

m.) To merge geographic research into the ever broadening cross-disciplinary investigation of theory building.”

The points listed present a desire to adopt methodologies that offer inductive, process-based ways of creating knowledge that are inclusive of a variety of methods, especially qualitative approaches and that can interpret the world and human decision-making. From a methodological perspective, the grounded theory approach combined with an exploratory approach to with quantitative and qualitative data collection methods, appears a strong fit with the aims of behavioural geography.

3.1.4 Reasons for Selecting Grounded Theory

The case was made in previous sections of the suitability of fit among my research goal, grounded theory, the theoretical frameworks, and quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection strategy. The complementary aspect of the four is clear. However, the exploratory aspect of the project must be reinforced here. Creswell & Plano Clark (2003, p.75) define an exploratory study as “one where there is little known, measures and instruments are not available, the variables are unknown and there is no guiding framework”. They go on to state that exploratory research does not need to include all the criteria listed in their definition of an exploratory study but biased towards the unknown more than the known is expected.

The lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of a high recreation amenity environment represents a new direction of inquiry and a unique application of
the various theoretical frameworks and research areas reported in Chapter Two. Despite the voluminous research conducted within each area of literature as cited in Chapter Two, its application to the research project goal is minimal if at all. The exploratory nature of my research is an important reason for the selection of the grounded theory approach.

3.2 Selection of the Research Site

Statements of the appropriateness of the Bow Valley site to my research goal and objectives were made in Chapter One. From a methodological perspective, the Bow Valley was selected for the following reasons:

- No language barrier or similar challenges exist to hinder the conduct of research activity;

- Researcher access to the site and specifically to the residents was assured, I secured Parks Canada research permission to conduct my study in the Town of Banff, within Banff National Park;

- Access to the site over a prolonged period of time, as recommended within grounded theory, was also assured enabling multiple iterations of data collection to occur (Corbin & Strauss, 1990);

- Two distinct communities that also share important commonalities exist in the Bow Valley, adding to the richness of the research project.

From a methodological perspective the Bow Valley is an appropriate site in which to my research.
3.3 Focus Group Research, Initial Exploration of Negotiated Leisure

3.3.1 Purpose of Focus Group Research

The purpose of the focus group research was to conduct the initial exploration of phenomena surrounding negotiated leisure of residents of the Bow Valley. I also wanted to explore the viability of leisure constraints and recreation coping frameworks in an effort to explain leisure negotiation, motives for residency, perceptions of life in a resort community, and to identify additional phenomena not previously considered or known to me. I determined that focus group research data collection was an effective initial phase of investigation for its ability to capture a wide range of phenomena and appropriate to an exploratory investigation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2003).

3.3.2 Focus Group Format and Research Design

The focus group method has been used in the fields of tourism and recreation, but less so than other methods. Perhaps the most widely cited tourism study (using a series of focus groups) is that of Wilson et al. (2001) who investigated factors that determine successful rural tourism. A slightly different approach was taken by Wansink & van Ittersui (2004) to investigate why travelers in the United States stop where they do and when they do. Two focus groups were conducted first to ascertain traveler motives, and second to identify factors in the stopping decision-making process. This data was combined with nationally polled travel data and then exit survey data from the regions of study, representing a quasi-mixed methods and quasi grounded theory approach.

A focus group is defined as “an informal, small group discussion designed to obtain in-depth qualitative information” (Wilson, 2001 quoting Dean, 1994, p. 132). Krueger (1994, p. 16) defines the focus group as a “carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment.” The central characterization of the focus group is that the researcher is carefully guided by a specific theme (Edmunds, 1999). Focus group methodology may be characterized as having a fairly standard protocol from which there is some deviation
including different types of focus groups (Krueger, 1994). According to Edmunds (1999) there are five types of focus groups all variations on the standard 8 to 10 person, face-to-face focus group. Edmunds (1999), Kruger (1994) and Berg (1998) provide similar focus group guidelines while Edmunds (1999) provides more detail. These authors served as the basic reference points for this section in my research.

Edmunds (1999) presented focus group methodology as a series of steps or tasks. The first task is to ensure clarity of topic and theme, and clarity on the purpose of the data which will provide direction to the entire research project. Second, focus group methodology employs a moderator guide similar to an interview schedule. Focus group moderator guides may vary from highly structured formats that include specific researcher, or moderator, instructions including the need to poll or probe for certain questions, to an unstructured format that relies more heavily on the moderator’s ability to generate and maintain discussion. Edmunds (1999) claims that most focus group moderator guides tend to be within the semi-structured area of the spectrum. Third, a typical focus group session should last between 1.5 to 2 hours in length meaning that the moderator guide may contain anywhere from 15 to 40 questions depending on the level of structure. Fourth, focus group sessions can be facilitated by the researcher or a skilled facilitator who is referred to as a moderator. Moderators generally have the freedom to digress into critical emerging areas of discussion or discard questions based on judgment and the flow of discussion. I served as the moderator for all my focus group sessions.

Another component of focus group methodology is participant recruitment and selection. According to Edmunds (1999), focus group methodology generally includes a group of 8 to 10 participants for each session. These participants should be homogenous in nature to increase the likelihood of meaningful discussion. Participants should be recruited to fit the specific criteria of the area of examination, rather than a representative sample of the population that is often sought in quantitative research methodologies. Participants generally are offered a financial incentive for participation and the amount of the incentive varies greatly with the type of participants. The focus group meeting is
facilitated by a moderator or researcher, guided by the interview schedule and usually (although it is not necessary) conducted within a specific focus group facility. According to Edmunds (1999), Berg (1998) and Krueger (1994) it is critically important for the moderator to obtain consent by explaining the purpose of the focus group, audio and video recording and client viewing to the participants prior to any questioning.

My research followed a nine step process for the focus group research. Ethical considerations were approved by the Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board at the University of Calgary on October 19th 2005. A copy of my focus group consent form is found in Appendix C). The steps, including timelines involved, were as follows:

1. Determine the purpose of the focus group research component and ensure clarity of topic (August 2005).
2. Determine appropriate sample(s) (August 2005).
3. Develop moderator guide including multiple drafts (August to October 2005).
5. Conduct pilot test session (October 2005).
6. Examine pilot test results and make revisions as needed (October 2005).
7. Prepare support materials, book facilities etc. in preparation of sessions (October 2005).
8. Conduct focus group sessions (November 2005).
   - November 7, Canmore Men
   - November 8, Canmore Women
   - November 14, Banff Men
   - November 15, Banff Women
   - November 18, Banff Seasonal Workers
3.3.3 **Focus Group Questions/Moderator Guide**

One moderator guide was developed to serve the Canmore and Banff Men and Women focus group sessions while minor modifications were carried out for the Banff Seasonal Workers session. Table 3.2 presents the basic questions for the focus group moderator guide that consisted of six sections including: the introduction including mandatory comments pertaining to confidentiality and use of data; motivation to reside; perceptions of life in a tourism community; negotiation of leisure constraints; recreation coping; and finally thoughts on the future. The moderator guide included 23 semi-structured questions designed to position less invasive questions first following guidelines set forth by Berg (1999). The focus group sessions were conducted within 90 minutes. The moderator guide included questions deemed essential, extra, complex, probing and throwaway as per Berg’s (1999) guidelines, and are presented in brackets in Table 3.2. However, each session developed its own character with some variation and moderator skill was required to ensure consistency of data collection. A handout was used to explore one question regarding recreation coping. Focus group sessions were audio-taped so that the researcher was free to facilitate connections and discussion with participants.
### Table 3.2 Focus Group Questions

**Part 1 — Definitions and Motivation**

1. Let's begin by having everyone briefly tell me what terms like recreation and leisure mean to you. Probe for recreation and then leisure. *(introductory question)*
2. Can you tell me why you choose to live here or ended up living here - basically what's your motivation for living here? *(essential question)*
3. How important is leisure and recreation to you as a reason for living here? *(cross-reference question if needed)*
4. Do you get to have the type of lifestyle you thought you would living here? Explain *(cross-referencing/optional question)*

**Part 2 — Tourism as a Setting Affordance**

1. What is it like to live in a tourism community? Do you think it's different from living in other communities? If so how? *(introductory question)*
2. Do the tourism amenities (eg. Ski hills, Nordic centre, shops, restaurants, etc) around you make it easier or harder for you to achieve your leisure goals? *(essential question)*

**Part 3 — Negotiation of Leisure Constraints**

1. Do you experience constraints or obstacles that hinder your ability to do what you want from a leisure point of view? Give me an example. *(introductory question)*
2. Do you experience any constraints that you think are specific to living here in a tourism community? Give me an example. *(essential question)*
3. What happens when you encounter one of those constraints that we just discussed? Does it stop you from doing what you want or do you negotiate around it, or something else? Explain. *(essential question)*
4. Do you experience more or less constraints to your leisure in different seasons? Explain? *(cross-reference question)*

**Part 4 — Daily negotiation through recreation coping**

1. Next I would like to ask some questions about whether or not, or if so how, you may adapt your leisure to your surroundings. In front of you is a handout that explains four common ways that people have been known to adapt their leisure or recreation to various stressors. I would like to work through each one and you tell me if you think you have experienced it and if yes try and give me an example. Maybe even write the example on the handout if you can. That would be great.

**Example of Handout but it would be entire page.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Brief Definition</th>
<th>Yes or No</th>
<th>Example (if yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do these strategies describe for you your 'negotiation' process? *(essential question)*

Which of the coping strategies discussed is most prominent for you? *(optional question)*

**Part 5 — Future**

1. If you were in charge of the world what would you do to make sure that residents like you could have a strong leisure lifestyle here? You can change policy and even budgets.
2. Who has the most control or influence over your ability to experience your leisure lifestyle here - local government, provincial or federal government, the tourism industry, other things like the economy or weather? What do you think?
3. Your best friend just called you from Toronto or Vancouver and said he/she is thinking about moving out to Banff/Canmore because they are tired of life where they are - they want to live and really have fun — what advice would you give them?
4. Would anyone like to many any final comments?

Thank participants
3.3.4 Pilot Testing of the Focus Group

The focus group moderator guide and procedure was pilot tested with a group of content area experts on October 17th 2005 in Banff, Alberta. The group consisted of eight individuals from the recreation, parks, tourism and social services sectors of the Bow Valley. Each had some professional experience in dealing with the management of quality of life issues for residents of the area. Three of the eight participants were known to the researcher. Their tenure in the Bow Valley ranged from six to thirty-eight years.

The participants were informed of the purpose of the research project and the purpose of the session as a pilot test. The session was carried out as intended for future sessions. At the conclusion of the session the group was asked to comment on whether each question was clearly understood, whether any ambiguous sections or concepts emerged, and what should be changed for non-content area expert participants. There was strong support for the questions and structure of the moderator guide. Although the term leisure constraints did not resonate very well no alternative suggestions were offered. One question regarding what is the best and worst thing about living in the Bow Valley was determined to be non-useful as it may have sparked divergent discussion, so that question was eliminated.

3.3.5 Recruitment and Selection of Focus Group Participants

Recruitment for focus group sessions was based on theoretical sampling as suggested within grounded theory guidelines (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). However, given the exploratory nature of the research project, and especially the purpose of the focus group research, few criteria were applied to participants. Table 3.3 presents the recruitment criteria for focus group participants.
Recruitment for the Canmore and Banff male and female sessions was carried out by contacting individuals through my network of contacts in the area and by placing posters at local coffee shops and grocery stores. Recruitment for the Banff Seasonal Worker session was facilitated by the Living Room in Banff, an independent not-for-profit organization whose mission is to assist seasonal workers in general living issues in Banff and Canmore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Criteria for Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canmore Men</td>
<td>• Male (18 years of age or older)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To have lived in Canmore for one year or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To be willing to complete the session as a volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canmore Women</td>
<td>• Female (18 years of age or older)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To have lived in Canmore for one year or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To be willing to complete the session as a volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Men</td>
<td>• Male (18 years of age or older)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To have lived in Banff for one year or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To be willing to complete the session as a volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Women</td>
<td>• Female (18 years of age or older)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To have lived in Banff for one year or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To be willing to complete the session as a volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Seasonal Workers</td>
<td>• To have lived and worked in Banff for a period of four months but less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Male or female (18 years of age or older)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant profile for the focus group sessions appears in Table 3.4 and includes the session, number of participants in each session, the range of years each has lived in the area, the age range and the number of participants recruited by the researcher through contacts. Recruitment for focus group sessions was moderately difficult because no financial incentives were offered, conversely, individuals were more open to participation once it was understood that the research was independent and not funded by Parks Canada. A copy of the focus group recruitment poster is found in Appendix D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Range of Tenure (years)</th>
<th>Age Range (years)</th>
<th>Number Known to Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canmore Men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 to 31</td>
<td>22 to 58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canmore Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 to 54</td>
<td>22 to 66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Men</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 to 44</td>
<td>22 to 65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Women</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 to 66</td>
<td>27 to 66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Seasonal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 months to 10</td>
<td>19 to 28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first session with Canmore men consisted of seven men ranging from 22 to 58 years of age. Their tenure of residency ranged from 3 to 31 years. They included two
younger males working towards guiding industry status, two men with career positions in Calgary who commute, and three men with career positions in Canmore. Four of the seven men had families. Two of them had older children while the other two had young children.

The second session involved 11 Canmore women whose tenure in the Bow Valley ranged from 2 to 54 years. This session included a diverse group of women from young professionals (engineer, nurse, radiology assistant) who had planned and worked towards a permanent move to Canmore for years, three women who were simply struggling to find decent work and live in Canmore, two women who had accompanied their husbands years prior, and three women who had lived and been a part of the valley for decades. The age of participants ranged from 22 to 66 years.

The third session included a group of eight Banff men whose tenure in Banff had ranged from 11 to 44 years whose ages ranged from 22 to 65 years. This group included three men who had worked for Parks (National or provincial) in the past, three related to the hospitality sector whom were long time residents who owned restaurants, and two younger men, one who had been born and raised in Banff and the other who had moved from Ontario for a career position.

The fourth session comprised of ten Banff women with extremely diverse backgrounds whose tenure in Banff ranged from 8 to 66 years and whose ages ranged from 27 to 66 years. Three women had accompanied husbands to Banff years ago, were no longer married to the individuals but had remarried, and remained. Two others were employed by the Town of Banff and one had spent a considerable amount of time in politics. Three women were younger and struggling with sustaining residency in Banff as they were trying to establish careers. One was single, worked in the outdoor industry and unsure if she could afford to stay due to increased cost of living.
The final session consisted of 11 individuals who had worked in Banff for a period of four to ten months in the past year. Their ages ranged from 19 to 28 years. Of the 11, six were from Canada (Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec) three were from Australia, one from New Zealand and one from Great Britain. All considered themselves to be representative of the younger backpacker set and Banff was not their intended destination for permanent residency, that is, they all planned to move on “when the party finally stopped”.

3.36 Focus Group Analytical Procedures

The analysis of focus group and interview data followed similar grounded theory guidelines; thus this sub-section applies to the following interview section. Qualitative analytical procedures often are confusing, messy and made up of hybrids of specific approaches depending on research objectives, the nature of the data, and over all contexts (Cutcliffe, 2000). The first part of this section describes the basic approach for qualitative analytical procedures employed in the research project while the latter part provides a detailed account of actual procedures.

The predominant method of analyzing both interview and focus group data involves content analysis (Krueger, 1994; Edmunds 1999). Berg (1998, p. 223) defines content analysis as “the examination of artefacts of social communication involving any technique for systematically and objectively identifying special artefacts of these messages.” He also states that content analysis remains poorly defined and must simply be understood simply as a process that often relies on critical reflexivity and one’s interpretive community to make sense of the material.

The process of content analysis refers to a search for specific terms, phrases, and words ordered towards the goal of uncovering the meanings and insights of the data. A variety of methods are used to carry out this often tedious process. Some researchers use filing systems and filing cards to physically sort content. Others use a more open system that seeks to code naturally occurring classes of things, people, and the like into major
and minor categories (Berg, 1998). Essentially, all forms of text-based qualitative data analysis is a form of content analysis, thus it is important to highlight nuances of one’s approach in relation to one’s purpose and goals. The content analysis approach of identifying categories and themes is argued to be better suited to confirmatory research designs, while a variable approach - to identify variables rather than number of cases of particular terms etc. - is better suited to theory-centered research designs (Onuegbazie & Teddie, 2003, pp. 363).

Analytical procedures within grounded theory place emphasis on saturation, abstraction, and cross comparison (Turner, 1981). Grounded theory analytical procedures differ from typical content analysis in a subtle yet important way. For example, frequency of occurrences of a particular theme in content analysis is all important, whereas within grounded theory once a theme has been deemed to be saturated by the researcher; frequency of occurrence becomes less important, even disregarded, in search of other theoretically relevant data. The data should then be abstracted or defined then compared to other emerging data and/or frameworks. My research employed a grounded theory analytical approach. Two other aspects of analytical procedures need to be addressed: use of computer assisted analysis and use of an interpretive community.

The use of computer assisted analysis tools is considered common practice within qualitative procedures (Bazeley, 2003). Generally such programs are used for traditional content analysis but some have shown promise in conducting more complex contextual analysis (Hannon & Knox, 2005). Computerized data analysis programs contribute most by offering greater convenience and efficiency, not necessarily rigour (Bazeley, 2003). Hannon & Knox (2005) concur, and emphasize that it is the researcher who must ultimately identify themes and draw out the connections. Despite the widespread use of computer assisted qualitative analysis programs, manual analysis is accepted. Hughes, Newsome & MacBeth (2005) employed manual qualitative analysis of surveys pertaining to visitor perceptions of captive wildlife tourism in Australia. Getz & Jamal (1994) used
manual analysis of highly complex qualitative data pertaining to stakeholder perceptions of a collaborative tourism planning process in Canmore, Alberta.

My research did not employ a computer assisted analysis program. An early attempt was made using the HyperResearch program but upon review of the output, I was not satisfied that important contextual elements were being captured relative to a manual analysis and I decided to conduct the analysis manually.

The involvement of an interpretive community to assist by offering different perspectives on qualitative data analysis is considered a common practice (Berg, 1998). In my research, I accessed an informal interpretive community at several important points throughout the analysis. First, I regularly enlisted three individuals with content area expertise, who were also a part of the focus group pilot session to review and discuss emergent themes (no raw data). Second, there were two separate meetings (in April of 2007) with Parks Canada and Alberta Sustainable Development staff with considerable human-environment management experience to review themes and preliminary conclusions.

Third, qualitative findings, including the typology generated from the research project, were formally presented at four separate conferences involving academic and practitioner audiences.

Feedback was sought following each presentation. I am satisfied that I sought sufficient perspectives to assist in the interpretation of results. The following table provides a summary of the focus group analytical procedures which began in November of 2005 and continued through to June of 2007, with some overlap with the interview research phase. Adjustments to the findings continued beyond June of 2007 as contextual information emerged.
Table 3.5  Summary of Focus Group Analytical Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Analytical Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Focus group sessions were audio-recorded using a double recorder system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The researcher made notes on each session of key findings, notes were written from memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Audio-tapes were transcribed verbatim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>The researcher read each session transcription three times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Each transcription was open coded - that is, listings of key findings were made in relation to the research goal and relevant theoretical frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Open coding occurred for the five transcriptions combined. Data was compared across transcriptions and to relevant theoretical frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>Initial concepts were formed from the combined transcripts. Concepts were examined in relation to the research goal, extreme comparisons (second home owner interviews) among concepts, and to relevant theoretical frameworks. Input from the interpretive community was enlisted at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>Concepts were reduced to Phase 1 categories through constant comparison and among concepts to relevant frameworks. Input from the interpretive community was again sought at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9</td>
<td>Categories were reduced to Phase 2 categories through constant comparison of the data and relevant frameworks. At this stage the human-environment relationship was especially useful in organizing the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 10</td>
<td>A final summary was prepared, but it is important to note that focus group findings were constantly reviewed throughout the remainder of the research project as new data emerged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final summary of the focus group (and interview qualitative analysis process) became an important feature of the analytical process. In keeping with the inductive and emergent nature of grounded theory, I applied an additional filter to the results at the concept level (Charmaz, 2008). The filter involved asking one three-part question of the data. The question was: In relation to the theoretical frameworks, associated literature and common understanding of the phenomenon, what data emerged as:

a.) Highly expected in its presence?

b.) Highly unexpected in its presence?
c.) Highly unexpected in its absence?

Analytical procedures for focus group data involved a messy (i.e. highly interpretive), yet rigorous, systematic, process of data reduction through constant comparisons towards theoretical model building.

3.36.1 Section Summary

The purpose of this section was to describe the methodology and methods employed in the conduct of the focus group research. All relevant aspects of the methodology were addressed from its purpose and design through to detailed points of application and demonstrated to be supported by accepted practices. I am confident that appropriate rigour was applied to the conduct of the focus group research.

3.37 Phase Two of Research: Semi-Structured Interviews

The purpose of this section is to present the detailed methodological procedures for the conduct of two separate interview research iterations. The first is the Second Home Owner interviews conducted in association with the initial focus group phase, yet methodologically distinct. The second is the Lived Experience interview phase, which followed the focus group research. The two iterations shared several methodological similarities such as they were face-to-face, semi-structured, qualitative interviews, with similar analytical procedures and considerations of validity but they differed in their focus, questions, sample and recruitment, and pilot testing of methods. Each sub-section in this section will include a brief explanation of the underlying rationale for the methodological component followed by an account of the detailed procedure for each of the two interview iterations.
3.37.1 Purpose of Interviews

The purpose of the interviews was to capture complex or underlying information that often escapes more structured positivistic methods (Davies, 2003). Qualitative interviews are considered an integral component of an exploratory research (Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001).

Purpose of Second Home Owner Interviews

The purpose of the Second Home Owner interviews was to provide an initial investigation of negotiated leisure for second home owners in the Bow Valley, in this case Canmore residents specifically. The interviews allowed me to investigate motivation to reside, leisure and recreation patterns, perceptions of life in Canmore and any emergent issues previously not considered. The Second Home Owner interviews represent an important step of cross or extreme comparison within grounded theory. Despite the connection to the focus group phase, I selected the interview method because of the difficulty involved in operationalizing a focus group with these people.

Purpose of Lived Experience Interviews

The purpose of the Lived Experience interview phase was to explore phenomenon related to negotiated leisure specific to daily life or the lived experience. The Lived Experience interviews built upon the knowledge of the focus group and Second Home Owner interviews and specifically explored everyday aspects of negotiation. The interview included: motivation to reside; leisure preferences; constraints; and recreation coping. Two additional question areas were included at the early stage of administration - everyday trade-offs of life in the Bow Valley and mobility. The Lived Experience interviews proved to be a critical component of the research project because it was at this stage that the overall direction or evolution of the project shifted towards amenity migration, mobility and destination change. If one can envision that the focus group research was to capture 'high level' exploratory data regarding leisure motivation, the
Lived Experience was to capture more detailed, operational data at the daily or lived experience level.

### 3.37.2 Interview Format and Research Design

Interview use is widespread in the area of tourism, recreation and geography research. Little (2002) examined leisure constraints for women within outdoor adventure experiences. Her investigation was based on 42 in-depth, semi-structured interviews that ranged from one to four hours in length. The interview schedule was based loosely on Leisure Constraints Theory, however, it was unstructured enough to allow for grounded theory development as well. Wearing, Cynn, Ponting, & McDonald (2002) investigated the level of congruency between backpacker’s personal and stated “eco” orientations and their actual buying habits in Australia. Primary data collection included 10 in-depth, semi-structured interviews based on a multiple act measure of environmental attitudes. The informants were chosen specifically on their fit with a definition of an international backpacker. Ludkin, Bertramini, & Martinez (2002) investigated the complex array of issues related to the tourism planning process in Cusco, Peru. For this they relied on a series of 11 in-depth interviews to supplement an extensive background analysis. However, of the 11 interviews, seven were conducted in a face-to-face format, three were conducted using e-mail and one was conducted over the telephone. They reported that data integrity did not suffer because of the inconsistency of interview methodology delivery.

In yet another variation of the single application of interview methodology, Tosum (2001) investigated the social impacts of tourism in several small villages throughout Greece. He employed an interview that had been used in two other case studies in the United States and Fiji and required translation into Greek. A total of 280 interviews were conducted within a door-to-door and face-to-face format to address the language issue. This application appears to be nearing a quantitative survey methodology; however, it was clearly presented as a qualitative study. Butz (2002)
employed unstructured interviews along with observational research to investigate the impact of sustainable tourism on the everyday (lived experience) life of mountain porters in India.

There is no one set of methodological procedures for the conduct of interviews, therefore a series of well established guidelines will be presented here (Berg, 1998). The interview allows the researcher to explore data regarding social relationships, motives, decision-making and causal relationships. The interview is a conversation with a purpose (Berg, 1998). Or a purposeful conversation with one or more informants simultaneously (Manheim, 1977; Dunn, 2000). Generally, interviews are conducted in a face-to-face format although numerous variations exist. Manheim (1977) adds that the interview is more than purposeful conversation because it must be focused on a specific theme with associated goals. It is recognized that interview types range from a rigid to a loose format. Manheim (1977) states that there are two types: the structured and unstructured. Dunn (2000) adds the bridging category of the semi-structured interview and both Dunn (2000) and Manheim (1977) agree that the majority of interview research methodology embraces degrees of the semi-structured interview. Berg (1998) refers to a similar range, but stated as formal and informal, and further categorizes these two types into the standard, semi-standard and un-standardized interview types.

In the following discussion I use the generic terms of structured, semi-structured, and unstructured interviews. In the structured interview, the researcher is led by a set series of structured questions so there is little to any freedom to deviate from the questions. Differences within the spectrum of the standard or structured, to the un-standardized or unstructured interview holds several key implications. Questions may include fixed alternatives and the questions should be delivered in a similar way for all interviews (Manheim, 1977; Berg 1998). The true structured interview is closely related to the statically-based survey methodology and conceivably could cross-over in certain cases; however the qualitative interview is not intended or designed for self-administration (Berg, 1998; Dunn, 2000).
The unstructured interview occupies the opposite end of the spectrum from the structured interview. Its characteristics are based on a loosely guided, but purposeful conversation. The researcher may be guided by several general questions or even themes and hope to generate the necessary discussion based on the informant’s responses. With the unstructured interview there is freedom to digress from questions, and it is assumed that digressions will occur. Berg (1998) offers insight into the difference between the structured and unstructured types by explaining that the two types are approached from fundamentally different assumptions. The researcher employing the structured interview must assume a high level of content knowledge to be confident of having included all the right questions because there is very little opportunity to deviate and alter questions during the interview. Conversely, the researcher employing the unstructured interview can assume that he/she does not know what the right questions are and may take a more exploratory approach.

The semi-structured interview, as can be assumed, falls in between the two ends of the spectrum. Manheim (1977) claims the semi-structured interview is most common. The semi-structured interview includes a set series of questions but there is freedom to digress. Likewise, the researcher can assume that the interview likely contains most of the right questions but some digressions may be needed. I employed a semi-structured interview in my research.

There is little offered in terms of specific protocols pertaining to the conduct of interview research. Berg (1998) and others recommend that the interview schedule be clear, that there is a clear idea of the desired sample and that the interview is conducted in a comfortable manner. The specific procedures used for the conduct of the two interviews for this research are presented next.
Second Home Owner Interview

The Second Home Owner interview included five homogenous participants. Interviews were unstructured but biased more toward a structured. Specific procedures were as follows:

1. Determined that the interview method would better suit data collection for the second home owner population over the focus group (October 2005).
2. Ensured clarity of purpose, to complement focus group data (October 2005).
3. Develop interview schedule (November 2005).
4. Conduct pilot testing with one person (November 2005).
5. Make revisions to interview schedule (December 2005).
6. Begin recruitment based on theoretical sampling (January 2006).
7. Conduct five interviews (February and March 2006).

Lived Experience Interviews

The Lived Experience interview data evolved over the course of the 24 interviews as critical themes emerged within various discussions; however the format and design remained constant throughout. The specific procedures for the Lived Experience interviews were as follows:

1.) Determined the focus of interviews and ensured clarity towards the daily experience (November 2005).
2.) Developed interview schedule – various drafts (December 2005).
3.) Began recruitment through various means of contacts and posters (January 2006).
4.) Conducted three pilot test interviews (February and March 2006).
5.) Reviewed pilot testing results and made minor changes to the interview schedule (March 2006).
6.) Conducted interviews and on-going recruitment – theoretical sampling as required (April 2006 to November 2006). The following progression demonstrates the grounded theory process of saturation and theoretical sampling:

- Group 1 consisted of nine individuals of primarily ‘mountain recreation lifestyle’ people (April to July 2006)
- Group 2 consisted of three individuals of the ‘established Bow Valley residents’ group (May to August 2006)
- Group 3 consisted of four individuals of the ‘urban recreation – vampires’ (late night/early morning recreationists) group (June to September 2006)
- Group 4 consisted of three individuals of the ‘primarily career motivated’ residents (May 2006 to August 2006)
- Group 5 consisted of three individuals who were ‘former residents’ who had since moved. (October to November of 2006)

7.) Began analysis of interviews (June 2006 to February 2007) although interview data was reviewed constantly throughout the research project.

Based on the methodological guidelines for the conduct of interviews and grounded theory canons, the researcher is satisfied that both interview iterations were carried out in a rigorous manner. A copy of the Interview Consent Form is found in Appendix E.

3.37.3 Interview Questions/Interview Schedule

Dunn (2000), Manheim (1977) and Berg (1998) offer two basic ways of formatting interview questions: the interview schedule and the interview guide. The interview schedule contains a comprehensive list of specifically worded questions often associated with the structured and semi-structured interview types. The interview schedule likely will contain a large number of questions and it may contain closed or aided questions in addition to open-ended questions. Conversely, the interview guide is
intended to be more general, and contain fewer questions with the assumption of generating discussion based on the minimal number of questions present. In some cases the interview guide in some cases may only contain themes to be discussed and explored by the researcher with prompts to deepen discussion in key areas (Berg, 1998). The interview guide is likely to be employed with unstructured and semi-structured interview types. I used an interview schedule associated with the semi-structured interview format.

Strategies related to questioning follow a simple principle, which is to create a comfortable environment that will result in complete, honest, and insightful responses (Manheim, 1977). Typical strategies include the placing of less invasive, easier or uncomfortable questions first to ease the informant into discussion. Wording of questions should be clear and concise and in language that is appropriate to the informant. Berg (1998) explains four types of questions often found within interviews schedules or guides. The first is essential questions which are central to the inquiry. These may be found scattered or grouped together. The second is extra questions which hold a similar role as essential questions but approach the content from a different angle in order to act as a check and balance. The third is the probe which is essentially a prompt within a question to ensure the researcher emphasizes and explores targeted areas. The final type of question is the throwaway which is included to gather information on informant profile but this data may also be observed. Both of my interview schedules followed a similar structure with some deviations as noted in the following section.

Second Home Owner Interview Schedule

The Second Home Owner interview schedule contained five sections with a total of 19 questions. Following the introductory section, the first section focused on motivation to reside and some definitions and leisure patterns, the second section addressed perceptions of life in Canmore. Section three addressed leisure negotiation, section four focused on recreation coping strategies. The final section solicited ideas about the future. Interviews varied with individual discussions as some held strong views about various topics. A
summary of the Second Home Interview Guide appears in Table 3.6. No problems pertaining to the interview schedule were encountered in the conduct of the Second Home Owner interviews.
Table 3.6 Second Home Owner Interview Schedule

Part 1: Definitions, Motivations and Recreation

1. How long have you had a second home in Canmore? (introductory)
2. Why did you decide to purchase a second home in Canmore? (essential)
3. Where else did you consider buying a second home and why did you end up choosing Canmore over other areas? (extra)
4. In general how often do you come out to Canmore each month? (Probe)
5. Tell me what does a typical Canmore experience consist of – what do you generally do? (aided by a table) (essential)
6. How important is leisure and recreation to you as a reason for purchasing a second home in Canmore? (essential)
7. Do you experience the kind of lifestyle you thought you would here? Explain. (extra)

Part 2: Perceptions of Life in Canmore

8. What is it like to live in a tourism community? Do you think it's different from living in other communities and how? (introductory – extra)
9. Do tourism amenities around make it is easier or harder for you to achieve your leisure goals? (essential)
10. How evident is it to you, in your normal day here, that you live in a tourism community? (probe)

Part 3: Leisure Negotiation

11. In general and not specific to your time in Canmore, do you experience constraints or obstacles to your leisure – to do what you would like to do and if so give me an example. (introductory)
12. Do you experience any constraints similar or otherwise when you are here in Canmore? (essential)
13. Do you think there are any constraints specific to living in a tourism community? (extra)
14. What happens when you encounter one of those constraints mentioned earlier? Does it stop you from doing what you want or do your work around it in some way? (probe)

Part Four: Recreation Coping

15. Next I would like to ask you some questions about whether or not you adapt your leisure activity to the stuff that is going around here in Canmore? (Aided by a table) Four types explained and responses solicited. (essential)

Part Five: The Future

16. If you were in charge of the world what would you do to make sure residents like you could have a really positive leisure lifestyle here? You can change anything you want – you are in charge of the world. (introductory)
17. Who has most control or influence over your leisure experience here? Government, neighbours, economy, weather, etc.? (probe)
18. Your best friend just called from Toronto and they are thinking about buying a second home in Canmore – what advice would you give them? (extra)
19. Any final comments? (extra)
Lived Experience Interview Schedule

The Lived Experience interview schedule underwent several changes from its earliest conception prior to pilot testing. The challenge for this research iteration was to target daily negotiation and move away from the broader explanations that participants offered within the focus group research. The Lived Experience interview schedule initially included five sections and approximately 27 questions. The five sections were as follows:

1. definitions and motivations for living in the Bow Valley (introductory)
2. tourism as a setting affordance (background)
3. leisure constraints (essential)
4. coping strategies (essential)
5. future strategies (cross-referencing, optional)

Following pilot testing, it became apparent that the format of the existing interview schedule could not be assured to capture daily negotiations and what success there was, was based generally on my ability to probe. Furthermore, the interview was too choppy and lacked flow. A summary of final questions appears in Table 3.7. It is important to note key changes I made to this interview schedule. The questions presented in Table 3.7 represent the manner in which the bulk of the interviews were carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.7 Lived Experience Interview Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How long have you lived in the Bow Valley? Banff/Canmore or both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can you explain how you ended up here or why did you move to the Bow Valley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can you describe to me what an ideal day is like for you here in Bow Valley? From start to finish what is it like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What constraints or obstacles to your ideal day do you encounter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is your personal recreation made easier by the tourism and recreation amenities here or is the associated tourism a hindrance to your recreation goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trade-offs: what do you get and what do you give up in everyday life by living in the Bow Valley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lifestyle: is the motivation to live here a lifestyle decision? If so describe the lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 6 and 9 were added following the fifth interview and used in all subsequent interviews. As I gained confidence in my interview protocol, after the first several interviews I noted that leisure constraint feedback would appear, but not necessarily within a leisure constraints question. The leisure constraint feedback would appear in the 'trade-offs' or 'tourism' or even the 'lifestyle' question. Confidence gained in the conduct of the first several interviews allowed me to progress in a more relaxed manner. Minor modifications were needed to re-word certain questions (in the past tense) for the three participants who had since moved from the Bow Valley. In the end there was little distinction between an essential or extra question as they all solicited rich feedback depending on the background of the individual participant. Despite changes to the initial interview schedule I noted no apparent problems arising from the questions were noted by the researcher.

3.37.4 Interview Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment for interview research was based on theoretical sampling as suggested within grounded theory guidelines, with some convenience sampling technique included (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The Second Home Owner interview participants were recruited using my own network of known individuals who own second homes in Canmore, as such it would be termed convenience sampling. However, the Second Home Owner interview research iteration was an extension of the initial focus group research and based on theoretical sampling. The Lived Experience interview recruitment was based initially on a convenience sample of individuals who had responded to recruitment posters (See Appendix F). Others were found with selective snowball techniques and selected based on theoretical sampling - that is, once the researcher was
satisfied a particular theme had been saturated; others were sought for extreme comparison purposes. Criteria for the selection of second home owners from Canmore was minimal and included that they be a second home owner for one year or longer and visit the home on a fairly frequent basis - that is, have some experience from which to draw upon for discussion purposes. Criteria for the selection of Lived Experience interview participants were somewhat more complex as it was based primarily on motivation to reside in the Bow Valley. It is presented in Table 3.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in Group</th>
<th>Motivation to Reside</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Recreation Lifestyle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>To balance work with mountain recreation</td>
<td>To have resided in the Bow Valley for one year or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established with Families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>To balance work, recreation and children's needs</td>
<td>To have resided in the Bow Valley for one year or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To work in the Bow Valley and experience a rich social life based on urban type recreation</td>
<td>To have resided in the Bow Valley for one year or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily Career Motivated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>To pursue a career in a chosen area primarily and experience the mountains secondarily</td>
<td>To have resided in the Bow Valley for one year or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.37.5 Interview Respondent Profile

The purpose of this section is to present the profile of interview participants for the Second Home Owner interview and the Lived Experience interview research phases. The Second Home Owner interview participant profile is presented in Table 3.9 and the participant profile for the Lived Experience interview research phase is presented in Table 3.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Years in Permanent Home</th>
<th>Permanent Home Location</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.10 Profile of Lived Experience Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation/Lifestyle</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Years Range in BV</th>
<th>Gender M-Male</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number that work in BV</th>
<th>Residence B-Banff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Recreation Lifestyle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 – 22</td>
<td>M/5</td>
<td>22 – 46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B/2 C/7 Both 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Family/Parent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 – 31</td>
<td>M/2</td>
<td>31 – 56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B/1 C/2 Both 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5 – 7</td>
<td>M/1</td>
<td>27 – 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B/3 C/1 Both 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mountain Leisure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 – 17</td>
<td>M/4</td>
<td>27 – 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B/4 C/0 Both 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3 – 7)</td>
<td>M/2</td>
<td>29 – 37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B/0 C/2 Both 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 – 31</td>
<td>M/14</td>
<td>22 – 56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>B/7 C/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Home Owner Interview Participant Profile

The Second Home Owner interview participant group was fairly homogenous. The range of years of second home ownership in Canmore was from 3.5 to 8 years. Calgary is the permanent residence for the entire group. Three of the five are employed as physicians while the other two are self-employed. Three of the five were known to me through the loose connection of children’s sport activities, while the other two were referred to me. It is important to keep in mind that the Second Home Interview research
phases was carried out to compliment the Initial Focus Group research as a form of extreme or cross comparison.

Lived Experience Interview Participant Profile

The participant profile for the Lived Experience interviews were more diverse than the Second Home Owners and are presented in Table 3.6. The first column categorizes the individual based on a combination of their motivation to reside and a general classification of their lifestyle. The latter was largely based on their description of their “ideal day” and additional insights garnered throughout the interviews. Although a total of 26 interviews were carried, two interviews were not deemed usable because of problems with recording equipment. Therefore the data is based on 24 complete interviews. Mountain recreation lifestyle participants made up the largest group and the researcher had to decline several opportunities to carry out more interviews with this already saturated group. The Established Family group refers to a group that had initially arrived for a mountain recreation lifestyle and partly for a career and who have found themselves to be living relatively normal lives (i.e. children play hockey, do gymnastics, piano lessons, etc). They are well established from a social and career perspective and they do not consider themselves to be mountain recreation enthusiasts. The Career group is made up of four people whose primary goal was to secure a career position in the Bow Valley, but each was also clearly aware of the lifestyle potential of living in the Bow Valley. The Urban Mountain Leisure group consisted of four men who had resided in the Bow Valley for no less than seven years, worked in hospitality, were highly socially driven and wanted to experience urban types of leisure (late-night clubs) but were drawn equally to live in a beautiful mountain community. The Exit Interviews group consisted of three individuals who had once lived in the Bow Valley but had since moved to Calgary and Cochrane, AB. Two were known to the researcher through friends and the other was referred.
The number of years in the Bow Valley in the Lived Experience group ranged from 1 to 31 years, and most participants considered themselves to be comfortably settled in the Bow Valley. The next column depicts the gender breakdown, a total of 14 participants were male and 8 were female. With respect to age, the group was generally a younger group of participants who can also be described as a physically and socially active group in general. The next column reports the number of participants who work in the Bow Valley and all but two of the present residents (excluding the three exit interviews) worked in the Bow Valley. The final column attempts to address where the participants reside presently. Seven lived in Banff, 12 lived in Canmore and 2 insisted on being categorized as living in both. In fact, several participants had resided in both Canmore and Banff and claimed to be equally loyal to both.

### 3.37.6 Pilot Testing

This section briefly describes the pilot testing procedures for both the Second Home Owner interview and Lived Experience interview research phases.

**Second Home Owner Interview Pilot Testing**

Pilot testing for the Second Home Owner interview consisted of one pre-test conduct with a Canmore second home owner known to the researcher. The interview was carried out on November 16, 2005 in Calgary. The interview required 76 minutes in total. The pilot test resulted in one important insight which was to include a ‘visitor’ orientation component. That is, the goal of the Second Home Owner interviews was to be an extension of the focus group research directed at residents. Earlier versions of the Second Home Owner interview schedule more closely resembled the focus group moderator guide. Feedback from the pilot test suggested that I should add questions pertaining to recreation patterns as the (second home owner’s) time in Canmore was treated more like a visit than residency. Data from the pilot test was audio recorded and
reviewed and notes were taken following the session. Otherwise, no changes were made to the interview schedule and no changes were made by the researcher.

Lived Experience Interview Pilot Test

Pilot testing for the Lived Experience interviews occurred with two individuals at the start of the project and overlapped partially with the conduct of the Second Home Owner interviews. As noted in an earlier section, the Lived Experience interview schedule underwent considerable change from its inception to research completion. Two Canmore residents both known to the researcher were asked to take part in the pilot test of the interview schedule in February of 2006. The interview schedule initially included 20 questions in an attempt to isolate multiple variables related to daily leisure negotiation. For example, the initial interview schedule contained two separate questions soliciting feedback on one’s ideal day for both summer and winter. The seasonal aspect of the question was considered repetitive and did not yield additional meaningful information and it was eliminated. The initial interview schedule also included a series of questions regarding everyday life in the Bow Valley in an attempt to abstract information about the quality of daily life and the manner in which notions of leisure were integrated into daily life. Pilot test participants found them difficult to answer without proper context, yet later in the interview process this exact area of questioning became apparent through the “trade-off” question.

The two Lived Experience pilot test participants were male and female and 29 and 26 years of age respectively. Both had resided in the Bow Valley area for five and three years respectively and would be considered to be in the mountain recreation lifestyle group. Both were keen to offer feedback on the instrument following their respective interviews and summarized as follows:
a. seasonal questions regarding the ideal day to be discarded but to keep one, even though it is not easy to answer;

b. everyday life questions appear to hang almost out of place as though they are of a different topic and needed to be grounded (later addressed through the trade-off question of what do you get and what do you give up by living in the Bow Valley?).

Changes were made to the interview schedule based on pilot test feedback. Analysis of the pilot test audio-recording and notes supported the two changes listed, as meaningful data would not be gathered by 'more' questions. Upon review of the pertinent feedback, I am satisfied that the interview schedule employed for the Lived Experience interview research phase work was intended.

3.37.7 Analytical Procedures

Analysis of the data for both the Second Home Owner and Lived Experience interview research phases was based on the procedures previously established for the analysis of the focus group data (Section 3.3.7). The analytical steps are summarized below in Table 3.11. Second Home Owner interview transcriptions yielded approximately 97 pages of single-spaced verbatim data averaging 19.4 pages per interview. Lived Experience interview research yielded about 375 pages of single-spaced verbatim transcription resulting in about 15 pages per interview.

| Table 3.11 Analytical Steps for Second Home Owner and Lived Experience Interviews |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Step                             | Second Home Owner Interview     | Lived Experience Interview |
The analytical procedures for both the Second Home Owner interview and the Lived Experience data followed the canons of grounded theory as provided by Corbin & Strauss (1990). Each transcript was read three times with basic and sporadic note taking. Concept level data emerged first when like data emerged in a repeated manner. The data was then framed into a short cohesive statement, a concept. Concept level data was reviewed repeatedly. In most cases concept-level data was the result of repeated participant statements regarding a similar phenomenon such as the data pertaining to the displacement response of recreation coping (see Figure 4.1, Chapter Four). In some cases single sourced comments were recorded as concept data because of their impact on the researcher for their extra-ordinary ability to explain observed phenomenon. For example, participants noted changes in the communities from a temporal point of view. Changes occurred weekly for Canmore and seasonally (over the course of a year) for Banff. This perceived difference between the two communities offered poignant insight.

Concept level data was reviewed repeatedly and modified into a smaller number of more cohesive statements representing phase one category data. Phase one category data was later reduced further to phase two category data. The data categories of concept, phase 1, and phase 2 are similar; they constitute what is referred to as open, axial, and selective coding (Woodside et al. 2004). Throughout the process attention was directed to ensuring the analysis followed exploratory inductive methods, as per the canons and spirit of grounded theory. Some important observations were made of the qualitative data analysis process. Through the practice of critical reflexivity (Ateljervic et al., 2005) I noted that initially I paid more attention to concept data that related to known theoretical frameworks and with less attention to data that appeared to lack a connection to known frameworks. This resulted in many returns to and reviews of the data to allow for all seemingly relevant data to be coded. A measure of faith was required that some seemingly disparate data would become meaningful at some later point. Over repeated reviews of the raw data, concept data and some early iterations of phase 1 category findings, new themes emerged. Perhaps the most prominent theme to
emerge from this process of constant comparison via critical reflexivity was that of destination change and individual mobility in and out of the Bow Valley. This emergent theme significantly impacted the direction and nature of theory building for my research project. Finally, I reviewed several published papers involving grounded theory in tourism and recreation to obtain an understanding of ‘accepted’ ways of presenting grounded theory analytical procedures and results.

3.37.8 Section Summary

The purpose of this section was to present the methodology for the Second Home Owner and Lived Experience interview research phases. Sub-sections provided methodological context and actual procedures for the two phases of the research project and specifically addressed the areas of interview purpose, interview schedule development, interview participant recruitment and selection, interview validity, and pilot testing. I am satisfied that the Second Home Owner and Lived Experience interview research phases were carried out in accordance to what is known and accepted as grounded theory methodology, interview methodology and the goals and objectives of my research project.

3.38 Mail Back Questionnaire – The Bow Valley Recreation Survey

The purpose of this section is to detail procedures employed in the design and administration of the mail-back questionnaire component of the research project, herein referred to as the Bow Valley Recreation Survey (BVRS). The BVRS represent the final phase of data collection in my research project. The incorporation of a quantitative method within a grounded theory research project requires an explanation. Blended together quantitative and qualitative research constitute the mixed methods methodological approach that recently has been viewed as a unique methodological approach with its own canons (Plano Clark, Creswell, O’Neil Green, & Shope, 2008).
My research project was firmly conducted within grounded theory canons and guidelines. It is not common to incorporate quantitative research into grounded theory studies, but if it is done (Jennings & Junek, 2007) the manner in which it is done needs to be well understood.

Figure 3.2 provides an overview of the relationship between the BVRS component and the rest of my research. The over-arching approach to the BVRS within the broader study was to be both inductive and abductive. It is to be inductive in order to further explore emergent concepts from previous iterations and abductive to be open to, and able to, identify new concepts not yet gathered (Charmaz, 2008). The methodological design of the questionnaire was to be exploratory and descriptive. The exploratory and descriptive aspects were important to the inductive and abductive approach because they were not intended to test hypotheses. My choice of questionnaire design can be best characterized as a necessary step in returning to the studied in order to verify and further explore previous concept level data, but in this case it is in the form of a quantitative survey (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The analytical approach to the data collected was to apply descriptive and segmentation statistical procedures to extract information and support theory development.
The next section begins by describing the purpose of the BVRS within subsection 3.5.1. followed by a detailed explanation of the sample and sample design in subsection 3.5.2. The next sub-section addresses questionnaire design, including all aspects of its presentation. Pilot testing of the BVRS is described in 3.5.3 and questionnaire administration and response rates will be addressed in sub-section 3.5.4. Limitations to the research will be discussed in 3.5.5 and a brief sub-section on data input and handling is presented in 3.5.6, followed by a summary sub-section.

3.38.1 Purpose of the Bow Valley Recreation Survey (BVRS)

As Charmaz (2008) points out, grounded theory has evolved into a constellation of methods rather than an orthodox unitary approach (pp.61). Within mixed methodology, the purpose of a survey is to increase the scope and comprehensiveness of the research (Creswell et al., 2003). Morse (2003) explains that a quantitative survey within a qualitative project should address at least one of the following objectives: 1. to indentify notions and ideas incorporated into the broader study; 2. to identify different information to explain broader phenomenon; or 3. to re-examine data within a wider sample. The purpose of the BVRS within my research was to increase the scope, understanding and comprehensiveness of the research by returning to the researched, and identifying new and different information to be incorporated into the study towards the goal of theoretical model building (Creswell et al. 2003; and Morse, 2003).

Qualitative research phases produced a variety of findings including a working theoretical model of the typology of amenity migrants within a mountain resort destination. The typology evolved from the understanding that leisure negotiation of residents involved individual negotiation, with elements of the broader environment including recreation amenities, and physical and structural aspects of the area. These elements influence individual negotiation as individual negotiation influences the dynamics of the broader environment. Implied within the typology is that different
groups maintain different patterns of recreation, negotiation and relationships with the Bow Valley. The BVRS was intended to explore the presence of different groups based on key variables such as motivation to reside in the area, the importance of recreation amenities, perceptions of change within the Bow Valley, and overall quality of life. The presence of distinct groups, and the identification of patterns of importance placed on different types of recreation amenities and perceived changes in the Bow Valley, would allow the addition of key elements to the theory building of this research project. Primarily, the BVRS would allow for a theoretical connection of influence from the individual back to the place, in keeping with the human-environment relationship within behavioural geography.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly I returned to the field within the BVRS to verify previous data and explore broader phenomenon (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Charmaz, 2008). It was clear from qualitative research phases that participants reported changes in the importance of various recreation amenities and subsequent changes in the broader community. If this were evident on a broader scale, then the changes would hold important implications for theory building as it would imply possible changes to the physical environment and further add to the recreation-based human-environment relationship. Thus I chose to include a quantitative survey.

3.38.2 Sample and Sample Design

The purpose of this section is to present a detailed account of the sample and sample design employed within the BVRS. The sample was situated within the population, targeted population, targeted sample and actual sample. Table 3.12 presents the population, targeted sample and sample within a stratified context of the two communities of Banff and Canmore. The population for the study consists of all individuals within the study area (Gorard, 2003). The total population for the BVRS consisted of all residents of the two communities amounting to a total of 25,128 taking into account an estimate on the part of the Town of Canmore that included second home
Table 3.12 Description of Population, Targeted Sample and Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Targeted Population</th>
<th>Targeted Sample</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canmore</td>
<td>16,407 (1)</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>13,692</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff</td>
<td>8,721 (2)</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>5,585</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,128</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19,277</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Canmore (2006 Census) states 11,599 permanent and 4,818 non-permanent residents totaling 16,417 residents. (2) Banff (2007 Census) states a total population of 8,721 including non-permanent residents.

owners. The targeted population consists of all individuals who could be included in the study given the study criteria (Jennings, 2001) which is estimated at 21,298. This figure was arrived at by subtracting those 17 years of age and younger (however data did not separate for the 15 to 19 age category) and those who have not resided in the Bow Valley for more than one year. The targeted sample for the BVRS consisted of 1,200 individuals stratified in a representative manner. The actual sample consisted of 363 individuals, 264 from Canmore and 99 from Banff.

Sample design for the BVRS consisted of a stratified systematic sample or probability based method (Creswell, 2003). Creswell (2003) points out that the term ‘random’ sometimes refers to a pure random process as earlier referred to by Jennings (2001), or a systematic ‘random’ process that is largely a probability based method. A systematic (random) sampling method was commonly used in studies examined for this research project (Yoon, Gursory, & Chen, 2001; Ko & Stewart, 2002) among others. Jennings (2001, p. 143) provides four steps for stratified systematic sampling which include:

a.) Dividing the population into a number of strata – in the case of the BVRS the population was divided into separate Banff and Canmore populations.
b.) Developing sampling frames for each strata – in the case of the BVRS sampling frames were created for each (see Table 3.8)

c.) Developing samples for each strata – in the case of the BVRS, a sample for each strata of Canmore and Banff was developed (see Table 3.8)

d.) Merging the individual samples into one listing – in the case of the BVRS, results from both communities were treated and analyzed as one larger data set.

The BVRS sample was stratified by the two communities or populations of Banff and Canmore. The sample was systematic in that every 6\textsuperscript{th} household was selected within each of the two communities (populations). Every 6\textsuperscript{th} household was selected as a frame prior to the administration of the project based on an assessment of the number of households in each community. According to Statistics Canada Community Profiles (2006) which considers the most accurate information available, there were 2,568 residential units in Banff and every 6\textsuperscript{th} household represents targeting 428 households. There were 4,778 residential units in Canmore and by selecting every 6\textsuperscript{th} resulting in 796 households was established. Details of survey administration are discussed in Section 3.5.4. While grounded theory supports theoretical sampling (Charmaz, 2008) incorporating a quantitative research phase into my research required flexibility of methods in order to include non-theoretical sampling method.

3.38.3 Questionnaire Design

This section begins by providing an overview of the methodological approach taken for the questionnaire used in the BVRS, followed by a description of the general questionnaire, its supporting rationale, then a detailed explanation of each item and measure. The first part of this section focuses on the description of the questionnaire, followed by a description of the complete questionnaire package. All questionnaire items
and measures were developed specifically for this research project. Reliability and validity are addressed in Section 3.9.

Bow Valley Recreation Survey (BVRS) Questionnaire

There is much written about approaches to questionnaire design but they tend to follow strict positivistic guidelines and address experimental and confirmatory methods (Creswell, 2003). The BVRS questionnaire is best characterized as a theoretically grounded exploratory measurement tool. All items and measures were developed specifically for this questionnaire, not borrowed or modified from other studies. No other similar studies were found. The basis of the questionnaire is found within inductive and abductive reasoning. The former refers to the emergence of data and the latter refers to a grounded theory tenet of seeking out additional information based on what the researcher believes to be relevant to the development of theory, and more so, to the reflection of real life phenomenon (Charmaz, 2008).

The BVRS questionnaire is made up of 17 questions. It is anchored by four measures: Q2 Motivation to Reside, Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities, Q8 Perception of Change and Q9 Quality of Life. Combined, the four measures effectively mirror an amenity migrant’s stay, beginning from one’s motivation to live in the Bow Valley importance of various recreation amenities, perception of changes within the community and finally, the respondent was asked to comment on quality of life in the Bow Valley.

The BVRS questionnaire was divided into six basic sections. The first section can be referred to as ‘Living in the Bow Valley’ and included four questions (Q1-4) on length of residency, motivation to reside and a reflective question on lifestyle in relation to motivation to reside. The next section, ‘Importance of Recreation Amenities’ includes three questions (Q5 – 7) on rating the importance of recreation amenities, including
‘other’, and changes in recreation activity since residing in the Bow Valley. The third section (Q8) ‘Perception of Change in the Community’ includes one question with a 28-item measure to explore changes in the community. The fourth section ‘Quality of Life’ includes two questions (Q9-10) on rating of quality of life variables and an overall rating. The next section is referred to as ‘future intentions’ and includes only one question (Q11) soliciting the respondents’ intention to stay or leave. The final section pertains to the respondent profile and includes six questions (Q12-17) of a demographic nature.

Table 3.13 provides a description of each item based on variable name (dependent, independent, intervening, and extraneous) (Jennings, 2001), the research question, the item(s) on the survey and the response set. Jennings (2001) points out that it is useful to indicate the variables in relation to questionnaire items even in descriptive studies. The complete BVRS questionnaire is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q-item</th>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td>Independent (tenure of residency)</td>
<td>Please indicate how long you have lived in the Bow Valley.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
<td>Independent (Motivation to reside)</td>
<td>Please indicate how important each of the following statements is with respect to your decision to live in the Bow Valley. Included 7 items derived from previous research.</td>
<td>Five point Likert scale of importance including 'unsure'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
<td>Independent (Motivation to reside)</td>
<td>Are there any other reasons to explain why you moved to the Bow Valley?</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
<td>Dependent (Reflection on Bow Valley lifestyle)</td>
<td>Do you think you are living the life you thought you would be living here?</td>
<td>Six point Likert scale of importance including 'unsure'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5</strong></td>
<td>Extraneous Variable (Importance of recreation amenities)</td>
<td>Please indicate how important each of the following areas are for you at present in your life? Included 14 items depicting front and back country recreation amenities abstracted from previous research and review of recreation opportunities within the area.</td>
<td>Five point Likert scale of importance including 'unsure'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q6</strong></td>
<td>Extraneous Variable (Importance of recreation amenities)</td>
<td>Are there any other facilities important to your recreation? (please state)</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Dependent Variable (Change in recreation activity)</td>
<td>Since I have started living in the Bow Valley I...participate in backcountry activities; in town activities; and recreation in general</td>
<td>Checklist from more, less, about the same and not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Dependent Variable (Perception of change in Community)</td>
<td>In this section I would like to know whether you have noticed changes, as increases or decreases over time, to any of the following. Please answer in relation to where you live now — Canmore of Banff. Included 28 items derived from previous research.</td>
<td>Six point Likert scale from Increased Greatly to Decreased Greatly and Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Dependent Variable (Quality of Life)</td>
<td>Please consider your overall quality of life in the Bow Valley. Consider whether the following items have a good or bad impact on your quality of life here. Included 10 items derived from previous research.</td>
<td>Five point Likert scale from Very Bad to Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Dependent Variable (Quality of Life – overall rating)</td>
<td>I would rate my overall quality of life in the Bow Valley as...</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Dependent Variable (Future intentions)</td>
<td>Over the next five years I...please circle only one</td>
<td>Checklist from: I will stay; I am not sure if I will stay or leave; I will probably leave; I will definitely leave; I will likely leave (education, extended travel) and return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Intervening Variable (Age)</td>
<td>Please check one of the categories listed below.</td>
<td>Checklist of five ordinal categories from 18 to 65 years and older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Intervening Variable (Household structure)</td>
<td>Which of the following households most closely describes your personal situation?</td>
<td>Checklist of six distinct ordinal categories including other (coded separately as 13b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Intervening Variable (home ownership/rental)</td>
<td>Do you own or rent your home?</td>
<td>Checklist of own, rent and other (coded separately as 14b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Intervening Variable (Education)</td>
<td>Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed.</td>
<td>Checklist of seven distinct categories including other (coded separately as 15b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Intervening Variable (Income)</td>
<td>Which of the following categories most closely represents your personal income from all sources during 2006-</td>
<td>Checklist of nine distinct ordinal categories including don't know and refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Intervening Variable (Gender)</td>
<td>Your gender is...</td>
<td>Checklist of female and male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The BVRS is anchored by four measures developed specifically for use in this research project. The first measure (Q2) pertains to Motivation to Reside. It includes seven (7) items supported by an additional ‘other’ response question and presented in Table 3.14.

**Table 3.14 Motivation to Reside Questionnaire Items**

- a.) To pursue a career in tourism, hospitality or parks
- b.) To balance work (work in general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle
- c.) To start a business
- d.) Just to be with a friend or partner
- e.) To get away and escape where I was
- f.) To own a second home
- g.) I have lived here all my life — it was not my choice

Each of the seven items in Table 3.10 is grounded within qualitative findings of the previous research. There is little literature on the motives for residency in a high amenity community. General motivations to reside include to seek out places of extraordinary natural and cultural amenities (Price, Moss & Williams, 1997) and to seek out places that reflect one’s identity (Williams & McIntyre, 2000). Other literature, such as that of McMillan (2006), and Perdue (2004), presents typologies of amenity migrants that only indirectly imply aspects of motivation to reside. Motivation to reside in the Bow Valley is important to the theory building aspects of my research. The seven items (including the supporting ‘other’ category question) presented in Q2 well represents the range of motives for residency of Bow Valley residents.

The next measure was focussed on ascertaining the importance of recreation amenities (Q5). The underlying intent was to explore the recreation based relationship between residents and their environment in an adductive manner. This aim could have been addressed by asking respondents to report on their recreation activity, but it is my experience through numerous years of recreation market research that respondents often over-report their activity, and by utilizing the construct of importance a more accurate reflection of the relationship could be achieved. Similarly focussed measures can be found in the literature about resident support for tourism (Getz, 1994; Easterling, 2005;
Andereck & Vogt, 2000) but recreation amenities generally form a portion of the broader measure of a community’s amenities and attributes examined for importance.

Item generation for related to Table 3.15 originated from results of previous research. Numerous focus group and interview participants indicated the importance of various recreation amenities in discussions but no attempt was made in my previous qualitative research was made to comprehensively assess the importance of recreation amenities. The Q5 item represents an attempt to return to the field to bring together numerous data in a cohesive manner and offer additional clarity on the relationship between residents and their environment from a recreation perspective.

The next measure is intended to help understand aspects of change within the community, and it included both recreation amenities and other relevant aspects of the community. The Q8 Perception of Change measure was made up of 28 items. Table 3.16 presents the items contained in the measure and seventeen (17) of those items directly related to the perception of change in recreation amenities (items a,b,c,d,e,f,j,k,l,o,p,s,t,u,v,aa,bb) while eleven (11) items focussed on change in relevant community aspects (items g,h,i,m,n,q,r,w,x,y,z). The breakdown and subsequent selection of both recreation and community items is directly grounded in the qualitative research that led to this research phase. In particular, as noted in Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7, a clear distinction emerged regarding two precincts of daily life - a ‘recreation’ precinct that was generally thought to be positive and satisfying, and the ‘sustainability’ precinct that included a variety of structural elements such as ability to find work, cost of living, over-crowding, housing, etc. that directly impacted respondent’s place attachment, ability to sustain a desired lifestyle, and often residency itself in the Bow Valley. The recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.15 Importance of Recreation Amenities Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) Backcountry trails for mountain biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) Town fitness centre and/or pool (municipal or hotel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) Rivers and lakes for canoeing and/or kayaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d.) In-town trails for walks  
e.) Backcountry climbing areas (rock and ice climbing)  
f.) In-town restaurants and cafes  
g.) Backcountry trails for more remote hikes  
h.) The roadways for leisure driving trips  
i.) In-town bars and nightlife  
j.) Performance arts venues  
k.) Museums and galleries  
l.) Backcountry trails for running  
m.) In-town trails for dog walking  
n.) Recreation centre for children’s activities  
o.) Mechanized ski areas for skiing and riding  
p.) Nordic ski areas  
q.) Backcountry slopes for skiing and riding

and sustainability precincts are argued to be inextricably linked and thus included together in the Q8 measure. Though the measure was designed for this research project similar types of measures have been used to assess the impact of tourism on residents (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Andereck & Vogt, 2000) while Ap & Crompton (1998) developed and tested a measure specifically examining the increase or decrease of community phenomenon (including recreation) towards the assessment of tourism impacts in the community.

Table 3.16 Perception of Change Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) The number of backcountry trails have</td>
<td>Recreation Amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) The number of restaurants have</td>
<td>Recreation Amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) The number of areas for rock climbing have</td>
<td>Recreation Amenity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am satisfied that I took all appropriate steps to develop the Q8 measure in accordance with canons of grounded theory and principles of questionnaire design.

The final measure (Q9) was focused on an assessment of quality of life. It consisted of ten (10) items. Three (3) items addressed recreation opportunities (items b,d,h) the remaining seven (7) items addressed aspects of the community as presented in Table 3.17. Items that make up this measure were designed from previous qualitative research and constructed in theoretical manner similar to the Q8 measure to include
aspects of both the recreation and sustainability precincts of daily life. The inclusion of items that address a recreation component and sustainability component is not uncommon in quality of life – tourism studies.

Table 3.17 Quality of Life Measure Questionnaire Items

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Cost of living (housing, and daily life in general) (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Quality of backcountry recreation opportunities (Recreation Opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Availability of career work and/or job of my liking (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Level of regulations regarding backcountry recreation (Recreation Opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>The sense of community (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Ability to make friends (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Level of town development (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Quality of in-town recreation opportunities (Recreation Opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Access to quality education opportunities (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Access to quality health care (Community)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bow Valley Recreation Survey (BVRS) Questionnaire Package

The BVRS questionnaire package as presented to potential respondents included a total of five components including: the questionnaire, envelope with printed instructions
on the envelope, the cover page of the questionnaire, the incentive card and a postage paid return envelope. Each component is presented in detail except the questionnaire which has been explained previously.

Each potential respondent was given, or left, a large (legal size) manila envelope which contained all materials. Table 3.18 presents the survey instructions which appeared on the front of the envelope. The instructions appeared in large 14-point bold print. Instructions included the title of the survey, the BVRS purpose, a qualification or screening statement, identity and affiliation of the researcher, approximate time required to complete the questionnaire, the potential contribution of the research project (benefit to the respondent), incentive, opportunity for the respondent to remain involved, and information about confidentiality. I expected that respondents read the boldly printed instructions prior to opening the envelope and thus their participation in the research.

The next item likely encountered by a potential respondent was the cover page of the questionnaire. The first part of the cover page reiterated the title of the research project, its goals and potential value to the community, and the time it would likely take to complete the questionnaire. Next, the cover page presented the instructions for successful completion of the survey. The following page was the consent statement as approved and contact information for the principle researcher and an independent contact person for ethical considerations as approved by the Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board. Another statement regarding confidentiality was included and an option for the respondent to receive a summary copy of the results, when completed. A statement was included to indicate that the research project was being independently funded and thus not tied to a local agency (this was considered important through the feedback of the pilot test). Three images were included on the cover page to further demonstrate the nature of the survey. The images selected were suggested through feedback obtained from the pilot test of the instrument. The cover page appears in Appendix G.
Table 3.18 Envelope Instructions

**Bow Valley Recreation and YOU!**

March 10, 2007

Quality of life is important for residents of the Bow Valley (Canmore and Banff). A critical part of that quality of life is access to everyday recreation (sports, leisure, arts, etc.). In recent years the Bow Valley has seen many significant changes that affect access to recreation areas both inside and outside of the town. In this envelope is a survey that specifically addresses these changes and provides you with an opportunity to express your thoughts on this subject. This survey is being independently carried out and funded by Joe Pavelka who is a PhD student in Geography at the University of Calgary (with some assistance from Mount Royal College where Joe is employed). It is important that the person completing this survey be 18 years of age or older and have lived in the Bow Valley (Banff or Canmore) for at least one year.

I ask that you please take a few minutes (it will take about 15 minutes) to complete the survey in the envelope and mail it back (postage already paid). You can also enter to win a weekend for two at the Jasper Park Lodge worth $650 - not a bad getaway. You can also receive your own copy of the summary results once the study is completed, if you are interested. Your thoughts and opinions are important in shaping the future of the Bow Valley. Complete this survey and contribute and maybe win a great prize too. At no point will your name be associated with your responses. There is a code on the envelope and questionnaire it is not associated to your name but it is used to monitor responses.

The survey incentive card was included as a separate piece of paper so it could be collected separately from the questionnaire and to ensure that it was not associated with the completed questionnaire. The card was approximately 9cm by 9cm on heavier cardstock paper. The purpose of the card was to inform the potential respondent of the incentive draw and to offer an opportunity to receive a summary copy of the results. An incentive was offered to increase the response rate. The incentive which consisted of an all expense weekend getaway for two at the Jasper Park Lodge was valued at $650.00 and paid for by me. A draw was carried out in June of 2007 and the prize was awarded. The respondent was informed that the completion and inclusion of the incentive card was voluntary. The respondent could choose to enter for the incentive draw, receive a copy of the results, none of the two or just one of the two. The final piece of the questionnaire...
package was a postage paid envelope (letter sized) with a return address (addressed to Joe Pavelka at Mount Royal College). I am satisfied that the five items of the questionnaire package, the envelope with instructions, the questionnaire, cover page, the incentive card and return envelope represents an effective and efficient way to obtain meaningful and secure data.

3.39 Pilot Testing

Pilot testing of the questionnaire is considered to be an important part of the overall research process. It can refer to a complete ‘dress rehearsal’ through to a feasibility undertaking of the intended research project (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001). Pilot testing takes on various forms depending on the research being carried out (Jennings, 2001). Van Teijlingen & Hundley (2001) describe the process to include up to three components: a focus group type of assessment of the questionnaire issues, followed by a second step to similarly assess wording and response sets and overall presentation, followed by a third step to test the process or administration of the questionnaire. It is recommended that 20 to 50 questionnaires be completed and analyzed if possible (Jennings, 2001). Feedback from all aspects of the pilot test is to be incorporated into the final draft of questionnaire construction and administration.

The BVRS questionnaire and administration was pilot tested in two ways. Firstly the questionnaire was given to a group of 6 content area experts (each resides in the Bow Valley and works in areas related to the research project). These content area experts were asked to comment on the content (issues) presented in the BVRS questionnaire and individual questions. They completed the questionnaire and provided feedback. The next step was to seek further feedback from a group of 18 individuals living and working in the Bow Valley. The second group consisted of former students of mine who were located using the social utility site Facebook. Each individual was living in either Canmore or Banff. Each person in the group was contacted through Facebook, asked to
complete the questionnaire and offer feedback on the clarity, appearance and on how well it related to their ‘real world’ and what if anything was missing. Pilot testing of the BVRS questionnaire occurred over a two week period from February 12 to 25, 2007.

The BVRS benefited from pilot testing in five ways: 1.) the item of “escape from where I was” was added to the Q2 motivation to reside measure; 2.) two items (roadways for leisure driving trips, and museums and galleries) were added to the Q5 importance of recreation amenities measure; 3.) the item of “I will likely leave (travel, education, etc.) and return” was added to Q11; 4.) the images of the cyclists, nordic skier and golfer were determined to be most inclusive of actual recreation carried out in the Bow Valley; and 5.) it was strongly suggested that a statement be included to inform potential respondents that it was not a Parks Canada or Town of Banff/Canmore funded project. Finally, the process of the administration of the questionnaire was tested with the six content area experts. They confirmed the viability of the process which ultimately was undertaken. The BVRS pilot test resulted in an improved questionnaire and administration strategy.

3.40 Questionnaire Administration

The BVRS was administered using a modified mail back procedure. The mail back questionnaire format is known to have advantages and disadvantages. The former includes lower cost, little to no interviewer bias, higher ability to reach geographically dispersed groups, possibility of respondent anonymity ability to access hard-to-recall information and no need for interviewer supervision (Jennings, 2003). Some disadvantages include that it is slower to administer, it should generally be limited to simpler questions, and generally results in lower response rates (Jennings, 2003). The mail back format is usually carried out in a randomized manner and includes a complete package of items (such as those for this research project) that includes a cover letter, questionnaire (with instructions and coded for possible follow-up), postage paid return envelope and any incentives (optional). The process is completed in a four phase staging
of advance letter, initial questionnaire, reminder letter and second questionnaire mailing (Salant & Dillman, 1994; quoted in Creswell, 2001).

The mail back format has been used extensively in the tourism/geography fields and especially for studies targeting residents. Ko & Stewart (2002) used a mail-back method to target a random sample of adults on Cheju Island, Korea to obtain data on tourism impacts. Perez & Nadal (2005) carried out a door-to-door person delivered approach with a mail-back component in their research of tourism impacts on several Greek Islands. Manning & Valliere (2001) used a systematic stratified mail back procedure to assess coping responses of residents of four smaller communities adjacent to Acadia National Park. They reported using a four-stage procedure similar to that recommended by Salant & Dillman (1994). Salant & Dillman’s (1994). research project was the only one reviewed to have reported on its complete mail back administration procedures.

The BVRS mail back procedure involved a two stage procedure of door-to-door, in-person contact with explanation of the study with a mail back return component similar to that of Perez & Nadal (2005). The exact procedures were as follows:

Step 1: Prepared 1,250 BVRS questionnaire packages as described in the previous section, 1,200 were targeted for delivery while 50 were used for pilot testing.

Step 2: Residential (street by street) maps of both Banff and Canmore were obtained from both Town websites.

Step 3: A calculation was made of the systematic numbering required to ensure optimal distribution of the questionnaire. Every sixth residential unit was determined to be the optimal number as previously explained in section 3.5.2.

Step 4: Nine walking routes were pre-mapped on actual paper copies of the residential maps using a yellow highlighter pen/marker. Nine walking routes covering both Canmore and Banff residential areas were selected because nine field volunteers were recruited to carry out the actual delivery.
Step 5: The nine field volunteers were recruited from the ETOL program at Mount Royal College, the program in which I teach. The volunteers met on the evening of March 8th 2007 for just over one hour for a training session. Volunteers were instructed on the study, how to approach each sixth residence, how to explain the study to a person answering the door (wording taken from the instructions found on the envelope as presented in the previous section), to screen or ensure a proper fit of respondent (adult and a resident of at least one year) to highlight the incentive and to ask the respondent to mail the completed questionnaire at their earliest convenience. Volunteers were also instructed that if no individual was contacted then the package was to be left in the mailbox or in the first door whenever possible. Volunteers were rewarded with a dinner and evening at the Drake Hotel in Canmore on the evening of March 10th 2007.

Step 6: On the morning of March 10th (Saturday) the group of ten (nine volunteers and me) drove to Canmore and began distributing BVRS questionnaire packages as per the maps as per stratified guidelines previously presented in 3.5.2. I walked and drove throughout the neighbourhoods to monitor the administration and maintain communication by mobile telephone with volunteers and to re-stock their package supply. Distribution began at 9 AM and all of Canmore was completed by 1:20 PM. The group was given lunch while travelling to Banff and Banff distribution began at about 2:30 PM and continued through to about 6 p.m. Not all communities were completed by that time but it was clear that the group could not continue due to fatigue. A total of 1,057 BVRS packages were delivered on Saturday March 10th. I returned to Banff the following day (Sunday March 11th) and completed the remainder of the 143 BVRS packages using the door-to-door method. All 1,200 packages were delivered within a two-day period. The field volunteers were asked to keep track of the number of deliveries which included real-person contact at the door, and records which were mostly accurate would suggest that in about 55% of the cases a person was encountered at the door. It should be noted that some difficulties were encountered in the door-to-door delivery as reported by the field volunteers. In three cases, two in Canmore and one in
Banff, volunteers could not enter condominium complexes for security reasons. In all three cases volunteers counted the correct number of BVRS packages and placed them in every sixth mail box.

Step 7: Respondents completed and mailed BVRS questionnaires to me at Mount Royal University using a Canada Post pre-paid envelope. A total of 371 BVRS questionnaires were returned. Eight were deemed unusable, resulting in 363 usable returned questionnaires. This constituted a return rate of 30.25%. A complete discussion of the response rate is found in Chapter Eight.

The procedure for the administration of the BVRS questionnaire did not employ the complete four phased approach as suggested by Salant & Dillman (1994) (quoted in Creswell, 2003) for two reasons. First, the modified approach of including door-to-door real-person contact mitigated some need for the recommended pre-survey mail out. Secondly, due to the transient nature of residents in the Bow Valley, from second home owners, to full time residents who take extended trips during the winter, to the number of homes acting as staff housing, it was determined that the consistency of residency required to justify a second or follow-up mailing was not present. I decided to distribute all 1,200 BVRS packages within a single distribution. I am satisfied that the BVRS questionnaire was administered in a manner that complied with accepted standards.

3.41 Limitations to the Research

Limitations to the BVRS research are characterized as limitations related to the conduct of quantitative research with a modified mail-back procedure. Limitations to research are defined as the boundaries, exceptions and qualifications of a particular method or approach (Creswell, 2003). Limitations to this phase of the research includes: closed response or aided questions restrict possible answers; in-depth data is difficult to gather; answering surveys may actually create attitudes where none existed before, including creating expectations of research outcomes where none have existed prior; and lack of reciprocity or the respondents ability to see and realize changes as a result of
participation in a survey, may affect future participation (Jennings, 2003). Furthermore, Northcote & MacBeth (2005) investigated limitations of resident perception surveys and determined that, in many cases, residents do not always accurately report changes in the community within a quantitative survey format alone. They also suggest that any resident perception research use a triangulated approach or one employing a variety of methods. I am satisfied that all feasible mitigations to research limitations have been undertaken throughout.

3.42 Data Input and Handling

Data from the BVRS research phase began arriving at the recipient address on March 16th 2007 and continued through to April 6th 2007. A total of 371 questionnaires were returned. The procedure I undertook for data handling and input involved physically retrieving questionnaires from the college mail room and returning them my office. I opened each returned package and separating the completed questionnaire and incentive card (if present) into two separate boxes. Questionnaires were coded and input into a SPSS Version 14 program in my secured office. The computer was not accessible (security passwords) to any other individual other than myself and all raw data questionnaires were kept in my office and stored in a locked file cabinet.

Each question on the BVRS questionnaire was coded using simple guidelines put suggested by Fox (2003) whereby each case appeared as a row category within SPSS. Each item response appeared as a column category within SPSS. Additional columns of data within SPSS Version 14 included the first three columns as respondent number, location code and community. Other columns coincided directly with questionnaire data. Data was input on a regular basis as questionnaires were returned. I completed three data checks reviewing 100 survey entries by comparing every tenth entry of the 100 inputs with the actual raw data questionnaire. Eight BVRS returned questionnaires were determined to be unusable because in all eight cases at least one of the four major measures was not completed. They were discarded.
I am satisfied that BVRS data was handled and input in a manner consistent with approved ethical guidelines and standard research practice.

3.43 Research Validity and Reliability

Given the nature of the multi-phased grounded theory approach of this research project, validity and reliability need to be discussed within the research phases and among the research phases. The first subsection explains validity for qualitative research phases. The next subsection discusses research reliability and validity of the quantitative research phase. The final section addresses validity and reliability among research phases.

3.43.1 Qualitative Research Validity

Legitimacy of qualitative research, including validity, is operationalized in a variety of ways (Onuegbazie & Teddie, 2003). Five types of validity in qualitative research are commonly considered: descriptive, interpretive, theoretical, evaluative, and generalizable (Maxwell, 1992, quoted in Onuegbazie & Teddie, 2003). The following is a description of each type as presented by Maxwell (1992) and how it was addressed in my research.

Descriptive validity refers to the factual accuracy of the account. This issue was addressed in my research through the use of audio-recording and verbatim transcriptions. Interpretive validity refers to the researcher's interpretation of what was said in relation to the group or individual. In my research, interpretive validity was addressed by seeking clarification where needed during data collection and the use of the interpretive community to ensure no outliers in interpretation. Theoretical validity refers to the degree to which a theoretical explanation or framework fits the findings. In my research project, theoretical validity was a central concern and imbedded in the cross comparison analysis. Findings were compared constantly to theoretical frameworks with strong fit as evidenced by the explanations underlying the theoretical models generated by this
research project. Evaluative validity refers to the degree to which an evaluative framework can be applied to results rather than simply an explanatory or descriptive framework. In my research evidence to support evaluative validity can be found in the predictive nature of the final theoretical model. Focus group data was primarily exploratory and descriptive in nature and purpose. ‘Generalizable’ validity refers to the extent to which a researcher can generalize findings to other settings. In this research project generalizable validity was supported through various presentations of results to diverse audiences. I received feedback pertaining to the relevance of the findings to other communities (settings), especially communities within British Columbia.

3.4.3.2 Quantitative Research Validity and Reliability

Reliability within quantitative research refers to dependability or repeatability of the observations (McClendon, 2004). An important measure of reliability is internal consistency (i.e. the items responses are consistent across the constructs) (Creswell, 2003). Internal consistency of the four measures used in the BVRS questionnaire were tested using SPSS Version 14 reliability tests and are reported in Chapter Eight. Measures used in the BVRS were created specifically for this research phase; no prior data on the reliability of the measures was available. This is to be expected within exploratory research projects.

3.4.3.3 Research Validity among Research Phases

Perhaps the most meaningful assessment of the validity of this research project is assessed among the research phases level. Creswell (2003) cites several important measures of validity for concurrent and mixed research projects. Each is discussed along with the manner in which it was addressed in my research.

The first is data transformation, which requires the researcher to alternatively quantify and qualify data from qualitative to quantitative (creating codes to numerically
count qualitative data) and from quantitative to qualitative by qualifying quantitative results within qualitative results. This process is imbedded within the grounded theory approach of constant comparison. Qualitative data, though not specifically counted, was quantified through the process of saturation. Quantitative data from the BVRS questionnaire was qualified throughout the entire theory building process as demonstrated in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten.

Another strategy is to explore outliers, which involves the identification of outlying quantitative results that are to be explored within subsequent qualitative research phases. An additional strategy is referred to as instrument development, and essentially involves the inverse of the previous (explore outliers) which is the development of quantitative instruments through previously gathered qualitative research. In the case of my research and in accordance with grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990), the results of each research phase served to inform the development of the following research phase. I believe that the grounded theory approach of this research project as described earlier in the chapter served to ensure a high degree of overall project validity.

3.44 Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the methodology for my research. I first described the grounded theory methodology. I then explained each of the four distinct research phases and placed each within the context of related literature. Additionally, I included separate sections to address the validity and reliability of my research. The chapter presents a complex methodology, and it may even appear messy (Cutcliffe, 2000) but the reader should first apply the lens of grounded theory (including its basic tenets of exploratory, inductive investigation) followed by the lenses of each method for each of the research phases.

*The hegemony of one research style deprives social scientists of a variety of research strategies that have equal, and possibly superior, claims to the mantle of*
'science'...The complexity of the world around us demands the deployment of a variety of techniques and strong intellectual and methodological discipline, not a commitment to the hegemony of a single research modality.” (Jennings, 2001, p. 157; quoting Whyte, Greenwood, & Lazarsfeld, 1991, p. 19). The above quote emphasizes the allowance and even the need to be both rigorous and flexible in approaching methodological design, and especially appropriate to the goals and objectives of this research project.
4 Results of Initial Focus Group Investigation (Qualitative Research)

4.36 Introduction

Chapter Four presents the results of first phase of research, the Initial Focus Group research. Each research phase and chapter builds upon the previous toward the development of theory. Earlier (Chapter 2) the grounded theory process of theory building was explained as: observing activity within a phenomenon as action/interaction in light of changes in response to prevailing conditions (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). This is the approach undertaken for the next series of chapters as presented in Figure 4.0. In this
case, leisure negotiation of residents was observed in light of the broader dynamic action/interaction of amenity migration.

In reading Figure 4.0, the progress of research should be read from left to right or from initial explorations carried out with broadly targeted focus group methods, to the more focussed quantitative methodology of the Bow Valley Recreation Survey. Qualitative results of the Initial Focus Group research are presented first in this chapter as highlighted in Figure 4.1. The Second Home Owner interview results are presented in Chapter Five, followed by the results of the Lived Experience results in Chapter Six. A summary of qualitative data is presented in Chapter Seven along with working theory in the form of a Typology of Amenity Migrants. Within grounded theory, theory building involves the development of and verification of hypotheses or assumptions (Corbin & Strauss, 1990), thus the key themes that form the Typology of Amenity Migrants are used to inform the basis of the development of the final phase, the Bow Valley Recreation Survey. Results of the final phase of research, the Bow Valley Recreation Survey, are presented Chapter Eight (descriptive results) and Chapter Nine (segmentation results). Each results chapter includes discussion to situate findings in light of theoretical frameworks and other relevant findings, but a final discussion chapter to present the Model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration is presented in Chapter Ten.

This chapter includes the following sections: an overview of the data by question or question groupings; initial concepts; Phase 1 category groupings; Phase 2 category groupings; and a summary. The overview section is generally brief and provides an overall summary of the research findings by question or question groupings such that the reader can understand the inductive formation of the initial generation of data and its broader context. The next section includes a grouping of like responses into coherent concepts, the basic unit of analysis in grounded theory and this section is supported by participant quotes. Selected quotes are included in the presentation of results not only to provide readers with insight and evidence into the inductive formation of later statements about the data, but also because this section is the fundamental grouping phase.
4.37 Overview of Initial Focus Group Research

Five distinct groups of focus group participants were involved: Canmore females; Canmore males; Banff females; Banff males; and Banff seasonal workers. The purpose of the focus group was to begin to explore aspects of motivation for residing in the Bow Valley, the role of recreation or leisure in that decision, whether those expectations have been met, leisure negotiation in the form of leisure constraints model and recreation coping model, and mental image of the place. Questioning within the focus group sessions remained broad to capture topics or issues that may not have been considered in preparations to this point.

In general for the participants of the five focus groups, recreation was a primary motive for residency except for a minority who had followed a partner to the area. For the most part, expectations of the lifestyle residence intended had been met but not without some effort. Leisure constraint negotiation did not resonate with everyone although responses specific to the construct emerged throughout the discussion. Meaningful negotiations were those related to maintaining the ability to live in the Bow Valley in a satisfying manner. Recreation coping resonated with everyone and displacement was viewed as a part of daily life. Figure 4.2 presents the Overview of Focus Group Results. In keeping with grounded theory protocol, first, a summary of individual questions or question groupings is presented, followed by a list of emerging concepts. Next, the Phase 1 Categories, or grouping of concepts, is presented followed by a Phase 2 list of the final categories for this section.
Figure 4.1 Overview of Focus Group Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary by Question or Question Groupings</th>
<th>Focus Group Concepts</th>
<th>Phase 1 Categories</th>
<th>Phase 2 Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition of leisure.</td>
<td>1. People arrive with a mental image and expectations.</td>
<td>1. Recreation coping is real and engaged in by most participants, while all strategies are evident displacement is a way of life. (23,24,25,28,16)</td>
<td>1. Within a recreation context residents strive to understand tourists and others by their ability to fit into their place, residents learn to live around tourists but not without some residual conflict over values. (Phase 1 categories of 7,8,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Definition of a tourist.</td>
<td>2. Mountain recreation lifestyle is ideally seamless - integrated with work</td>
<td>2. Tourism (economy) is something that must be negotiated in order to live in the Bow Valley despite recognition of its role and positive aspects. (8,10,27)</td>
<td>2. Tourism and related development defines the destination (place) with reluctant acceptance by residents. (Phase I categories of 2,4,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motivation to reside in the Bow Valley.</td>
<td>3. Motivation to reside in the community is used as a measure of oneself and others</td>
<td>3. Leisure constraints are evident, mostly at the structural level and related to living in the Bow Valley. They negotiate through constraints. (19,20,21,17)</td>
<td>3. Recreation negotiation is centered around the ability to negotiate the structure of the destination (place) more so than access to recreation opportunities. (Phase 1 categories of 1,3,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you living the life you expected?</td>
<td>4. Daily life exists in two dimensions of Recreation and Sustainability</td>
<td>4. Multiple influences affect the character and mental image of the place (1,6,7,9,22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is it like to live in a Tourism based community?</td>
<td>5. Residents perceive different categories of tourists</td>
<td>5. The focus of negotiation (even leisure) is at the broader level of negotiating life and lifestyle in the Bow Valley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you benefiting from the tourism amenities?</td>
<td>6. Residents are active in place creation and re-creation</td>
<td>6. Community changes noticed in the form of seasons and weekends are important to residents (12,13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What are daily signs of living in a tourism community?</td>
<td>7. There is a fantasy land aspect to living in the Bow Valley</td>
<td>7. There are different types and classes of tourists for residents. (5,16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you experience leisure constraints?</td>
<td>8. There is desire to downplay the role of tourism in daily life</td>
<td>8. Social inclusion is related to how well one fits into the broader values of the community - these values are related to place identity. (3,5,11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What would you change if you could change anything?</td>
<td>10. For most it is the tourism economy that will determine if they stay or leave</td>
<td>10. For most It Is the tourism economy that will determine if they stay or leave (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How would you recommend the Bow Valley to a friend?</td>
<td>11. There is resentment between groups</td>
<td>11. There is resentment between groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Group Analysis Process from Questions to Concepts to Categories
4.3 Summary by Questions or Question Groupings

4.3.1 How do you define leisure?

Responses varied as expected, five basic categories of responses emerged. The first involved a reference to relaxing and anything related to downtime. The second, cited primarily by male groups, involved a reference to mountain sports. The third, mostly cited by female groups, was an integrated approach to leisure such as having a job that allows one to be active in the outdoors. Fourthly, female groups also included references to family activity. The final category of response referred to party and nightlife related activity and was cited by the seasonal worker group as well as in other sessions. In general responses were activity based and included active and passive pursuits.

4.3.2 How would you define a tourist?

The definition of a tourist was fairly simple: someone from away, who is on vacation, and not looking for work. However, a variety of distinctions were offered such as the difference between a tourist and traveler, whereby the latter is here to ‘experience’ while the former is less interested in learning about place. Calgarians are defined differently from weekenders, as the former generally are seen as day-use outdoor enthusiasts similar to Bow Valley residents while the latter are second home owners who keep to themselves. There was an equal split as to whether Calgarians are tourists, but most agreed that they are different from the “bus loads of tourists from Toronto” thus they warrant special consideration. Men, more often than women, referred to tourists in a negative manner while both were equally negative (although not excessively) in their reference to weekenders.
4.3.3 Motivation for residing in the Bow Valley, including the importance of recreation in the decision to reside.

Five basic categories of responses emerged with respect to the general question regarding motivation to reside in the Bow Valley. The first category can be summed up as mountains, mountain activity and a general ‘passion for the mountains’. A second category is a small community, mountain community and a sense of community was emphasized. Third, non-recreation related responses included to follow a partner, and for a specific job. The fourth motivation was for the ‘unique’ setting of a national park and lastly, many made reference to being lured by one activity (generally skiing) and staying for the lifestyle. The latter part of the question referred specifically to the role of recreation as a motivator for residency in the Bow Valley. All but two participants who followed their husbands to the Bow Valley reported that it was a primary motive. Several made reference to the unique ability in the Bow Valley to integrate work and recreation into a lifestyle. Others spoke of slower transitions to the Bow Valley that occurred over a two to three year period based on repeated recreation visits with increased exploration of the feasibility of residence and culminating with the eventual move to the Bow Valley. Seasonal workers differed from full time residents through their focus on novelty, party-motives and to a lesser degree, mountain activities.

4.3.4 Are you living the life you thought you would? (Meeting expectations).

Responses to this question varied by group. Banff and Canmore residents generally report a resounding yes, however some Canmore men reported not ‘getting out’ as much as they thought they would due to work and family commitments. Canmore women report yes but report a variety of trade-offs around cost of living such as having to hold multiple jobs to keep pace with costs which in turn limits recreation opportunities. Banff women reported family reasons and safety concerns involving humans and animals as hindering their initial recreation expectations. Seasonal workers reported a resounding
yes based almost exclusively on social factors such as bonding with other travelers and partying.

In general residents reported yes to the question but strongly agreed that it took years to find the right balance or to find one’s place and that one must consciously work through trade-offs such as the prospect of not owning a home, crowding, and the general cost of living. Conversely, the seasonal group’s basis for immediate satisfaction is intra-group bonding.

4.3.5 What is it like to live in a tourism community? How is it different from other places you have lived?

In general responses among groups were fairly consistent excepting the seasonal worker group. The most common response was recognition of a higher concentration of services and amenities for its population. Related to this response was the worldly and cosmopolitan character of Banff. Next was a widely cited concern that meaningful friendships were frustrated by the transient nature of the region. In general, women emphasized social aspects including extraordinary safety concerns while men emphasized physical aspects such as the physical transformation of Canmore towards tourism development and the presence of tourists. Seasonal workers were asked to compare Banff to other backpacker destinations they had visited and remarked on two key differences. The first was the remarkable social cohesion among seasonal workers and the second was the “never-never-land” aspect of Banff – that it exists outside of normal life, every night is a Friday night – that seems to facilitate a party atmosphere.

4.3.6 Do you benefit from tourism amenities?

The general response was yes and in a variety of ways, including a stronger economy, better access to medical service, ski areas and restaurants. Approximately half noted a trade-off which could be characterized in two ways. Firstly, male groups and seasonal workers remarked that the tourism influence includes built facilities such as
hard-surfaced trails and even the Nordic Centre which has made access to certain areas and activities too easy or that hard surface trails were not necessary and the seasonal group even commented that it took away from the rustic character of Banff. Banff women took a slightly opposite view that increased accessibility was positive. Male groups generally believed tourist amenities did not affect their backcountry activity at all and they generally try to keep away from tourist areas. Overall, participants readily acknowledge that they benefit from tourism amenities.

4.3.7 What are the daily signs that you live in a tourism community?

Responses to this question can be separated by Banff and Canmore participants. Banff groups emphasised touristic elements such as buses, the stark seasonal differences in activity, that people stop locals to ask questions and “you end up in the background of a lot of pictures”. Canmore responses emphasized the effects of development including the stark differences in weekend and weekday activity whereby the town’s population tends to increase on the weekends due to the population of second home owners, the empty homes of second home owners and the loss of trails to golf course and residential development. Of note is that both groups reported temporal signs - for Banff it was the broader seasonal frame and for Canmore it was witnessed over the course of a week.

4.3.8 Do you experience constraints to your recreation and leisure?

Participants required probing for this question because when first asked, the unaided responses were vague and unsure. However, respondents generally reported a generic group of structural constraints such as lack of money, lack of time, family obligations and too much work. The probed discussion revealed considerably more. Female groups were more likely to emphasize constraints such as a lack of money, working multiple jobs, crowds and a general concern regarding personal safety. Male groups were more likely to report restrictive permits and regulations both inside and outside the Park, along with trail closures due to development. Crowding was an issue
for men but they were quick to point out that they can easily overcome this concern by the “luxury of having so many trail options to choose from”. Crowding was less of a concern for Banff women, they even remarked that crowded trails made them feel safer from human and animal dangers.

All groups indicated that they generally work through constraints by various means, ranging from relying on extensive resource knowledge (men) to reliance on a supportive community (women) and even to share gear if otherwise too costly. In fact, during the focus group session, an older Canmore woman offered to lend her little used road bike to a younger Canmore woman who was currently holding two jobs and still struggling. All groups commented on the pressures of a high cost of living and how vehicle travel during busy times was avoided if at all possible. Generally it was not difficult for participants to identify constraints to their leisure; however it was not readily understood within the framework of the leisure constraints model.

4.3.9 Recreation Coping: Participants were asked to respond to a handout, each type of coping was explained and discussed.

Results of this series of questions are presented by each group, as responses varied considerably. Canmore women reported experiencing little stress from recreation-based crowding or other areas of daily life, even during peak periods. They did report stress related to cost of living, and younger women reported they did not believe they could afford to live in Canmore in the long term, thus there was a stress related to trying to achieve their recreation and lifestyle goals quickly. They all reported experiencing spatial and temporal displacement but it was accepted as a part of everyday life. Rationalization was reported to be minimal while product shift was more prevalent and also accepted as a way of life. Direct action was reported as a strategy they would likely use in the future.

Canmore men reported minimal stress during recreation, although more so during peak seasons. They noted that their type of backcountry activity was remote enough to be minimally impacted by the increase in tourism traffic. All reported spatial and
temporal displacement recognized as a part of daily life. Rationalization was reported to be minimal. Product shift was reported to be prevalent and in both directions - some believed the Canmore ‘product’ had improved over time while others commented that it had deteriorated. Direct action, generally noted as direct contact with authorities to mitigate a stressful situation was reported but seldom.

Banff women reported experiencing more stress in general and especially during peak visitor times. Temporal and spatial displacement was reported to be high and imbedded into everyday life. Rationalization was strongest for this group and expressed in relation to activity or site specific expectations. For example, the expressed rationalizing of crowds and traffic when bringing a non-local guest to Johnston’s Canyon for a July afternoon would not be stressful because it would be expected. Banff women held a unique position with regard to product shift as they all agreed that the basic character of Banff had shifted over the years but its position within a national park meant that it would shift minimally in the future relative to similar communities. Virtually all Banff women reported engaging in direct action at some point.

Banff men reported more daily stress than Canmore men overall and especially related to walking and driving. Like Canmore men, they indicated that the remote nature of their backcountry activity meant they encountered few others and therefore stress was minimal. Temporal and spatial displacement was reported to be high and second nature to this group. In fact, spatial displacement farther into the backcountry held added social benefits of avoiding “punters” and finding more like-minded individuals. This group reported that displacement knowledge of where to go and not to go was something one learned from the “old guys” and this group generally relished their extensive resource knowledge. Rationalization was reported especially in relation to tourists “if it’s really busy I’m reminded of the reason why I live here”. Product shift was not highly reported however they did remark on how Banff was different from other similar destinations due to the national park. They believe that rules, regulations and policies can manage rates of change to a degree and they accept the trade-off of greater regulation for resource
consistency and that public awareness of a national park will bring like minded people
(versus motorized recreation people and related activity which is not permitted in the
Park). Direct action did not resonate with this group.

Seasonal workers all reported experiencing stress in daily life and in recreation
activities. They, too, reported spatial and temporal displacement and despite their
relative minimal knowledge of the area and its resource options compared to more
tenured residents, they viewed themselves as having extensive local knowledge compared
to tourists. Rationalization was not reported. Product shift was reported despite their
relatively brief stay and reported in the context of over-catering to tourists. Direct action
did not resonate with this group; in fact the following quote provides ample insight “not
in Banff it would be futile”. They believe they do not have much of a voice in
community affairs.

4.3.10 What would you change if you could to create a better recreation/leisure
environment?

Participants suggested creating greater access to the basic necessities of a good
wage, housing, even to legislate balance of work and leisure. Suggestions to green the
Bow Valley were offered especially in relation to transportation. Of note is a common
comment about the weather, first that it significantly impacts recreation plans and that
they would like to control it if possible. Concerns over the rapid urbanization of
Canmore were something they would like to address but were unsure how.

4.3.11 What advice would you give to a friend considering a move to the Bow Valley?

As the final question of the focus group session, participants were aware of a
variety of topics and concerns that had been raised throughout, thus responses to this
question took more of a reflective tone. The most common response was to be aware of
the high cost of living, followed by need to recognize the difference between the idea of
living in the Bow Valley and the reality of it. Another common response was to be
cautious of the social challenges of raising a family in the area. Lastly, seasonal workers were unanimous in their high recommendation of the experience.

4.4 Focus Group Research Reduction Guidelines

Focus group transcriptions were analyzed using the following key terms to guide coding for the extraction of concepts.

- Motivation to reside in the Bow Valley
- Satisfaction with residing in the Bow Valley
- Living in a tourism based community
- Negotiation of personal leisure in a tourism community
  - Leisure constraints framework
  - Recreation coping framework
- Negotiation of ‘ability to live’ in the Bow Valley
- Place attachment

4.5 Initial Focus Group Research Concepts

Analysis of the focus group data used the above coding guide and resulted in the emergence of 28 concepts. The concepts were eventually worked into nine, Phase 1 categories and then three, Phase 2 categories. The presentation of the concepts usually include a verbatim quote. For presentation of the categories, quotes are to be used, as categories represent the fusion of like-concepts that have usually been previously supported with quotes. Quotes in this section are followed by a bracket that indicates which focus group session it originated from, which includes: Canmore Men (CM); Canmore Women (CW); Banff Women (BW) Banff Men (BM) and Banff Seasonal Workers (BSW). The following concepts are derived from the focus group transcriptions.
1. People generally arrive in the Bow Valley with an image and expectations of a mountain recreation lifestyle and whereby recreation is to be broadly defined from hard mountain sports, to easy town walks, through to urban nightlife.

   ...I think to a certain extent it's the kind of lifestyle that I was envisioning but I seem to be learning more and more that I can't do everything that I want to do. So when I first moved here I would have envisioned, I'd like to be a mountain guide, I want to be an elite runner, I want to go on month long climbing...(CM)

2. Mountain recreation lifestyle is ideally viewed as seamlessly integrated among recreation activity, work, housing, and social life all guided by an overarching theme, mountain sports, culture, etc.

   I think it's integrated into a lot of people's lifestyle and in careers too. It's just a part of the whole package. You can't separate it very well. (BW)

   I find living in the Bow Valley you are able to integrate leisure and recreation into small parts of one's day, rather than kind of just wanting to do it on a weekend or in the evenings. It's all part of the experience (BM)

   I love it here. When I came here, I climbed a lot, skied every chance I had. Now I have a job where I'll go out to Lake Louise, ski up the road, go do my technical work...(CW)

3. Motivation is used as a measure of oneself and others as to where one fits in the Bow Valley. For example, people are often assessed by their motivation for being in the Bow Valley, and that includes tourists (good tourists who want to learn and bad tourists who just want to take) other residents (those who want to give and be a part of the community versus those who don't) and ultimately it is used on oneself when the inevitable question arises as to whether they are so motivated to live in the Bow Valley that they are willing to negotiate other parts of their lives.

   Lots of people come here just to party and we've been branded with that. You're often branded with that too, but
those people come and go. Those people can stay outside.
(BM)

On the weekenders:

Cause they come here to get with the town and leave, but
they’re not invested in our community.(CW)

4. Life for many in the Bow Valley is assessed based on two often separate but
related dimensions of everyday life; which will be referred to here as,
Recreation and Sustainability and this occurs despite one’s best efforts
towards a seamlessly integrated mountain recreation lifestyle. Recreation
satisfaction tends to be fairly high, a good fit between expectations and
reality is often possible, while Sustainability (being able to sustain the
mountain recreation lifestyle from a personal, social and economic
perspective) is often low. Sustainability in the Bow Valley appears to be
largely based on getting a good job, good housing, flexibility to be able to
enjoy one’s recreation, etc. and it is almost always the reason for questioning
one’s tenure in the Bow Valley. Dissatisfaction with the Sustainability
component of life can grow to negatively affect the Recreation component.

The recreation and leisure is happening. I don’t know if the
rest of a lot of people’s lives are working quite the way
they thought they would when they came here, but the
recreation leisure – I mean that’s easy, all you have to do is
walk out the door. (BW)

I have a really low paying job I didn’t like and considering
getting a second job …And that would take time away from
your (recreation) time…and then I just got a new job that I
was really fortunate in finding and it’s freed up tons of time
for me and security financially but not so 6 months
ago…. (CW)

While discussing recreation constraints the conversation moved away from
recreation and to lifestyle:

“What does it have to be specific to recreation? Will that take us
to affordable housing? (CW)
We’ve had staff that move here because they’ve wanted to live in the mountains, they take the offer but they couldn’t afford it. They could afford the house but they couldn’t afford the ski pass and that’s why they came here. They move somewhere else. (BW)

5. Residents perceive different categories of tourists and some are seen more favourably than others.

The tourist is there to sightsee. They weren’t there to engrain themselves in the culture. And a traveler, that they were living in large part with that sense, they were living the lifestyle. They would go see some of the sights, but they were there for a different purpose so I think that’s a really tough one because a lot of the Calgarians who I used to meet come here four or five days a week to climb, hike, bike, and everything, and they love it here as much as the rest of us, and they can’t be here for whatever reason. So, I don’t know if I would define them as tourists. (CW)

6. Residents are active in place creation and re-creation of the Bow Valley. Residents include second home owners.

I think it’s tougher because so many tourists, and richer tourists, are drawn to this area so the prices are all geared towards those people, not geared towards ski bums and climbing bums, they just can’t afford it. And it’s the same with the cost of living as well…(CW)

I felt overrun by cyclists riding on trails here. It got so that when I went out I was always stepping aside for somebody on a bike or having them screech up behind me…so I quit running on the trails here…Were those visitors or locals? Probably both. (CW)
7. There is a fantasy-land aspect to living in the Bow Valley — Banff is seen more so this way but Canmore as well. The fantasyland appeal can be anything from mountain sports to a party lifestyle, but it is play. This is mostly about the Recreation precinct once the Sustainability precinct is addressed — the fantasy aspect is over once the Sustainability part of life is no longer possible.

...there's definitely a section of the population that thinks that we’re living in fantasy land here...there's a lot of people that think that this is just a fantasy land. (BM)

"...this town is what I tell a lot of people like, it's like never-never land. If you come here you don't grow up unless you want to. I mean there's 95% of the people are here because, they're looking for just to have some fun and that has a reputation...as everyone was saying what they expect when they are coming here... the vast majority of people don't stay for long...the majority of people who come here are looking for a fast quick fun life and then they can go retire, like when they’re done they retire back home (BSW)

Somehow the novelty of the playground wears off, you know what I mean where you just kinda get desensitized by it...you've done everything like 10 times, so then you’re like ok you know, you actually do become like a local resident and you go ok just so you’re doing it. (BSW)

8. There is a desire to downplay the role of tourism. There appears to be a desire to live the mountain recreation lifestyle while ignoring tourism and tourists including the contribution that tourism makes to the Recreation part of life.

...in my off time, I really like to do something or go somewhere where the tourists aren’t gonna be, because I spend my time working taking people to the same places that everyone often goes to, I like to get the hell out of where I know that they’re gonna be and that’s I think harder and harder to do since I’ve been here in that town for 4 years. (BM)

Everyday, you walk down the sidewalk and they're not even wide enough you know what I mean? For the amount
of people that are there in the summer time and people are
stabbing me in the eyes with their umbrellas when I
walk. (BSW)

9. There is a view that tourism ‘access’ development (in the form of trails,
stairs, guard rails, etc.) increases access to front and back country recreation
– accessibility adds to crowding and takes away from the authentic. This is
generally not viewed as positive but in some cases such as Banff women they
see increased access positively.

I would say it actually makes it easier but it also detracts
from the experience a little bit. It was a bit of got to fix it,
It’s great, it’s snow all the time but at the same time I’m
like you know it wasn’t really broke before. Did you need
to fix it this much? Did you need to do that? …setting
mountain biking trails… It was great, you know 15 years
ago up there, and it was a lot tougher, now they’re
everywhere, now it’s easier now but at the same time
you’re up there with 100 people and maybe more of course,
but there’s definitely this, yeah I feel like things are, it’s
easier to get to places, it’s some of the things, some of the
amenities may be more convenient, but they don’t make
them better. I feel that if there’s too much of a pandering to
make things easier… (BM)

I think you hear it both ways, you hear it from the
recreational side of things, that there is a lot more
opportunity now, or maybe we’ve gone over that curve now
and we’re on a down slope… there was that time we
reached that critical mass folks there is so much going on
and that was a shift from when I came here in 1980 that
was the tail end of the mining town still and the only major
outdoor recreation was dirt biking and quading in Bow
Valley and that’s a bit on the weekend and people
climbing. That’s a complete shift from the 1980’s to where
we are now. (CM)

Look at the gondola, that’s so I can experience getting a
gondola out to the top, instead of walk up. (BM)

10. Tourism and the dominance of the tourism economy will likely determine if
one stays or leaves but for many people tourism is not a primary motive for
being in the Bow Valley and even an afterthought for some. Specifically,
people arrive with little knowledge about what it means to work in tourism
they are more focussed on the Recreation and lifestyle aspect.

...everybody's working for the tourists so everybody's
schedule is based around what's gonna work best for the
tourist... it leaves not much time for you to go do the things
you want to do. You got to do what works for them. (BSW)

11. There is resentment between and among groups. This resentment appears to
be based on the idea that one group is getting more than another, or that they
are getting more than they deserve and another is getting less.

The first is residents to tourists.

For some reason, I think about tourists as kind of nuisances.
So I don't necessarily consider myself one...(BM)

Another is Canmore residents towards second home owner population.

I'll drive past the same like four-plex on my corner and I
never see the lights on ever and I would kill to live there.
(CW)

Seasonal workers on Banff residents and Banff leadership:

... this might be ranting, but like there's totally a cast
system and like it I don't want to say that I feel like a server
or anything but you know when I do my job everyone I
work with is young. I can go through town and every store
that I hit whether it's like clothes, food, whatever, there's
no-one that's old, everyone is my age. But, I know that it's
a working force, it's a circle while everyone else is living
above it you know watching the kids make money, you
know. We're the back that they're breaking to make their
money.(BSW)

12. Seasons and weekends serve as powerful signs or symbols that they
(residents) live in a tourism community. Seasons and weekends equate to the
presence and absence of crowds and crowding, which transforms it into a
different community.

I live in south Canmore and in the middle of the week,
every second house is empty and it is noticeable. On the
weekends we have a parking problem, but during the week we don’t.(CM)

That the influx of tourism or tourists delineates the seasons for us as well. You can tell at the door any given time of the day or year, you can tell what season you are in.(BW)

I find that we have our peak seasons, and you know, when I first moved here in the fall, it was the down time and everybody breathed this sigh of relief that summer’s over. And for economic reasons and down turns in tourism and so on there’s been this increasing push to shorten the shoulder seasons because it’s about making a living or earning a living, but summer gets busy, fall things slow down and then ski season starts up. It gets busy. Winter you know is a different pace. Especially during the day, because most of the skiers are out on the hill and then they come into town at night and I think we adjust our schedules at our house. You know, in the summer, during high season, we shop differently. You know for the longest time I’d order my groceries by fax or online (laughter) and they’d get delivered.(BW)

13. Seasons and weekends are directly linked to spatial and temporal displacement coping which is universally accepted as a way of everyday life, but highly negotiable depending on how much local (geographic) knowledge one has “you may not get your first choice but you can always get your second” this is also related to tenure of residency.

It seems pretty crowded to me. It’s really kind of like squeezing a balloon. It might be crowded in one place but there’s gonna be room someplace else.(BM)

14. The ability to negotiate crowding is a function of one’s resource knowledge and ability to substitute.

I know for me, I shift where I go. Certain places I just don’t go. You know the seasons, like Christmas I don’t go on popular routes or ski popular trips during that time of year. I always adjust according to the season. I’m always trying to find a place where, I think it’s just the same thing pretty well empty. (CW)
15. The local advantage over a tourist is time and resource knowledge. Time such that they can forego busy periods (e.g. weekends) for less busy periods and they can substitute busy areas (e.g. trails) for less busy areas.

So I guess in that sense yes, but you know 2 weekends ago I went out for a hike or just to go just for a little walk, and I thought well we’ll go to the Paint Pots. Well we pulled into Johnston’s Canyon. We got back in the car. We drove down the road 5 Kms and hiked up to Castle Lookout and we were the only people on the trails. So in that sense it’s like, no, I didn’t get my first choice but I had B, C, D, E and F to choose from so really it was ok. (BW)

Resource knowledge:

I think it’s very different for a visitor or the newcomer who doesn’t have that sort of roster of places that they could know about from people. ...You will get a different answer from someone who’s been here for a couple years and doesn’t know how to navigate the system. (BM)

...Other times I’m in the back country and there’s just so many people in an area or I don’t know if there’s gonna be lots of people and they’re people too, just like you, doing the same thing. At least you’re gonna run into people that are like minded. It’s like that...As you get further away there are more like minded people...And the same skill levels - punter factor comes down. (BM)

16. Displacement and substitution is a learned local knowledge.

Well it was a learning process when we first moved here I hung around the older guys you think these guys were relatively good...You learn from them. Yeah, you learn where to go or how to avoid people. There’s one guy that lives here that, his name is Mike, and he, we’ve got over 400 kilometers of trails... But you can’t get to them but with a mountain bike you could, and you’ll never find it without us. (BM)

Yes but I think we’ve sort of learned now what areas to go to where there aren’t as many people so... (CW)
You know, displacement for me, doesn’t actually mean leaving the park. It just means going to a different spot in the park where I know it’s not particularly busy. (BM)

17. Recreation supply (choice in recreation areas that are less crowded) is seemingly unlimited and not so difficult to find but access and mobility (roads, highways, and trails) are more limited and set in supply and therefore less negotiable. Intra-site mobility is usually stressful.

The mountain bikes would be there today, or the skiers will be there on the weekend, do it another day or, for me what sort of constrains me, it’s just the traffic on the highways… (BM)

To me it’s the driving. It’s not the actual activities (CM, BM)

18. Local knowledge serves to confuse the question of whether Calgarians are tourists as some have it to a similar extent. That it is common to encounter Calgarians with similar local knowledge of the resource than residents.

19. Structural constraints are most evident although others are reported.

I like to do or try everything but I can’t afford a $2,600 road bike…I can’t afford a mountain bike, can’t afford all new climbing gear, I can’t afford more ropes so there’s a lot of gear involved in a lot of stuff I like to do and yeah definitely, I don’t kayak because I don’t have a boat and I have to rent one from the city every time I have to do it so what’s the point. I borrowed crampons for two years before I finally bought a pair...(CW)

...a lot of people make such little money, they have to pick and choose only a few things that they can do as far as leisure goes, they may only get to go out to the hill maybe one day a week, cause that’s all they can afford. Because they have to pay for their rent which is crazy expensive here or groceries which is ridiculously expensive too. Just the cost of living factor is so high here that you got to do those things first before you can have that leisure. (BSW)
20. **Leisure negotiation is linked to the broader negotiation of residing in the Bow Valley.**

I feel that because of the housing situation I feel pressured with my time here. My time here is valuable because I know I’m not going to be here forever, and so I feel I need to fit in all this stuff and do all these things in my life here and now because I might not be here in 2 to 3 years, 6 months maybe, I don’t know... I feel pressured... I’m looking for the next Canmore. (CM)

I’d say that’s one of the natures of living in an area of parks and protected areas. It’s where many people come to do recreation, you deal with a lot more restrictions and regulations and permit issues and access issues so that affects it. (CM)

...you have your 9 to 5 job you’re, you absolutely have no time during the week day to do anything, it gets dark at 5 o’clock so like you get off work you know, you can’t go hiking, you can’t obviously go skiing cause you’re working all day so it kind of like pushes all your leisure into one space... (BSW)

I haven’t gone out backpacking in Banff National Park for awhile because of the situation. We camp in the safe places but there are bears everywhere... so fear would be in there somewhere. I think that it keeps me from doing some things in some places that I might otherwise do. It keeps me close to home. (BW)

I have to say that it’s easier for me to take my kids out on trails when they’re (trails) are busy, which is a new experience for me. They tend to feel that it’s something that’s done or something I feel safer... I’ve got this feeling of safety in numbers or something... (BW)

One of the restraints that is specific to this area has got to be the fact it’s a National Park and there are certain areas where use is restricted and some of my favourite trails I don’t use anymore because they’re are not allowed. (BW)
21. People generally negotiate through constraints

I think for me personally if I want to go do something, I’ll figure out a way to do it. I’ll put work aside. Basically because I can, I guess it maybe goes back to the community thing too. There’s always somebody there to back you up if you say I need this day off cause I want to go do this, you know everything’s on the phone call and somebody can you cover me because I want to do that. I figure there’s always a way, you really want to go and do something, there’s a way around it so that you can go do it. (BSW)

22. Place identity or creation is influenced by urban references.

People come to the Bow Valley with the, “hey this is not bad, it was so busy back in Toronto, this is great.” All of a sudden the benchmark as to what makes a nice mountain community has changed. It becomes more stress is acceptable. More people, therefore it gets more expensive and stressful. (CM)

23. Overall there is little stress reported with recreation activity although more so with daily life in the town.

Displacement:

I go somewhere else. So, I guess in a way it is stressful.
(BM)

Rationalization:

I prefer back country or cross country skiing and I will go to downhill resorts. I find I do experience stress when I go there, getting your pass or parking or driving or throughout there, lift lines, whatever, I suppose it is a sense of stress but again it’s a good experience and I do rationalize it.
(BW)

It’s the lift lines, it’s the parking lot, it’s that whole race to get up there and cause we have the hill here and it’s so close it’s I just find, and if there’s a ski race, or a border-
cross, you tend to just not go cause it’s a hassle. It’s stressful. It’s annoying. (BW)

24. Rationalization occurs but it is minimal.

It depends on what my expectations are. So if I’m expecting a certain experience to be a certain way, my tolerance level for that activity and perhaps with crowding will be different and so I will rationalize differently than if my expectations were other. So if I’m bringing family members out in summer time and they want to do Johnson Canyon, I’m going to have a different way of looking at that than if I were to go by myself. I’m rationalizing it cause hey you know what, I’m with my family, it’s a great time. I’m showing them something that they’ve never seen so I’m excited and I’ll accept this (crowds). (BW)

25. Product shift occurs and in both directions.

That’s the prevailing feeling among long time Canmore residents. This is exactly what people will be talking about in coffee shops. I remember the day it was 1985 it was like this, now it’s like this. It is typically not as good as it once was. That’s how many people say, some people understand how suddenly things change. They can live with it and are more into the rationalization than product shift. (CW)

30 years ago they could only get Jones Brew at the Esso station and now they have a choice of 35 different coffees, and 27 lattes. (CM)

26. Direct action – women engage more than men and seasonal workers claim it to be futile.

Not in Banff…that would be futile here (BSW)

27. Many residents understand that they receive extra-ordinary benefits by living in such a resort community.

I think that it’s fabulous and I think it’s so neat to, you know any day you can walk down the street and say hi to people... (from) different places. I think it’s so much more because it’s a (cosmopolitan)... (BW)
We have 32 doctors here or 35. That is unheard of in a community this size... (CM)

28. There is an understanding of the trade-offs and negotiation required to remain in the Bow Valley.

I work to play and my pay check goes to buying my gear so I can do the things that I want to do. So that, the expenses that I don’t own a home cause I make a choice and spend my money on my toys, right? So yeah so I had to make a sacrifice and not own a home to pay for my leisure time. (BM)

Trail closures due to development is a big concern (BW)

It’s the choice like that we have to make too though...I could have a better job in another community if I wanted to but I choose not to take it because I want to be here because of all the people around me and the things that I do everyday. ...nowhere you’re gonna be as perfect with other choices that you make and the attitude... these amenities are available to you or not, it’s your own initiative and your own ambition that makes you stay. You could sleep all day or you can go out and do something. (BSW)

On trade-offs:

Be prepared to live in half of what you have now, like half the size of home you’ve normally lived in but know that your playground is right at your doorstep...(CW)

Yeah it’s hard to make a living in your first year or two living here. If you’re really serious about living here and make a career in Banff, then it doesn’t really start happening until 3 or 4 years after you’ve been here.(BM)

4.6 Initial Focus Group Research Categories and Interpretation Phase 1

The purpose of this section is threefold: to present the Phase 1 Category findings for the Initial Focus Group research phase; to relate the findings to relevant theoretical frameworks and literature where possible; and to relate the findings to other qualitative
category level findings (cross-comparison). Corbin & Strauss, (1990) recommended that
category-level data, rather than concept-level data, be related to theoretical frameworks
and other category-level data within grounded theory protocol. The following sections
4.6.1 through to 4.6.9 represent the Phase 1 category-level data for the Initial Focus
Group research phase.

1. **Recreation coping is real and engaged in by most participants, while all
strategies are evident displacement is a learned way of life. (Based on Concepts, 23, 24, 25, 28, 16)**

   It is possible to say that recreation coping is real due to the confident and clear
manner in which participants were able to identify such strategies in daily life. At some
level all four strategies were reported but displacement was clearly the most common
coping mechanism. This result is supported by the recreation coping literature, most
notably by Manning & Valliere (2001), Schneider (2000) and Miller & McCool (2001)
whereby study participants report a range of coping strategies, with displacement most
commonly reported. Cross comparison with other category-level data reveal support the
inclusion of this finding. Within the Lived Experience interview research, recreation was
widely reported and even thought to be a part of unconscious daily life. It was reported
within the Second Home Owner phase but to a lesser degree.

2. **Tourism (economy) is viewed as something that must be negotiated in order
to live in the Bow Valley despite recognition of its significant role which
many would like to downplay and positive aspects. (Based on Concepts, 8, 10, 27)**

   A distinct emergent theme was that residents struggle with aspects of the tourism
economy, yet understand the setting affordances it offers. This sentiment is central to the
area of literature referred to in Chapter Two as ‘resident support for tourism’.
Considerable research from the early work of Pizam (1978) through to Andereck &
Jurowski (2006) has researched the basic question of under what conditions do residents
offer support for tourism and while the results vary it is generally accepted (as noted in Chapter Two) that residents negotiate negative aspects of tourism to benefit from positive aspects. But there is the potential for considerable stress and tension in everyday life resulting from daily negotiation of tourism. Tourism development is understood to impact the daily lives of residents. Andereck & Jurowski (2006, p. 140) state that “tourism development directly affects resident habits, daily routines, social lives and benefits and values which may lead to psychological tension.”

The negotiation of the tourism economy in the Bow Valley emerged as an important category-level finding within the Lived Experience interview phase under the topic of positive and negative trade-offs. The Second Home Owner group did not report such tension.

3. **Leisure constraints are evident, mostly at the structural level and related to living in the Bow Valley. Residents generally report that they negotiate through constraints. (Based on Concepts 19, 20, 21, 17)**

Leisure constraints were reported in a consistent, albeit post-hoc, manner and generally within broad quality of life discussions. This finding is supported by Samdahl & Jekubovich (1997) who reported little resonance of formal leisure constraints among study participants, but within post-hoc analysis of broader challenges to leisure participation, data emerged in-line with well accepted leisure constraints. Structural constraints including a lack of money and time, and work schedules emerged most often but were generally situated specific to the Bow Valley. For example, high cost of living, and seasonal tourism work schedules. Structural level constraints tend to be most commonly reported and people report an ability to work or negotiate through constraints. The cross comparison analysis of category-level responses reveals that leisure constraints in various forms, whether top-of-mind or post-hoc, are reported.
4. **Multiple influences affect the character and mental image of the place.**  
   *(Based on Concepts 1, 6, 7, 9, 22)*

   The image and character of the Bow Valley appears to be influenced through a multi-faceted and dynamic process beginning with one’s expectations prior to arrival, experiences and observations once there, and on-going social discourse. The relevance of this finding is in keeping with place attachment and the constant evaluation one undertakes of a good ‘fit’ between the place and individual (Kyle et al., 2004). High amenity destinations are sought to either form or to support one’s identity, thereby implying a constant evaluation of fit between place and identity (Williams & McIntyre, 2000). Participants made numerous references to experiences, past or antecedent references, and observations of change that resulted in statements of the image and character of the Bow Valley. In some cases statements were of a disappointing nature due to unmet expectations or negatively perceived change, while in other cases statements were decidedly positive. An important influence is that of broader social reference groups that serve to shape one’s present image of place through what Stokowski (2002) referred to as place re-creation discourse. The powerful role of social reference groups in influencing both place attachment (Brehn et al., 2004) and place creation (Stokowski, 2002) is accepted in the literature.

   Within cross comparison analysis, a similar phenomenon was noted in the ‘lifestyle’ finding of the Lived Experience research. The image and character of the Bow Valley was a shared creation that supported the identity and chosen lifestyle of long time residents. Joint place creation was a way to connect with similar individuals and distinguish from others residing in more urban settings.
5. The emphasis of negotiation (even leisure) is at the broader level of negotiating the ability to maintain living in and a satisfactory lifestyle in the Bow Valley. (Based on Concepts 4, 2, 28, 20)

Although the focus group phase responses to leisure constraints invariably drifted to comments regarding the challenges of maintaining a satisfying quality of life and even the ability to remain in the Bow Valley) their responses also underplay notions of leisure constraints. For example, when comments regarding the high cost of ski passes or outdoor gear were offered, they were invariably linked to one’s earning potential (low wages or the need for multiple jobs) in and specific to the Bow Valley. It is important to reiterate here that daily negotiation for the most part could be divided into two precincts of ‘recreation’ and ‘sustainability’. The former refers to negotiation of leisure in a traditional sense while the latter refers to negotiation of a satisfactory quality of life and ultimately the ability to remain in the Bow Valley. The latter is clearly the focus of negotiation of the focus group. This finding both supports and deviates from the leisure constraint literature. Most constraints noted by respondents were structural and related to cost of living, and appear to be similar to the literature (Jackson & Scott, 1999). However, the context of the negotiation represents an alternative conceptualization of leisure constraints because what is being negotiated is the ability to sustain a leisure ‘lifestyle’ within a specific leisure or high amenity recreation setting. In contrast, access to recreation and associated intra-personal level constraints (Jackson, 2000) and facilitators such as setting affordances (Raymore, 2002) are not the focus of negotiation.

Cross comparison analysis yielded similar findings across other category-level data. The Second Home Owner group reported minimal constraints except that of behavioural-reception assimilation related to a perception of discrimination in the community but not to recreation opportunities (see 5.6.5) (Stodoloska, 1997). The Lived Experience research yielded similar findings within the negative trade-offs category, whereby the negotiation to remain in the Bow Valley supersedes all others (see 6.6.6 and 6.6.7).
6. **Community changes that are noticed in seasons and weekends are important to residents as these changes transform place.** (Based on Concepts 12, 13)

This finding offers an important descriptive insight into the nature of the Bow Valley environment. The environment is dynamic in many ways, one of which is its palpable temporal-based transformation measured in either seasons (generally Banff) or weekends (generally Canmore). The transformation is a result of crowds animating the environment and the associated impacts of a quickened pace of life, longer work hours, and less spontaneous socializing related to peak time requirements. There is little research on this particular phenomenon (Hinch & Jackson, 2000). Its relevance here is primarily as an environmental descriptor and its relation to behavioural changes. No specific references were made to this particular finding in the Second Home Owner phase, although one might infer a similar effect on the lives of second home owners living harried lives during the week with weekend respite in the mountains. Data from the Lived Experience phase included numerous references to the harried life of high season and the respite of low season.

7. **There are different types and even classes of tourists for residents.** (Based on Concepts 5, 18)

It is important for residents to define their environments; one way is to define them in relation to the others (people) who animate it. Suvantola (2002) points out that within geography discourse it is common for the resident to view the tourist as the other (and vice versa) and that the other is often defined in an ethnocentric manner. Thus it is reasonable to observe that residents perceive different types and classes of tourists based on the resident’s own values and beliefs. A classification of Bow Valley tourists was not the prevue of this research project, but one can surmise from tourist typologies such as Plog’s Venturesomes (2002) that a range exists based on psychographic variables. This understanding can be extended to the confusion expressed over whether Calgarians are tourists as the classic ‘other’, or more similar to the resident. The classification of others
within the environment is an example of the phenomenon of the creation of behavioural environments (Johnston, 1989).

Cross comparison analysis with other category-level data revealed overt and subtle references to the classification of others. The Second Home Owner phase included numerous references to the classification of full-time versus part-time residents. The Lived Experience research phase included a variety of references (as concepts) to the classification of other residents based on outdoor skill, outdoor related employment, and level of activity. The preceding categories could serve as an extension to the creation of behavioural environments within a high recreation amenity setting as described by Johnston (1989).

8. **Social inclusion is related to how well one fits into the broader values of the community – these values are related to place identity. (Based on Concepts 3, 5, 11)**

   This finding relates to the previous data but is extended to address social inclusion. It appears that social inclusion is related to how well one fits into the broader values of the community as set by various reference groups. Numerous references were made of others who do not share similar values or behave similarly and how it can detract from the environment. Conversely, there was willingness expressed to accept others who are similar in values and behaviour. However, it is important to note that the specific values and behaviours of a particular reference group often were extended to refer to the entire community. For example, it was common for the highly active mountain recreation group to be both accepting of other similarly active mountain recreation types and to define the entire community as one collectively that values highly active mountain recreation types. The entire community is defined in accordance with a reference group’s values. The latter point underscores that the process of place creation can be highly contested among different groups and contested toward a preferred reality that is, one group’s reality dominates over others (Stolowski, 2002). A similar conceptualization can be derived from the leisure constraints framework, whereby the social structural-level
constraint of ‘activity style’ (Walker & Virden, 2005) inversely conceptualized as a facilitator (Raymore, 2002) is representative of social inclusion within a leisure environment similar to the data presented.

Cross comparison yielded similar findings at a variety of levels within other qualitative phases - as social exclusion within 5.6.5 in the Second Home Owner phase in the Lived Experience interview phase (concepts 6.6.3 and 6.6.9) In the case of the latter social inclusion was cited in reference to inter-personal constraints and defining one with lifestyle as distinct from others.

9. **A key aspect of being a local means learning recreation displacement strategies. (Based on Concepts 14, 15, 16)**

An important way in which participants distinguished themselves from others or more specifically, varying degrees of locals from varying degrees of non-locals, was through the level of local resource knowledge. Local resource knowledge appears to be a function of length of residency whereby with increased length of residency comes increased local knowledge and greater separation from the ‘other’ or tourist. For example, residents of thirty-plus years of tenure claimed to possess superior resource knowledge (e.g. hiking and mountain biking trails) over all others and thus placed themselves in an elite group. The same pattern was observed among other respondents whose tenure of residency is considerably less. For example, four-month seasonal workers claimed the same elite position over short stay tourists. This pattern may also explain in part why focus group participants were ambivalent about classifying Calgarians as tourists given that many Calgary outdoor enthusiasts may possess similar levels of local resource knowledge as Bow Valley residents. This phenomenon can be supported by the concept of behavioural environments within human geography (Johnston, 1989). It could be further linked to, and perhaps augmented by, recreation coping research through the addition of the temporal variable so far absent in studies involving visitors to a site rather than residents.
Cross comparison of this finding is of marginal value. The Second Home Owner group expressed less importance attached to local resource knowledge than a desire for solitude, that is, it was not important for this group. Local resource knowledge did not emerge as a distinct category finding within the Lived Experience research phase but is indirectly referred to throughout, mostly as an advantage of earned lifestyle (years of residence) of the Bow Valley.

4.7 Focus Group Categories Phase 2

The final focus group category follows a structure of human-environment negotiation with the human element involving residents and tourists, the environment involving a focus on the nature of the community, and negotiation being the ability to maintain a satisfactory lifestyle within the community.

4.7.2 Within a recreation context residents strive to understand themselves other residents and tourists by their ability to fit into to their place or community. Residents learn to live around each other and tourists but not without some residual conflict over values. (Based on Phase 1 Categories 7, 8, 9)

4.7.3 Tourism and related development defines the destination (place) with reluctant acceptance by residents. (Based on Phase 1 Categories 2, 4, 6)

4.7.4 Recreation negotiation is centered on the ability to negotiate the structure of the destination (place) more so than access to recreation opportunities. (Based on Phase 1 Categories 1, 3, 5)

4.8 Focus Group Summary

The purpose of the focus group research was to begin to explore aspects of life and individual leisure negotiation for residents of the Bow Valley, perceptions of place, and patterns and issues. Focus Group Phase 2 Categories sum up the findings this research phase. I will add further clarity to the findings by indicating what findings were not surprising in their presence, surprising in their presence, and surprising in their absence. This format should assist the reader to understand the inductive research process
undertaken and how future data collection iterations were informed by the previous research phase.

What was not surprising in its presence was the strong leisure and recreation motive for residing in the Bow Valley and the general conflicting feelings over tourism and resultant displacement. Surprisingly the Bow Valley was recognized generally as a unique place to live relative to other places. What I found surprising was how important it was to ‘fit-in’ to the community and how lifestyle (rather than anyone activity) was the measure of leisure and recreation. Separation of work and leisure, so commonly referred to in traditional leisure research, was not evident as much as was a general pursuit of an ideal integrated lifestyle. Finally, what I found surprising in its absence was negotiation for any one particular leisure activity, and more stress related to tourism-related crowding and congestion.

The Initial Focus Group research phase not only provided a sound understanding of the overall negotiated leisure experience for residents of the Bow Valley, but also raised new questions that guide development of the next phase of research. Considerable reference was made to the second home owner group as an important ‘other’, a group that is seen to be different from the full-time resident. It is important within grounded theory to examine a phenomenon by comparison of different groups to fully extricate data. In this case it was deemed important to purposefully examine the second home owner group. This group is central to the idea of amenity migration and many researchers loosely define amenity migration by this group (Price, Moss, & Williams, 1997).
5 Results of Second Home Owner Interviews

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Five is to present the results of the second phase, the Second Home Owner interviews. Results of this research project are presented in accordance with the grounded theory approach in six separate but related chapters. Each research phase and chapter builds upon the previous phase toward the development of theory.

Figure 5.0 Presentation of Results - Second Home Owner Interviews

Figure 5.0 should be read from left to right, or from initial explorations carried out with the broader focus group method to the focussed quantitative methodology of the BVRS. Qualitative results of the Second Home Owner research are presented in this chapter as highlighted in Figure 5.0. The Initial Focus Group results were presented first in Chapter Four, the Second Home Owner Interview research phase is presented in this chapter, followed by the results of the Lived Experience results in Chapter Six. A
summary of qualitative data is presented in Chapter Seven along with working theory in the form of a Typology of Amenity Migrants. Theory building within grounded theory involves the development and verification of hypotheses or assumptions (Corbin & Strauss, 1990); the key themes that form the Typology of Amenity Migrants are used to inform the development of the final phase, the Bow Valley Recreation Survey. The results of the final phase of research, the Bow Valley Recreation Survey, are presented in Chapters Eight and Nine, focused on descriptive and segmentation results, respectively. Each results chapter includes discussion that situates findings in light of theoretical frameworks and other relevant findings, a final discussion chapter to present the Model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration is presented in Chapter Ten.

This chapter includes the following sections: an overview of the data by question or question groupings; initial concepts; Phase 1 category groupings; Phase 2 category groupings; and a summary. The overview section for this chapter provides an overall summary of the research findings by question or question groupings with quotes. Data was generated through five semi-structured interviews with the Second Home Owner group. The quotes provided within each chapter do not represent the sum of the qualitative data to provide evidence and confidence for the inductive research process.

The purpose of Chapter Five is to present the results of the Second Home Owner research phase. The aim of the Second Home Owner research was to complement the first phase of exploratory research, and to carry out comparative research. This process is sometimes referred to as carrying out purposeful or theoretical sampling to examine extreme comparisons (Turner, 1981). Leisure constraints theory and the recreation coping model were used as the basis of the theoretical framework. Additionally, reference to amenity migration literature was used to situate this group. Chapter Five began with the question of whether the second home owner group was different from the full-time residents, and it will close with new questions that served to guide the next phase of research.
5.2 Overview of Second Home Owner Interviews

In keeping with grounded theory protocol of theoretical or purposeful sampling, it was deemed necessary to obtain feedback specifically from the Second Home Owner group within Canmore. Only Canmore second home owners were targeted as, at least in theory, they do not exist in Banff. The purpose of the interviews was to explore aspects of motivation to purchase property and reside in Canmore, activity and general relationship with place, and perceptions of the area and of their leisure experience. The interviews complement the exploratory level of the focus group research. Figure 5.1 provides an overview of findings of the Second Home Owner interview research phase.
Figure 5.1 Overview of Second Home Owner Interview Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary by Question or Question Groupings</th>
<th>Second Home Owner Interview Concepts</th>
<th>Phase 1 Categories</th>
<th>Phase 2 Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How long have you maintained a second home in Canmore?</td>
<td>1. Primary motivation to purchase is to create convenient family time with a recreational and nostalgic focus.</td>
<td>1. Motivation to purchase a second home in Canmore can be characterized as the desire to create a separate and more focussed everyday existence from which they experience in the city. (Concepts 1, 2,)</td>
<td>1. Second home owners are motivated toward solitary recreation and act in ways that are largely independent from the community while limiting most recreation to the town area. (1, 3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What was your motivation for purchasing a second home in Canmore?</td>
<td>2. Secondary motivation to purchase is to create an escape from the city, pursue a quieter leisure lifestyle and solitude type of experience.</td>
<td>2. Satisfaction with the purchase appears to be directly related to how much it is used. (Concept 4)</td>
<td>2. Second home owners report experiencing little stress in recreation and daily life activities (while in Canmore) excepting some local-based resentment which they recognize and would like to see addressed in the future.(5, 7, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you consider other destinations?</td>
<td>3. They are not motivated to be part of a mountain &quot;community&quot;.</td>
<td>3. There is little desire to be part of the community. (Concept 3, 8)</td>
<td>3. While satisfaction is based largely on frequency of use they do wish they were more motivated to be active while at their second home. (4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How often do you visit your second home?</td>
<td>4. Satisfaction with their second home appears related to the amount it is used by themselves or others.</td>
<td>4. Recreation is largely limited to forays into the mountains. (Concepts 5, 6, 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What types of activities do you do when you are at your second home on a typical visit?</td>
<td>5. Most common activities for this group while in Canmore are characterized as a quiet urban respite experience with short forays into the mountains.</td>
<td>5. Resentment, guilt, entitlement are a part of the Canmore second home owner experience. (Concepts 8, 9, 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How important is recreation as a motivation for the purchase of your second home in Canmore?</td>
<td>6. The next most common type of activities is characterized as urban recreation.</td>
<td>6. They experience few constraints in Canmore although intra-personal constraints (motivation) and intra personal constraints (local resentment) are reported. (Concepts 11, 12, 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has the second home in Canmore lived up to expectations?</td>
<td>7. Least common activities are characterized as outdoor intensive.</td>
<td>7. They report little stress in their recreation and daily activities, some displacement and product shift is reported as recreation coping strategies. (Concepts 14, 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What is it like to live in a tourism destination? Is it different from other places?</td>
<td>8. Second home owners perceive considerable resentment in town.</td>
<td>8. In the future they would like to see measures to address social division, the environment and a cap on further development as measures to improve the leisure environment. (Concepts 16, 17, 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you experience any constraints to your leisure in Canmore?</td>
<td>9. For some the guilt of being a weekender is a part of the Canmore experience.</td>
<td>9. They report little stress in their recreation and daily activities, some displacement and product shift is reported as recreation coping strategies. (Concepts 14, 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you experience stress and how do you cope?</td>
<td>10. Some second home owners feel entitled to purchase in Canmore for various reasons.</td>
<td>10. They report experiencing few typical structural constraints while in Canmore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What would you change, if you could change anything, about the situation in Canmore to make it a better leisure environment?</td>
<td>11. They report experiencing few typical structural constraints while in Canmore.</td>
<td>11. They report experiencing few typical structural constraints while in Canmore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What would you tell a friend considering purchasing a second home in Canmore?</td>
<td>12. They report a lack of motivation to be more active.</td>
<td>12. They report a lack of motivation to be more active.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you experience stress and how do you cope?</td>
<td>13. They report inter-personal constraints in the form of local resentment.</td>
<td>13. They report inter-personal constraints of a lack of motivation to be more active.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. They experience displacement but minimal.</td>
<td>15. They experience displacement but minimal.</td>
<td>15. They experience displacement but minimal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Future measures should mitigate the guilt of wildlife corridor impact and exclusivity.</td>
<td>16. Future measures should mitigate the guilt of wildlife corridor impact and exclusivity.</td>
<td>16. Future measures should mitigate the guilt of wildlife corridor impact and exclusivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. They also report that they would like to see a cap on further development but some</td>
<td>17. They also report that they would like to see a cap on further development but some</td>
<td>17. They also report that they would like to see a cap on further development but some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. They report that they would like to see measures to address this sense of division between the local the population and the second home population.</td>
<td>18. They report that they would like to see measures to address this sense of division between the local the population and the second home population.</td>
<td>18. They report that they would like to see measures to address this sense of division between the local the population and the second home population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. They experience few constraints in Canmore although intra-personal constraints (motivation) and intra personal constraints (local resentment) are reported. (Concepts 11, 12, 13)</td>
<td>19. They experience few constraints in Canmore although intra-personal constraints (motivation) and intra personal constraints (local resentment) are reported. (Concepts 11, 12, 13)</td>
<td>19. They experience few constraints in Canmore although intra-personal constraints (motivation) and intra personal constraints (local resentment) are reported. (Concepts 11, 12, 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. They report little stress in their recreation and daily activities, some displacement and product shift is reported as recreation coping strategies. (Concepts 14, 15)</td>
<td>20. They report little stress in their recreation and daily activities, some displacement and product shift is reported as recreation coping strategies. (Concepts 14, 15)</td>
<td>20. They report little stress in their recreation and daily activities, some displacement and product shift is reported as recreation coping strategies. (Concepts 14, 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. In the future they would like to see measures to address social division, the environment and a cap on further development as measures to improve the leisure environment. (Concepts 16, 17, 18)</td>
<td>21. In the future they would like to see measures to address social division, the environment and a cap on further development as measures to improve the leisure environment. (Concepts 16, 17, 18)</td>
<td>21. In the future they would like to see measures to address social division, the environment and a cap on further development as measures to improve the leisure environment. (Concepts 16, 17, 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Home Owner Interview Analysis Process from Questions to Concepts to Categories from Left to Right
5.3 Summary of Second Home Owner Interviews

This section presents a summary of the Second Home Owner interview research phase by questions.

1. How long have you maintained a second home in Canmore?

   The range is from 3.5 to 9 years, all had a second home in Canmore and three of the five were born and raised in Calgary.

2. What was your motivation for purchasing a second home in Canmore?

   All participants indicated a motivation that included a place to get away and perhaps a place to share with others – a nostalgic gathering place of sorts.

   We wanted someplace, so when I grew up my parents had a farm and then we had a cottage property and I really wanted something similar

   I think, we wanted to have a place where we could access the mountains more freely, and I think we thought it was a good investment...

   Table 5.1 presents additional descriptors of motivations of participants to purchase a second home in Canmore. Participants were given a series of words to select from to describe their motivation for purchasing a second home in Canmore. They were also asked to add words if needed. Not to be disturbed and business hosting were added by participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create family time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not my idea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business hosting *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat from the city</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure lifestyle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a part of a mountain community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not be disturbed *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Did you look around at other destinations?**

Three of the five indicated that they looked to purchase in other locations such as Invermere, BC, and Golden, BC, but chose Canmore because of the convenience (close to Calgary) and investment potential.

4. **How often do you visit or stay at your second home?**

Participants indicated a range of visitation patterns from once a month to every weekend. In some cases, visitation would include allowing others such as their children and friends to visit but not as a rental. The ability to let others such as their children use the property was an important reason for the purchase for four of the five participants. The other participant does not allow any others to visit the property unless it is with the family. Visitation is almost exclusively during weekends.
5. What types of activities do you do when you are at your second home during a typical visit?

In this section participants were asked to indicate the types of activities carried out on a ‘typical’ visit. Table 5.2 presents activities reported to be carried out by the second home owner interview participants on a typical visit. The numbers on the right end columns indicate how many people reported never, seldom, sometimes, usually, and always. Corresponding points were attached to values and a ranking was developed and appears in the bracket in the left column. Added to the list by participants were mountain biking, visiting friends, leisure drives in the mountains, and golf.

A strong motive is to do as little as possible. Some indicated they wished for motivation to do more outdoor activities while they are there on the weekends but are drawn to rest and simple escape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2 Activities Carried Out While in Canmore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry Activity (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski Hills (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Country Paths (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Mtn. Hikes (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Parks (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Rec. Facilities (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo Rec. Facilities (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff Town Visits (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Shop (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No. On a regular basis I go there and said I can sit in my house in Canmore and never move. I’d be quite happy to do that. And that’s the solitude thing, whereas at home, I could never do that. If I envisioned myself to wake up on a Saturday morning and never leave my house in Calgary I’d go nuts. In Canmore I’m quite happy.

6. How important is recreation as a motivation for the purchase of their second home in Canmore?

Four of the five participants indicated ‘very important’ while the one remaining indicated ‘important’. Recreation is an important motivation, but not the type of recreation that the Canmore men refer to as ‘mountain sport activity’ — recreation tends to fall into the more traditional notions of leisure of being rest and relaxation.

7. Has the second home in Canmore lived up to your expectations?

The majority indicated yes, they are living the life in Canmore they thought they would. Satisfaction is largely dependent on frequency of visitation. The more people get to visit their second home the more they feel it is meeting their needs. The one person who indicated that expectations had not been met was dissatisfied by the fact that too many trips to Calgary had to be undertaken even in the course of a typical weekend to cater to the children’s activities of hockey, etc.

Not quite. I think I was hoping, well basically before we had kids we had a very kind of active lifestyle, you did a lot of sport climbing, lots more road biking and I think, our kids being the age they were I was hoping to get right back to that lifestyle. But a lot of the time we’d get there, and I’m not sure if just tired from the work week, we don’t wanna. I mean the kids are tired too,
often, they don’t want to get up at 7:00 in the morning and do a big backcountry climb, so I think I thought we’d be a lot more in the backcountry or going back to those things that I really enjoyed. Instead we’re there and, we’re not doing anything, a lot of time we’re using some of the trails around, but not doing kind of the sort of bigger backcountry things that I was thinking.

On fear of being out in the backcountry:

No, I thought of, it’s funny, I thought of even just maybe going for a run up Lady McDonald on my own and yet since that woman was killed cross country skiing on her own on the Cascades fire route, by the cougar a few years ago and then that other woman you know, being killed by the grizzly, I’m just a bit, I’m a bit spooked about going on my own.

Oh definitely. I don’t think we use it as much as we want to, but for our family and friends it really does a good job. So I love a lot of that people use it.

On the ability to create a sense of calm:

It’s immediate. It’s as soon as you get into town and you know you don’t have to fight the traffic, that the mountains are there, and I love the mountains, so I mean to me they are just peaceful by looking at them. There’s a whole another mentality out there. It’s not so fast paced, you know, people you can just do whatever you know you drive, go out there and you don’t care what you’re wearing or how you look or, you know you just, you’re in Canmore.

8. What is it like to live in a tourism destination? Is it different from other places?

All participants, in one way or another, see Canmore as a place that is not receptive to the weekend population. They report feeling resentment, indifference and even animosity. Two of the males in the group argued against the resentment by making the argument that weekenders are vital to economic sustainability of the community. Two of the women felt guilt over their role in changing the community and actually see themselves as being a part of the problem.

On resentment:

I feel like I’m a visitor there. I don’t feel I belong and I feel there’s animosity towards us as a weekender and you just tell them where your condo is, and they
know. They kind of know already, you’re very much a second class citizen. Because when you think about it, the part timer people put an awful lot of money into the community but they don’t get many of the, you know the facility use as far as they’re not flushing the toilets as much and they’re not using the roads as much, and not using the recreation system as much but, so that makes me feel a little bit funny. I like it, I find it’s a bit of a transient community to tell you the truth.

Well I guess you go into the community sort of feeling like, the residents aren’t probably big fans of people like me. So, I suppose I don’t feel particularly welcome but it isn’t any particular comments or any way that people have interacted it’s just more knowing that I’m this person who comes into this community where lots of people would like to live and don’t have enough money, or to borrow enough money to have this place that we don’t even use that much.

On resentment and guilt:

I imagine there to be the resentment, partly because residents need affordable housing and assuming, they are residents that actually work in that area, either Canmore or Banff, and they really need to live there as opposed to the residents that sort of live there but drive into Calgary everyday. So I feel kind of badly I suppose for those residents, because sort of I see all of those weekend people as taking up their space and there’s obviously only so much housing you can put into. The other is kinda half guilt thing for me is just the whole impact on wildlife bit about Canmore, so I haven’t taken the time to really read much about it, but what I understand is basically, that neither the town council or Three Sisters are doing a whole heck of a lot about the wildlife corridors. Yeah but I don’t feel particularly good about that, because I kind of see myself as part of the problem.

On resentment, entitlement:

They just assume that I’m a transient, and or a transient person but, and the other thing that bothers me a little bit is you know, is this view that these people who’ve come to Canmore, often are from elsewhere. You know they’re from Europe, they’re from other parts of Canada. They come to Canmore and suddenly they feel they have the right to Canmore, and they can say what’s supposed to happen. Whereas I’ve been in Alberta most of my life and I’m much more Albertan than anybody else. Yeah I walk into Canmore, and I get some yuppie from Toronto whose husband just happened to make it big in some stock market deal and you know, they’re retired and she’s 50 and he’s 50, and she’s bitching about trail rights in Canmore, something like that and is
mad at me because I’m from out of Canmore, I have a condo, and I’m just kind of like, why!? Because you live there and you have more rights over this place than I do, I’ve worked and paid taxes and lived here all my life mostly.

On contribution of second home owners:

When you look at it in hindsight, Canmore was deemed almost a negative place because it was a coal mining town, dirty ugly, non-progressive and it still is a matter of 15 minutes away but most people didn’t really get into it. They thought well Banff was the answer and then either the positive thing of tourism has enabled it to grow. Banff was capped. People had to go somewhere so they went to Canmore and they started to make it a better place.

On lack of connection:

There’s not a real sense of community that you get into cause you’re popping in and out and a lot of the people are people that aren’t on permanent status so we don’t connect with locals who just connect with other people like themselves because of where we live.

On sense of connection to Canmore as a native Calgarian:

I don’t know that I initially think about it very much because maybe that has something to do with the fact that I’d grown up in Calgary so Canmore now is just a part of my life and I see them now as an extension of Calgary in the sense you know that they’re an hour away...

9. Do you experience any constraints to your leisure in Canmore? (Leisure Constraints)

Explanation of leisure constraints took a considerable amount of time but all participants eventually understood and proceeded. In general all participants reported experiencing very few constraints. Money, for all but two, was not a constraint in any way. Motivation ‘to do activities’ was a constraint but relative to expectations. On the one hand they would like to do more activities, but on the other hand they just want to relax and recuperate. However, some constraints encountered include fear of bears, and social resentment within the community, old age (not being able to activities they would like to do or did in the past), and lack of time to get there, but once in Canmore everyone reported that time was not a constraint. For one more active person, being next to a
national park with access and activity restrictions was deemed a constraint. For another (mother) it was the need to coordinate a family’s activities that would often mean they did very little in the end. Leisure constraints were far more relevant to this group in the city than in Canmore.

On development and restrictions:

Well a lot of the mountain bike trails that were in behind our place have now been paved over and made into a development and there’s gonna be a golf course that’s gonna take out the remainder of them, and the ones that aren’t being developed because there’s more people using the core, using the valley now, they’ve had to put restrictions on the trails and close trails because of the disturbance to the wildlife. When there’s fewer people using them, you can use more of the back country and when there’s more people using it they have to close a lot of the back country. So they close the very things that people are coming there to see... It’s a problem.... And at some point I think that I will stop supporting the environmental integrity of the wildlife in that area if they make it such that I can’t actually get to see any of that wildlife anyways so. I would prefer they ran the animals out of town eventually if they close it all down anyways.

On will-power and cost – “When you think of golf, and skiing and even going to the Nordic Centre it costs money, so I’d say still the will power is the biggest one for me.

Yeah it’s very different. [...from the city] That doesn’t change. But what changes is we book that time off. And so that time is now ours right, so there is no commitment that has to go run off and drive somebody, pick somebody up or be at home and do something or, there’s no patients calling me, there’s no internet, there’s no email, there’s nothing. And yeah it’s nice. I can do what I want to do and it’s fun....

10. Do you experience Recreation Coping?

Participants were first asked if they experienced stress while in Canmore, during their leisure pursuits or in town in general. Then recreation coping strategies were introduced and discussed. Participants generally reported experiencing very little stress related to crowding and congestion in daily and leisure activities. Despite recognizing the presence
of crowds, participants reported they are relative (to larger crowds elsewhere) and they did employ coping strategies such as displacement. Stress was associated in an unaided manner, with leisure constraints and specifically with the resentment experienced in town. Displacement is noted but not viewed as a part of daily life and related stress appears to be minimal.

[Stress is] It’s very relative. I would say never in Canmore do I ever feel like that. Although, you know, you sit at that stop light, a new stop light, and 1 day I was like wow it’s getting really busy in Canmore, and we’re like 6 cars back, so you’d think about it but it still doesn’t bother me, yeah I don’t think it ever bothers me.

Sometimes, I’ve learned to work around the crowding. I know when the people are gonna be and where they’re gonna be, and try to plan my activities such that I am not on their same schedule. So I’m very aware of the crowding and have developed many strategies to avoid it.

I mean you compare it to here or you compare to when we used to live in Boston. When you go out for dinner and there’s a 2 hour wait, it is a piss off you go someplace else, I mean that’s how they act, treat you, where you wait for 2 hours. So to wait for 15 minutes to go to a restaurant in Canmore is pretty minimal and you can adapt to it. And also the other thing is, is that there’s nothing on the other side of that dinner appointment.

Yes. I use that one intensely [displacement]. Getting to the ski hill before it opens to get a good parking spot, get up the lift first and then where the people are less likely to be skiing over the noon hour, going in for lunch at 1:30, and you know, just going to the time share hottub when it’s not the peak season, cause otherwise it’s packed.

Rationalization: three of the five reported not experiencing rationalization although no specific examples were offered.

Product Shift: quite common and more common with men than women.

...almost every time I go hiking in Canmore is you come upon these f’ing signs that people put up, you know that so and so has taken over this trail. The classic is Cougar Canyon, and I’ve been climbing there since med school in [19]87 and there was nobody there, you could park your car there, you could camp, you could live there for your whole 3 weeks if you wanted, nobody cared. And then all of these people started moving in, and they actually build a community right
there and then they put up sign telling us how we should take care of our trip because you know they are concerned about the environment. Like f off, you know we took care of the place just fine for the last 15 years and bloody evidence is that you’ve come to move here to enjoy what we’ve taken care of for the past 15 years so don’t tell me how I should take care of it.

Oh yeah. I use a product shift all the time for the town with the in town trails and sometimes we do go to those nice restaurants that they put in. On the ski hills they’ve made the lifts faster and longer so even if there’s a bigger line you don’t have to wait as long as you did in the bad old days. Everything goes faster. You get just as much skiing in. Now they’ve opened up tons of new terrain in Louise so I guess that’s much better.

Well I preferred it 8 years ago when it wasn’t as much a tourism community and it was a smaller town and quiet and I’m preferring it less as it is becoming a tourism community and you get the fancy restaurants and the fancier hotels and the big grocery stores. So I enjoyed its small town non tourism character more than I enjoy the tourism part of it. The advantages are some of local path infrastructure that they’re building. It’s something that we use a lot and that’s being expanded a lot with the growth of the neighbourhood so. That would be the one advantage of getting a tourism place. But the rest of it I find a disadvantage to actually be in a tourism city. I would have rather been in a small town, before it would get to be too touristy.

Direct Action: all but one respondent reported that direct action was not a strategy. In fact, four thought that it was not their place to act in such a manner. One of the males did write numerous letters to various authorities – mostly in relation to trail closures.

11. What would you change, if you could change anything, about the situation in Canmore to make it a better leisure environment?

All participants indicated that a better relationship between the second home owner population and permanent residents was needed. As well, several remarked that they would like to see a cap on development sooner than the 29,000 person build-out that is said to be in place at this time. They would like to make the situation more equitable such that more people could have the same access to purchasing a home in Canmore. Some also expressed concern over environmental issues, while others would like less restrictions and general emphasis on protecting the environment.
I think what has to be changed is the balance between protecting wildlife and access to the wilderness. Because I think they’ve gone overboard with the protecting wildlife and trying to keep everything in the state it was a hundred years ago, not a thousand years ago or ten thousand years ago. They’ve picked an artificial set point and decided that’s the point that you have to try to recreate. And any policy to limit growth is always difficult because that will just drive up prices and then the sort of disadvantage is a segment of society that can’t afford to be there which is already what is happening. Because Canmore is gonna build out a 28,000 so I personally would set policy such that it was frozen the second I bought my place and then no-one else could come. I mean a lot of people believe that so that’s the easiest way to set policy. I chose not to support Sunshine Village’s parking lot expansion campaign because I prefer the place to be less crowded. And so, if I’m eager enough to get up there early and other people aren’t then if they turn away because the parking lot is full then my day is better, so, I can set selfish policy.

Better Understanding of second home owners:

I think that a better understanding and support of non-resident folks in Canmore is needed. There’s a whole thing around the sense of that people don’t contribute to this and that. So I would establish that as some means of getting the community together better.

Disenfranchisement:

I would make a case for the fact that the people like me that come in on weekends have a value to Canmore...as opposed to looking at people who come in as rich Calgarians, or rich Albertans, or rich whatever...maybe I would just try to change the community’s perception of people like me that come up for a weekend....

Access:

I think the only thing I would change is to have more people have access to that same sort of lifestyle, making places cheaper, allowing, just because we have lots of cash, or more cash than the average guy, doesn’t mean we should have the right to live that way or have a place. It would be nice for other people to have places there.

Wildlife corridors:

We’ve got to actually do something about development in Canmore to make this different so that wildlife has their paths again. So I’d probably put a
whole bunch of money into that to try and figure that out. So, I think in
general I’d put money into the parts that are sort of, there’s a certain amount
of guilt I feel about having a place in Canmore and I’d be putting money into
those parts to get rid of the guilt so that I could kind of enjoy it and feel better
about enjoying it.

Guilt and further development:

Well I would stop further development in Canmore, which I hate to say because
you know everybody does this, right. They’re kind of pro-development and then
they get their place and they’re like oh, you know, no-one else should, you know
they should stop building so it’s a completely hypocritical thing to say. But I am
worried about the development, I’m more worried about the environmental impact
that would come if we continue to build in that community.

12. What would you tell a friend considering purchasing a second home in
Canmore?

Most indicated that people must be clearly aware of what they are buying, it is not
a typical investment property, that is, no warm body of water or ski-in-ski-out possibility,
so it would have to appeal to a person with specific tastes. Otherwise it was considered
positive because of its proximity to Calgary.

I’d have to get into a big discussion with them about what the advantages and
disadvantages are of getting a place along the lake, the ocean. You know
something that’s, ski in, ski out would always be an advantage. Canmore is for a
specific kind of person that likes some of the simpler leisure activities. You know,
walking, biking, looking at nature. So it depends what their interests are I guess.

5.4 Second Home Owner Interview Reduction Criteria

Second home owner group transcriptions were analyzed using the following key
terms to guide coding for extraction of concepts.

• Motivation to reside in the Bow Valley
• Satisfaction with residing in the Bow Valley
• Activities carried out while in Canmore
• Living in a tourism based community
• Negotiation of personal leisure in a tourism community
Leisure constraints framework
Recreation coping framework
• Negotiation of ‘ability to live’ in the Bow Valley
• Place attachment

5.5 Second Home Owner Interview Concepts

The following section presents concept level data for the Second Home Owner interview research phase.

1. The primary theme to explain motivation to purchase a second home in Canmore is to create convenient family time with a recreational and nostalgic focus. (Refer to Table 5.1)

2. The secondary theme to explain motivation to purchase a second home in Canmore is to create an escape from the city to pursue a quieter leisure lifestyle and solitude type of experience. (Refer to Table 5.1)

3. What is clearly not a motivation to purchase a second home in Canmore, is to be a part of a mountain community – no one indicated this response item. (Refer to Table 5.1)

4. Satisfaction with their second home appears to be highly related to the amount they use it themselves or allow friends and relatives to use it

5. Most common activities conducted by this group while in Canmore can be characterized as a quiet urban respite experience with short forays into the mountains. (Refer to Table 5.2)

• Front country walks/hikes
• Grocery shopping
• Going to restaurants
• Arts
• Short mountain hikes

6. The next most common types of activities conducted by this group while in Canmore can be characterized as urban recreation. (Refer to Table 5.2)

• In town parks and pathways
• Recreation within the condo-complex
• Banff town visits
• Shopping (as an activity)
• Nightlife

7. The final grouping of activities conducted by this group while in Canmore can be characterized as outdoor intensive. (Refer to Table 5.2)
   • Backcountry activity
   • Skiing at ski areas

8. Resentment towards second home owners, whether real, perceived or simply assumed, is a part of the Canmore experience for this group.

9. Guilt of being a ‘weekender’ is a part of the Canmore experience for this group as well.

10. Conversely, there is a sense of entitlement that they (some second home owners) should be allowed to purchase second homes in Canmore for various reasons – a response to the resentment at least in part.

11. They seldom experience typical structural constraints such as lack of money, and especially a lack of time while in Canmore – for many the second home is a refuge from those concerns and a way for them to deal with the harried lifestyle experienced in the city. They do report structural constraints in the form of fear of unplanned animal encounters in relation to short mountain hikes and running, and some regulatory constraints.

12. They do report non-traditional social (inter-personal) constraints in the form of local resentment towards second home owners.

13. They do report intra-personal level constraints of a lack of motivation to get out and experience more of the mountains while in Canmore – that is, to be more active.

14. They report experiencing very little stress in relation to recreation activities, while somewhat more in daily life, but minimal.
15. They do recognize and experience displacement, but not by all, and it is reported to be fairly mild and in some cases urban comparisons are offered – not as crowded as Calgary, Boston, etc. They do not report much in the way rationalization and direct action, while product shift is slightly more prevalent.

16. As to the future, they would like to see measures to address the guilt (three of five used the term 'guilt') in relation to living with wildlife and wildlife corridors and toward making this seemingly exclusive experience more accessible to the average person.

17. They also report that they would like to see a cap on further development because of the potential for further environmental degradation but realize that it may appear somewhat hypocritical of them to want that.

18. They report that they would like to see measures to address the sense of division and disenfranchisement between the local population and the second home owner population.

5.6 Second Home Owner Interviews Phase 1 Categories and Interpretation

The purpose of this section is threefold: to present the Phase 1 Category findings for the Second Home Owner research phase; to relate the findings to relevant theoretical frameworks and literature where possible; and to relate the findings to other qualitative category-level findings (cross-comparison). Qualitative methodologists recommend that category-level data, rather than concept-level data, be related to theoretical frameworks and other category-level data within grounded theory protocol (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The following sections represent the Phase 1 category-level data for the Second Home Owner research phase.
1. **Motivation to purchase a second home in Canmore can be characterized as the desire to create a separate and more focussed everyday existence from that which they experience in the city.** (Based on Concepts 1, 2)

Second home owners were unanimous in their expression that the primary motivation for purchase was to create an escape from their harried pace of life in the city. This finding is supported by Robinson & Stark (2006) who report that amenity migrants, including second home owners in Alberta, are highly motivated to create an escape.

This finding can be further situated with Cohen’s (1979) Tourist Typology which includes five types of tourists ranging from the recreational to the existential, based on a perception of alienation from homeplace or daily life (push factor) and a desire to find an authentic ‘other’ (pull factor). Second home owners are not tourists in the classic sense, but they are tourists ‘by definition’ if the Canadian Tourism Commission is measure of travel (greater than 80km one-way from the primary residence), and their reported position in the community is clearly that of an outsider, is considered. A push–pull model can be applied with relevance. Some level of alienation from daily life must be experienced by the Second Home Owner group otherwise there would be little need to seek an escape. However, the pull aspect of seeking authenticity is less clear (then the push) because there appears to be little desire to live the authentic life of the ‘other’, in this case Canmore (Wylie, 2000). The application of Cohen’s typology likely would result in labelling the Second Home Owner group as recreational travellers seeking brief (weekend) escapes and little ‘other’ authenticity. But at the other end of the continuum the existential traveller is characterized, at least in part, as having two consistent home places or centres as could be the case with an often utilized second home. Thus, the Second Home Owner group represents a hybrid within Cohen (1979) typology and provides an opportunity to re-examine tourist push-pull models with the addition of the contemporary phenomenon of amenity migration. Existing amenity migrant typologies as described in Chapter Two offer little to explain amenity migration and second home owner motivation; my research offers an opportunity to do so.
Support for the above concept can be found in varying degrees in the other qualitative research phases. For example, a central theme of the lifestyle of the Bow Valley (section 6.4.9) is a life separate from the city, albeit on a permanent basis. Similarly, the finding that the Bow Valley represents a 'fantasy-land' life further emphasizes escape and a distinct existence from the everyday. The idea that one can create a separate or re-invented existence within the Bow Valley is held widely.

2. **Satisfaction with the purchase appears to be directly related to how much it is used. (Based on Concept 4)**

Satisfaction with the purchase of the second home can be summarized as satisfaction with how often it used or how prominently it has factored into regular life. The scenario can be linked to Expectancy Theory “…a belief that a certain act will be followed by a certain result” (Lee & Graefe, 2003, p. 2). The expectation is that the second home will be used often, and perhaps adopted, as a regular part of life. Comparison analysis with other research phases and category-level data is difficult because of the specificity of this finding to the Second Home Owner group. Only broad connections can be made to the Lived Experience and Initial Focus Group research phases that relate to satisfaction resulting from sustaining a satisfying quality of life within the community.

3. **There is little desire to be a part of the community. (Based on Concepts 3, 8)**

Second home owner participants were unanimous in reporting little, if any, desire to be part of the community as a motive for purchase. This point underscores an important difference between the second home owner group and full time resident amenity migrants. My research identified a strong desire on the part of the full-time resident amenity migrants to be a part of the community and frustration was expressed when integration into the community was not successful. Such data indicate a separation of some full-time residents and second home owners similar to distinctions identified in
the behavioural environment of wealth, housing, (tenure of residency can be added here) and occupation (Johnston, 1989).

The desire not to be a part of the community can be understood in light of the desire for escape and solitude reported among the second home owner interview participants. An additional connection can be made to the recreation coping literature. Schnieder (2000) conducted a study of responses to conflict by backcountry users within an urban-proximate wilderness area. She found that backcountry users wanted to escape and reduce stress as an outcome of their experience. When faced with potential conflict (other users, garbage on the trail, etc.) they used what Schnieder (2000) referred to as 'distancing techniques' first, and reliance on rules, second. Though the setting is different from second home owners (i.e. town versus backcountry setting), the experiential goals of escape and stress reduction are similar. That the Second Home Owner group wishes to remain separate from the community may represent a distancing technique and reliance on rules may be equated to a reliance on the legitimacy of ownership.

4. Recreation is limited largely to activity in the town with some shorter forays into the mountains. (Based on Concepts 5, 6, 7)

This point is largely descriptive and provides insight into an aspect of the recreation patterns of this group and their relationship with the high recreation amenity physical environment. Little literature exists pertaining to recreation patterns of second home owners. Vague references to the topic are usually from the perspective of impacts such that the increase of amenity migrants generally results in increased demand on recreation services, residential and recreational development, and an increase in comfort amenities (Moss, 2006; Reeder & Brown, 2005).

Comparison analysis across other findings concludes that this pattern of activity characterized as being largely limited to the town front country areas is not so different from other groups. For example, Lived Experience interview data pertaining to the description of one's 'ideal day' resulted in four basic types of ideal days and only one of
the four involved forays into the backcountry. One can conclude that the majority (not all) of Bow Valley residents, second home owners, or otherwise, recreate primarily in town or front country areas.

5. **Resentment, guilt, and entitlement are a part of the Canmore second home owner experience. (Concepts 8, 9, 10)**

When asked what is it like to live in a tourism community such as Canmore, feelings of being resented, guilt over one’s impacts, and a sense of entitlement were reported at some level by all five interview informants. There is little research on this specific topic or result, but the finding that there is conflict between residents of amenity migration communities and especially between ‘old’ and ‘new’ residents is better documented (Moss, 2006; Robinson & Stark, 2006). Anecdotally, this finding is easily situated. One simply needs to read one of the three Bow Valley weekly newspapers to find an article or letter to the editor that involves low level animosity toward second home owners by full-time residents, and equal expressions of entitlement on the part of some second home owner informants. The feelings reported in this category-level finding directly relate to the concept of Behavioural-Reception Assimilation which Stodolska (1998) reported in her study of immigrant leisure constraints among new Canadians in Edmonton, Alberta. She claimed it to be a form of discrimination and an inter-personal level constraint. Further, Walker & Virden’s (2005) model of leisure constraints includes the structural constraint of territoriality, which refers to informal access to a site, or whether one feels welcome or not. Both apply to this category-level finding.

Analysis across other category-level findings revealed some connections. For example, social inclusion (Section 4.5.8) involved similar phenomenon but to a lesser degree and social constraints (Section 6.5.3) from the Lived Experience interview research also recognized accessing the community as a constraint.
6. Second home owners experience few constraints in Canmore although intra-personal constraints (motivation) and inter-personal constraints (local resentment) are reported. (Based on Concepts 11, 12, 13)

Everyone experiences leisure constraints at some level (Jackson, 2000). The fact that the Second Home Owner group reported few constraints while in Canmore, is understood given the experience is structured as an escape or sanctuary from city life. It is essentially designed to be free of constraints. To the best of my knowledge there is no comparable literature within leisure constraints research. The Second Home Owner group did report some intra-personal constraints such as lack of motivation to do more activity during their stay and the resentment reported previously. Analysis across other category-level data yielded a conclusion that the relative lack of constraints reported by the Second Home Owner group differentiates it from most other full-time resident groups related to this research project. The Second Home Owner group represents an extreme comparison relative to other groups, within the grounded theory sampling (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

7. They report little stress in their recreation and daily activities; some displacement and product shift are reported as recreation coping strategies. (Based on Concepts 14, 15)

The Second Home Owner informants reported little stress during daily activities and even less during recreation activities, but the displacement coping strategy was most widely reported. It is difficult to situate this finding within recreation coping research because no standard measures exist for comparison. Most recreation coping research involves samples of visitors to a specific site (Schneider, 2000; Johnson & Dawson, 2004), and while the second home owner is a visitor he/she is also a resident with an ability to cocoon if so desired. The ability to avoid crowds and related stress by Second Home Owners is greater then other groups investigated and may explain, at least in part, the low reported of use of coping strategies. Analysis across other category-level
findings again reveals the Second Home Owner group to be different from other amenity migrant groups.

8. **In the future SHO would like to see measures to address social division, the environment and a cap on further development to improve the leisure environment. (Based on Concepts 16, 17, 18)**

   It is interesting, and perhaps not surprising, that the Second Home Owner group reported that future measures to improve the leisure environment should include efforts to address social inclusion, the environment, and a cap on development. Not only do the three elements represent commonly cited negative impacts of amenity migration (Chapter Two) but also Second Home Owner responses further support the assertion that the Bow Valley exists as a high recreation amenity environment. At first glance the items cited have little direct connection to leisure or recreation as typically conceived. Yet these broader measures are understood to improve the overall environment in the Bow Valley which, in turn, affects leisure. It appears that daily life in the Bow Valley and notions of leisure are inextricably linked. Furthermore, it appears that social inclusion, impact on the environment and a cap on development may represent the ‘sustainability’ precinct of life in the Bow Valley for the Second Home Owner group. Conceptualization of the two separate but related precincts of life in the Bow Valley were noted (See Section 4.5.5) as recreation and sustainability. The latter refers to the struggle to remain in and maintain a satisfactory quality of life in the Bow Valley. The Second Home Owner group does not necessarily struggle with the same challenges (financial, career, education) as other amenity migrants but it appears that they are faced with non-recreation issues that challenge their quality of life in the Bow Valley.

   Cross comparison analysis offers considerable support for the finding that life in the Bow Valley is strongly linked to leisure. Category-level data (See Sections 6.5.1, 6.5.9) describe the Bow Valley as a distinct recreation focused environment - even one in which recreation is imbedded into daily life (See Section 6.5.9). Category finding 4.5.4 references the mental image of the Bow Valley as a recreation destination through
to a ‘never-never land’ world of leisure that exists separate from ‘real life’. Thus, measures to improve the leisure environment are measures to improve daily life in Bow Valley.

5.7 Phase 2 Categories for Second Home Owner Interviews

The following represent the three Phase 2 Category level findings for the Second Home Owner interview research phase.

1. Second home owners are motivated towards solitary recreation and act in ways that are largely independent from the community while limiting most recreation to the town area. (Based on Phase 1 Categories 1, 3, 4)

2. Second home owners report experiencing little stress in recreation and daily life activities (while in Canmore) except some local-based resentment which they recognize and would like to see addressed in the future. (Based on Phase 1 Categories 5, 7, 8)

3. While satisfaction is based largely on frequency of use SHO would like to be more motivated to be active while at their second home. (Based on Phase 1 Categories 4, 6)

5.8 Summary of Second Home Owner Interviews

The purpose of the Second Home Owner interviews was to complement the initial exploration of the focus group research but with a specific group. The assumption at the start of the Second Home Owner research phase was that the sub-sample would be different from other full-time residents. The end result is that the Second Home Owner group represented an extreme comparison in many ways. Phase 2 Categories sum up the findings. Additional insights are provided in keeping with focus group research summary.

Second Home Owner interview findings that were not surprising in their presence to me included the emphasis on recreation, family time, and escapism as motivation to purchase. As well, the recreation patterns of second home owners which included a focus
on in-town recreation also were not surprising. Findings that surprised me included a theme of connective findings surrounding the second home owner 'fit' into the community. The first is that the second home owners did not express a desire to be a part of the community; and second that all reported experiencing or perceiving some level of resentment from permanent residents in the community. Thirdly, some (3 of 5 participants), expressed some guilt over their second home purchase and perceived impact in the community while 2 of the 5 defended their right to purchase for various reasons. This series of two findings separates the Second Home Owner group from other groups encountered in my research, and indicates the presence of some level of tension between this and other groups in the community. This level of tension implies that from a recreation perspective the Bow Valley may in fact be a contested space. Leisure and recreation are argued to be political in nature and symbolic of broader structures and social patterns and even struggles (Stolowski, 2002). Both the full time resident and the second home owner view the other as the 'other' (Suvantola, 2002). Tension between the second home owner population and full time residents implies that the space (or place) is contested. Later it is shown that this contention may give rise to mobility, or that issues surrounding the contention are not necessarily able to be resolved in the perception of some residents. The notion of a contested space also is evident in the concept of the behavioural community (Johnston, 1989).

Also, what was surprising in its absence was an indication of leisure negotiation (except inter-level resentment and some intra-level lack of motivation) or stress from crowding and congestion. This result may be due to a variety of reasons such as Second Home Owner's inclination to remain around the home or their reference of point to determine what is crowded. The lack of leisure negotiation also separates this group from others encountered thus far.
6 Results of Lived Experience Interviews

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Six is to present the results of third phase of research, the Lived Experience interview research. Results of the research project are presented in accordance with the grounded theory approach in six separate but related chapters. Each

![Diagram: Flowchart of research process]

Figure 6.0 presents the progress of research from left to right or from initial explorations carried out with broadly targeted focus group methods to the more focussed quantitative methodology of the Bow Valley Recreation Survey. This research phase and chapter builds upon the previous one toward the development of theory using the grounded theory approach expounded by Corbin & Strauss (1990). In this case, leisure negotiation of residents was observed in light of the broader action/interaction dynamic of amenity migration.
This chapter includes the following sections: an overview of the data by question or question groupings; initial concepts; Phase 1 category groupings; Phase 2 category groupings; and a summary. The overview section is generally brief and provides an overall summary of the research findings by question or question groupings such that the inductive formation of the initial generation of data and its broader context are clear. The next section includes a grouping of like responses into more coherent concepts, the basic unit of analysis in grounded theory; (Corbin & Strauss, 1990), and is supported by participant quotes. Quotes are included in the presentation of results to provide the reader evidence into the inductive formation of the fundamental grouping phase and the statements about the data.

Later grouping phases of categories, Phase 1 and Phase 2, do not include quotes as these are based on the initial concepts. Phase 1 categories represent a further reduction of the data into more coherent statements. Phase 1 Category data are presented with an interpretation and discussion component to situate each Phase 1 Category statement within broader theoretical frameworks or literature where possible. Phase 1 Category data for each chapter is also cross-compared with other category-level data. Phase 2 categories represent further reduction to final statements of the results.

The approach in Chapter Six, in keeping with grounded theory, was to enter with some assumptions of the phenomena and relevant theoretical frameworks to uncover data (Cutcliffe, 2000). The first two phases of research have served to inform the development of the Lived Experience interview research in a variety ways; some overt, while others less perceptible. Thus far what is clear from the Initial Focus Group research is that:

- People generally are drawn to live in the Bow Valley for recreation and lifestyle reasons;
- The Bow Valley is a unique place to live and inspire a unique lifestyle;
• Negotiated access to recreation activity is generally good, but resident’s ability to negotiate an acceptable quality of life in the Bow Valley is generally challenging;
• Full-time residents perceive part-time residents as ‘others’ who do not necessarily share similar values and lifestyle.

From the Second Home Owner Interview research phase it can be summarized that:
• Second home owners perceive that they are seen as different; and
• Second Home Owners carry out patterns of recreation that are largely focussed on the home.

The direction for the Lived Experience interview research was to explore negotiation and Second Home Owners’ relationship with place at the level of daily life, or lived experience.

Theoretical frameworks used to guide the Lived Experience interview research included the recreation coping model, place attachment literature, leisure constraints theory, and behavioural communities’ literature. Each of the frameworks appeared more and less relevant at various points of data collection and analysis depending on the nature of the emergent data. At the Lived Experience interview stage of research my questioning had deviated from typical parameters or guidelines one could find within the literature. Whereas it was easy to follow past literature with respect to designing leisure constraints questions (and approach for analysis) for the first phase, by Lived Experience interview phase typical leisure constraints or recreation coping research questions clearly need to be modified, as well as the entire concept (e.g. negotiation for leisure as being so focussed on negotiation with place). Furthermore, I believed the term ‘residents’ could be largely replaced with the term ‘amenity migrants’, and thus shift my theoretical direction toward related fields such as behavioural communities, and the amenity migration literature, especially that of Robinson & Stark (2006) who studied Canmore. In addition, the role of place attachment literature in the Lived Experience interview phase increasingly became apparent. Other frameworks became important including
Butler’s Model (1980) of the evolution of tourist communities models such as Butler’s Model (1980) and product shift coping response of the recreation coping model (Miller & McCool, 2003). I realized that some residents’ perceptions of being ostracized in daily life and recreation could be explained through Johnston’s (1989) behavioural communities, Walker & Virden’s (2005) territorial structural leisure constraint, or Stokowski’s (2002) ideas of contested space. There was, and remains, considerable ‘slurring’ of theoretical frameworks.

6.2 Overview of Lived Experience Interviews

A series of twenty-two semi-structured interviews were conducted with a diverse group of participants based on theoretical sampling. Informants included those seeking a mountain recreation lifestyle, those seeking a hospitality career and resort community lifestyle, those who arrived for specific career-related employment, those not interested in mountain sports at all, parents of younger and older children and with people who had lived in the Bow Valley but had since moved away. Figure 6.1 is a summary of the Lived Experience interview results by question and initial concepts. Figure 6.2 presents the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Category findings.

The Lived Experience interview research process proved to be dynamic. Two questions were added early in the process (following the first and fifth interview) as a result of interview discussions. The first question regarded place attachment or who, or what, type of person stays and who leaves the Bow Valley. The second question focussed on the trade-offs of living in the Bow Valley, or ‘what do you get and what do you give up by living in the Bow Valley?’ This question proved to be very effective in gaining access into daily negotiation.
### Figure 6.1 Overview of Qualitative (Lived Experience) Interview Results – Questions and Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary by Question or Question Groupings</th>
<th>Lived Experience Interview Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reasons for moving to the Bow Valley.</td>
<td>1. Mountains and the mountain recreation lifestyle represent an authentic way of life for many people and an expression of identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of an ideal day in the Bow Valley.</td>
<td>2. For some people mountain activity is less important and then an aesthetically pleasing lifestyle of mountain beauty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trade-offs: what does one get and what does one give up in everyday life by living in the Bow Valley?</td>
<td>3. Some people come to the Bow Valley to find a small town lifestyle but with access to specific urban entertainment amenities that makes it a place that is seldom boring. Banff is understood to be more vibrant than Canmore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some people are drawn by specific lifestyles amenable to a tourism based mountain community.</td>
<td>4. Some people are drawn by specific lifestyles amenable to a tourism based mountain community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is common to decide to return to live in the Bow Valley after a first visit as a tourist.</td>
<td>5. It is common to decide to return to live in the Bow Valley after a first visit as a tourist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. An ideal day for those seeking a mountain recreation lifestyle involves a variety of components such as activity (from mountain sport to nightlife to passive walks), food, friends and the flexibility to be carried-out spontaneously.</td>
<td>6. An ideal day for those seeking a mountain recreation lifestyle involves a variety of components such as activity (from mountain sport to nightlife to passive walks), food, friends and the flexibility to be carried-out spontaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Securing a satisfying career or a good job is a good way to sustain the mountain recreation lifestyle.</td>
<td>7. Securing a satisfying career or a good job is a good way to sustain the mountain recreation lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The mountains are seen as motivating because it includes a community of enthusiastic like-minded people.</td>
<td>8. The mountains are seen as motivating because it includes a community of enthusiastic like-minded people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most people recognize and accept the trade-off of mountain lifestyle over wealth and financial security.</td>
<td>9. Most people recognize and accept the trade-off of mountain lifestyle over wealth and financial security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The environment offers a wide array of recreational opportunity that, though not truly specific to the Bow Valley does represent activities that are unique with the combination of mountain access and urban styled opportunities. For many participants this could represent a strong attachment through place dependance.</td>
<td>10. The environment offers a wide array of recreational opportunity that, though not truly specific to the Bow Valley does represent activities that are unique with the combination of mountain access and urban styled opportunities. For many participants this could represent a strong attachment through place dependance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Those who stay make a conscious decision to work through the many trade-offs.</td>
<td>11. Those who stay make a conscious decision to work through the many trade-offs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The decreased emphasis on career and increased emphasis on lifestyle means that one’s identity is more closely linked to one’s play than work representing a difference from what one would see in most other parts of urban society.</td>
<td>12. The decreased emphasis on career and increased emphasis on lifestyle means that one’s identity is more closely linked to one’s play than work representing a difference from what one would see in most other parts of urban society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Living in the Bow Valley is like living in a fantasy-land setting that can include lifestyles that are perceived to be outside the real world. There is an associated concern that the fantasy will have to end.</td>
<td>13. Living in the Bow Valley is like living in a fantasy-land setting that can include lifestyles that are perceived to be outside the real world. There is an associated concern that the fantasy will have to end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vampires is a self-ascribed term associated with a group that is characterized as long time hospitality employees with an urban recreation bias and tend to experience fewer trade-offs with life in the Bow Valley.</td>
<td>14. Vampires is a self-ascribed term associated with a group that is characterized as long time hospitality employees with an urban recreation bias and tend to experience fewer trade-offs with life in the Bow Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The high cost of living is challenging but it can be a negotiated trade-off.</td>
<td>15. The high cost of living is challenging but it can be a negotiated trade-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A trade-off is that one will need to give up affordable housing and most people have to accept not owning a home.</td>
<td>16. A trade-off is that one will need to give up affordable housing and most people have to accept not owning a home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There are contrasting views of lifestyle in relation to place attachment and place identity from mountain to urban recreation lifestyles.</td>
<td>17. There are contrasting views of lifestyle in relation to place attachment and place identity from mountain to urban recreation lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gaining access to the mountains for mountain recreation is not difficult.</td>
<td>19. Gaining access to the mountains for mountain recreation is not difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The ability to commute to Calgary for work or career makes the lifestyle more feasible.</td>
<td>20. The ability to commute to Calgary for work or career makes the lifestyle more feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. For many people who are involved in mountain sports the weather is a constraint – a structural level constraint.</td>
<td>21. For many people who are involved in mountain sports the weather is a constraint – a structural level constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Financial, career, and housing stresses permeate daily life.</td>
<td>22. Financial, career, and housing stresses permeate daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Crime and fear of becoming a victim of crime is a widely held concern.</td>
<td>23. Crime and fear of becoming a victim of crime is a widely held concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The less stable lifestyle involving contract/seasonal employment appears more suited to a younger person with fewer responsibilities.</td>
<td>24. The less stable lifestyle involving contract/seasonal employment appears more suited to a younger person with fewer responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Flexibility in work whether on a weekly or seasonal basis is important in offering the individual more opportunities in temporal substitution.</td>
<td>25. Flexibility in work whether on a weekly or seasonal basis is important in offering the individual more opportunities in temporal substitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. People negotiate through traditional financial leisure constraints (structural).</td>
<td>27. People negotiate through traditional financial leisure constraints (structural).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Finding partners can be a social constraint especially for those engaged in mountain recreation activity where solo activity is not wise.</td>
<td>28. Finding partners can be a social constraint especially for those engaged in mountain recreation activity where solo activity is not wise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Unplanned animal encounters represent a fear and a structural level constraint.</td>
<td>29. Unplanned animal encounters represent a fear and a structural level constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Trail closures caused by animal activity or otherwise represent a structural leisure constraint – institutional.</td>
<td>30. Trail closures caused by animal activity or otherwise represent a structural leisure constraint – institutional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. There is a belief that recreational land has been lost to development residential and recreation development which affects one’s daily recreation – structural constraint.</td>
<td>31. There is a belief that recreational land has been lost to development residential and recreation development which affects one’s daily recreation – structural constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Displacement (spatial and temporal) as a way of life – it is a part of the lived experience of a Bow Valley resident.</td>
<td>32. Displacement (spatial and temporal) as a way of life – it is a part of the lived experience of a Bow Valley resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Rationalization is experienced yet generally does not emerge in a top-of-mind format.</td>
<td>33. Rationalization is experienced yet generally does not emerge in a top-of-mind format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To successfully negotiate crowds and crowding residents need to have the ability to be spatially and temporally flexible – beyond a flexible work schedule.</td>
<td>34. To successfully negotiate crowds and crowding residents need to have the ability to be spatially and temporally flexible – beyond a flexible work schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Crowding is limited generally to the townsite and ski areas.</td>
<td>35. Crowding is limited generally to the townsite and ski areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Attempting to define the lifestyle is challenging and elusive but virtually everyone speaks of and aspires to a 'lifestyle' whether it is a mountain recreation (sport) lifestyle or an urban escape lifestyle. The lifestyle is casual, flexible, deliberately resisting normal societal pressures, with a focus on recreation versus financial success and the like.</td>
<td>36. Attempting to define the lifestyle is challenging and elusive but virtually everyone speaks of and aspires to a 'lifestyle' whether it is a mountain recreation (sport) lifestyle or an urban escape lifestyle. The lifestyle is casual, flexible, deliberately resisting normal societal pressures, with a focus on recreation versus financial success and the like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Lifestyle and place identity appear to be linked.</td>
<td>37. Lifestyle and place identity appear to be linked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. It can be difficult to find and access the resident community in Banff (and Canmore).</td>
<td>38. It can be difficult to find and access the resident community in Banff (and Canmore).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Contrary to some who need privacy others, need more constant social contact.</td>
<td>39. Contrary to some who need privacy others, need more constant social contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Social status and ability to fit into the community are related to lifestyle.</td>
<td>40. Social status and ability to fit into the community are related to lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. There is general acceptance of the negative irritations of tourism in light of the positive economic impacts it yields.</td>
<td>41. There is general acceptance of the negative irritations of tourism in light of the positive economic impacts it yields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Banff is generally viewed as possessing greater range of cultural and urban opportunity than Canmore.</td>
<td>42. Banff is generally viewed as possessing greater range of cultural and urban opportunity than Canmore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. There is a general belief among residents that residential and recreational development in Canmore is altering the local environment.</td>
<td>43. There is a general belief among residents that residential and recreational development in Canmore is altering the local environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There is general belief that because of its position in a national park and associated policies such as the need-to-reside policy Banff will be better able to manage future growth.</td>
<td>44. There is general belief that because of its position in a national park and associated policies such as the need-to-reside policy Banff will be better able to manage future growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 6.2 Overview of Qualitative (Lived Experience) Interview Results – Categories

**Phase 1 Categories**

1. People are drawn to a mountain tourism (high recreation amenity) community because it provides an opportunity to pursue various distinct lifestyles that emphasize everyday recreation, ranging from mountain sport to urban, and escapism. (Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

2. Structural constraints are perceived as challenges of seasonality, weather, fear of unplanned animal encounters, high cost of living, inflexible work schedules, lack of appropriate career and housing options, loss of recreational land to development and trail closures. (Concepts 18, 21, 30, 22, 32, 33)

3. Social constraints are perceived as difficulty in finding partners, fear of crime, and accessing the ‘community’. (Concepts 23, 28, 38)

4. People generally report little if any intra-personal level constraints, they believe they usually work through constraints and access to recreation is NOT a constraint. (Concepts 19, 27)

5. Some participants perceive that recreational and residential development has altered the recreational landscape and sense of community of Canmore, and that Banff is less susceptible to such change. (Concepts 42, 43, 44)

6. Positive trade-offs of daily life in the Bow Valley include easy access to mountains and mountain recreation, a wide range of recreational opportunities including cultural and urban, and access to a like-minded and motivating group or community. (Concepts 19, 6, 10)

7. Negative trade-offs of daily life in the Bow Valley include concerns over career, cost of living, housing and not being able to own a home. (Concepts 7, 15, 16, 20)

8. The process of leisure negotiation is imbedded in the mountain tourism/high amenity lifestyle and everyday life. (Concepts 9, 11, 41, 24, 25)

9. For most participants the lifestyle of the Bow Valley is characterized as living outside of normal everyday life where the recreation, community and everyday quality of life satisfaction are valued over career advancement, financial success and delayed quality of life gratification. (Concepts 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 26, 36, 39, 40)

10. Recreation coping strategies are experienced on a daily basis with temporal and spatial substitution (displacement) being most prominent and rationalization and product shift also present. (Concepts 23, 32, 33, 34, 35)

11. Place attachment appears to be linked to place identity (a value-based link to the broader environment) rather than to place dependence (reliance on the resource/environment to carry out desired recreation activities.) (Concepts 1, 8, 6, 17, 37, 42)

**Phase 2 Categories**

1. The Bow Valley (Banff and Canmore) provides a high recreation amenity and tourism environment. The bow Valley possesses extraordinary breadth and depth of recreation opportunity for a residential community. It is distinct from other typical residential communities. (Phase 1 Categories 1, 9)

2. Most people are motivated to live in or migrate to the Bow Valley to experience a lifestyle that is focused on recreation satisfaction, seamless integration and distinct from normal everyday life. (Phase 1 Categories 1, 9, 6)

3. Within an environment biased toward recreation and leisure, such as the Bow Valley, leisure constraints serve to influence one’s fit or place within the community. Constraints act as parameters for fit within community. (Phase 1 Categories 2, 3, 4)

4. Within such an environment, recreation coping strategies influence everyday decision making (about recreation and leisure pursuits and beyond) within the community. (Phase 1 Categories 10, 6, 7)

5. For most people, living in the Bow Valley involves everyday trade-offs. These trade-offs favor recreation and community based satisfaction while they tend to hinder satisfaction in achieving typical societal goals involving wealth creation, career advancement, and home ownership. (Phase 1 Categories 2, 3, 4, 6, 7)

6. Place attachment is negotiated consistently as a function of a person’s motivation to migrate to the Bow Valley, the desired lifestyle, consideration of trade-offs, and perceived threats to place. (Phase 1 Categories 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11)
6.3 Summary of Lived Experience Interviews

1. Reasons for moving to the Bow Valley

Reasons for residing in the Bow Valley vary with individuals; however, there are three main categories of response to this question. The most common response involved a prior visit as a tourist (in some form) or a brief work stay, usually in the ski industry, and a return to the area years later with the specific intention to reside. In some cases the first visit was as a child but for most people it involved a specific recreation based visit to ski, climb, paddle, etc. followed by a more permanent stay. This group generally pursues a mountain recreation lifestyle in the Bow Valley. The second response category included participants working in hospitality who reported a more circuitous route akin to backpacker travel whereby the final stop had become the Bow Valley, generally because of the availability of employment. The second group tended to value the social and aesthetic aspects of living in the Bow Valley more than the ability to pursue mountain sports. A third group included those who followed a partner or friend to the area and decided to stay, and some came out for a specific job (Parks Canada, newspaper, etc.). 16 of the 24 participants interviewed for the Lived Experience interviews reported considerable intra-site mobility of residence from Lake Louise to Banff and Canmore depending on personal circumstances.

2. Describe your ideal day in the Bow Valley

To help my understanding of their lived experience I asked participants to describe their ideal day with the intent of connecting this response to motivation to reside. Four basic types of ‘ideal days’ emerged. The most common response involved a mountain recreation lifestyle type of day that invariably included the elements of physical activity in the mountains, food, friends and the flexibility to achieve such a day at any time. Emphasis placed on each element was generally comparable. The second typed ideal day was an urban family day where leisure activities generally took place in-town, often within public recreation facilities and carried out in a relaxed manner. A third
typed ideal day was centered on an urban-social-nightlife scenario that generally involved single men and those working in the hospitality industry, and this group were self-described as vampires (those whose recreation is late night/early morning based and involves the club-scene). A final type of ideal day was an urban-social-quiet day with an equally strong emphasis on friends but excluding the nightlife activities of the previous group. All four ideal day types include a clear emphasis on the importance of the social aspect. Despite the presence of the mountains, it is only the first group that includes a direct recreation foray into the mountains in their ideal day description.

3. Trade-offs: What do you get and give up in daily life by living in the Bow Valley?

This question yielded considerable discussion of a reflective nature. The responses are presented in two sections, 1) by what one ‘gets’ and 2) by what one ‘gives up’. The benefit aspect of the trade-off can be grouped into four broad areas. The most common response involved access to the mountains for sport/recreation as well as aesthetic value. For some people the emphasis was on the outdoor-fitness-lifestyle aspect of being able to go for a mountain bike ride after work with the mountain backdrop. Next, the social aspect emerged in two different types of responses. One aspect was that participants claimed access to a strong group of friends and, that one could find a like-minded group to carry out activities with. The two aspects are different in that the former emphasises a network of friends while the latter emphasises the manifestation of one’s identity within place. The third benefit response was a combination of physical setting and social factors in the form of a small town atmosphere, where respondents felt they could get to know people and walk rather than drive to address daily needs. The fourth benefit pertained to proximity to Banff to where everything from pristine mountains to culture, worldly culture and sophistication, and nightlife all within a protected national park is available. The uniqueness of this combination was seen as extraordinary.

The cost component of the trade-off can be described using six separate categories. The most common response was financial and specifically reported as a high
cost of living, lack of affordable housing and low wages. Many participants commented that cost of living concerns manifested themselves in daily life as a nagging realization that they would never be wealthy nor own a home in their current situation. This concern was reported to increase with age and it became a common reason for considering a move out of the Bow Valley. The second most common response was a lack of career opportunities. Many participants remarked that remaining in the Bow Valley meant a future of underemployment or indefinite work instability (contract to contract). Lack of career opportunities was often cited as a daily concern and one that challenged their resolve to remain. This concern was largely limited to those with a post-secondary education that was not directly related to tourism or hospitality. Career hospitality workers did not struggle with career conflict in the same way, if at all.

A lack of opportunity to further their education commonly was cited as another reason why some people considered a move out of the Bow Valley. The fourth cost was a lack of certain big city amenities such as cultural and entertainment opportunities, but most respondents simply wanted a Canadian Tire outlet. For those who live in Canmore and work in Calgary the commute was noted as a cost. The final cost was the distance from extended family members.

4. **Lived experience of negotiation in relation to their ideal day and what is negotiated in that context?**

This question resulted in considerable discussion with a fairly consistent three-part structure to each response. Initially participants would indicate experiencing little in the way of constraints or stress and emphasized the ease of access to their recreation pursuits. This was generally followed by a more reflective discussion surrounding everyday stressors that invariably were related to sustaining their chosen lifestyle or how to keep living in the Bow Valley in a satisfactory way. Lastly, the discussion would touch on more disparate aspects of daily life (e.g. crowds, safety, weather, etc.) that required negotiation. Virtually every participant at some point remarked that their greatest daily concerns were those related to cost of living, career prospects, choosing the
right time to upgrade their education, the prospect of not owning a home and the nagging realization that their time in the Bow Valley was, in all reality, limited. For example, “I’m very well aware that I can’t afford to live here...it feels temporary...it doesn’t feel attainable for me to have this lifestyle that I now have but actually have it as something I own” (single, professional, mountain-active woman). Financial concerns permeate through other areas of daily life. For example, “the whole thing is just to be able to afford to live here...there’s this huge panic if I don’t take this money (contract) I might not get through the lean time” (married, professional guide/interpreter) remarking on the need to never refuse a contract when available which results in a stressful feast or famine daily life. Financial concerns revealed themselves in other common responses including the need to take on several jobs, to work intensely during peak periods which are generally the summer and thus conflicts with personal recreation time, and the need to take on roommates in later life when privacy may be of greater value.

Other lifestyle sustainability concerns of respondents include the stress of limited career prospects, jobs that do not allow the flexibility to spontaneously recreate, and limited educational opportunities which are compounded by the realization that in order to address these concerns they likely will have to leave the Bow Valley. Jobs with a high degree of flexibility or leisure integration (e.g. outdoor jobs or those in hospitality with a high degree of social contact) were seen as most positive. Even for those who have secured a high paying stable position which is usually a Monday-to-Friday government position, it then means they must recreate on weekends when it is most crowded. Financial concerns and a wide array of associated implications are the dominant concerns in daily life.

The final grouping of other disparate elements of negotiation include finding a recreation partner with similar schedules, fears surrounding crime and unplanned animal encounters, crowds, traffic or travel to and from the recreation site, weather, and loss of trails due to regulated closures or to development. In summary, daily negotiation is
concerned primarily with the larger question of maintaining the lifestyle at a satisfactory level and secondarily with negotiating specific aspects of a tourism-based community.

5. **Crowds and crowding**

Crowds and crowding emerged strongly as a result of the focus group and early interview research it was treated as a separate category. All participants acknowledged crowding as a stressor although there are important distinctions. Firstly, that crowding in the backcountry is widely reported to be minimal but considerable in the town site. Participants who are more inclined toward a mountain recreation lifestyle appear to be more bothered by in-town crowding than those who lean toward more urban recreation. However, while displacement and substitution universally are viewed as a way of life, the longer one resides in the Bow Valley, the less of a daily concern they become as resource knowledge increases.

6. **Lifestyle**

Lifestyle was treated as a distinct area of questioning and analysis in the interview phase because during the focus group research phase it was often cited as motivation for residing in the area. Participants were asked to discuss whether their motivation to live in the Bow Valley was based on the pursuit of a recreation activity or a specific lifestyle. The overwhelming response was lifestyle, however some differences were noted. Some participants, while acknowledging the overarching draw of the lifestyle, reinforced their dedication to an activity (e.g. skiing or paddling sports) to almost down play the larger role of lifestyle. Other participants reported that over time they managed to build a lifestyle around one activity, usually skiing. Some participants viewed lifestyle synonymously with the idea of a multi-sport person though this is generally attributed to newer residents. Some people who have lived in the area longer, openly celebrate their lifestyle as one that is different from the city, where in the BV, one is not defined by their career but by their recreation “you may be a doctor but can you climb 5.10?” (older
Banff male). Many participants view their lifestyle as different from life in the city in that it is more relaxed and with a value system counter to the harried life of the city. This is not surprising since one would assume that longer term residents have mostly reconciled the trade-offs stated earlier (e.g. money and career for mountains). Some Banff participants reported a sense of stewardship as part of the Banff lifestyle - that by living in a national park it is their everyday duty to represent it properly. Other Banff participants remarked that their lifestyle is based on the idea that everyday is a vacation in Banff so there is no 'everyday' life as there is in the city. Regardless, participants were unanimous that there is a unique lifestyle in the Bow Valley that served and continues to serve as a draw.

7. The Social Element

The social component of daily life emerged as important early in the interview process, prompting more probing questions in the remaining interviews. Generally, there are four themes within the data.

Firstly, all participants report that the social or community component of life is important. Mountain recreation-oriented participants considered finding a like-minded group critical to their ability to recreate. Secondly, the hospitality-oriented people considered their social lives to be central to their experience. The latter group tended to be less put-off by the transient nature of the community and some even viewed it positively as making friends all over the world while staying in Banff. Thirdly, participants generally reported how difficult it was to find a community and acceptance within that community. However, once accepted the community was reported to be was very strong. People who have lived in both Banff and Canmore over many years commented that contrary to popular lore, the community is much stronger in Banff than it is in Canmore. Those who were not young, not old, (about 35 to 45) and single indicated it was difficult to find a partner because those in that age group were likely already married and settled. Canmore participants all noted the positive impact of community on
daily life. Fourthly, both Banff and Canmore participants remarked on the social pressure to be an active mountain recreation person. In Canmore social status was attached to the level of mountain skill, the type of mountain related employment (ACMG Guide is arguably most favoured) where one lives (Three Sisters is arguably least favoured) where one shops and the restaurants one frequented. The social component of daily life appears to be significant in guiding behaviour and forming ideas of place and community.

8. **Tourists, tourism and tourism development**

Participants were asked a series of questions regarding their views of tourists, tourism and tourist related development. Four major themes emerged in the responses. Firstly, most participants, especially those who worked in tourism (directly or indirectly) acknowledged the need for tourism, its central role in the economy and those most affected recognized it needs to be better planned to compete globally. Those who supported tourism also spoke positively of tourists and that interactions with tourists add to the positive aspect of the Bow Valley experience. Secondly, virtually every participant remarked at some level, that it is not difficult to avoid tourists, that back alleys and backcountry travel allows one to avoid tourists and that tourists generally stay within 20 minutes of their vehicle. Thirdly, most participants commented on the negative impacts of tourism including alcohol, drugs, noise, and parking concerns. Parents noted that it can be more difficult to raise children in these two communities and that they need to be extra vigilant about their children’s activities and whereabouts. Several Banff participants noted that most problem behaviours they encountered were attributed to seasonal tourism workers more than tourists. Only one long time Banff resident and tourism worker showed outright disdain for tourists. Lastly, numerous participants commented on the tourism related development in Canmore. The comments were unanimously negative and were of two basic types. The first was directed specifically toward golf course development and the ensuing loss of informal trails. The second was
related to a perception of unfair treatment. Three participants specifically expressed anger over the closure of trails adjacent to golf courses due to animal activity while the golf courses remained open. Based on the research of this phase, Banff appears to possess a collective community identity that is more accepting of tourism while Canmore is more ambivalent about its tourism-related identity.


This question was introduced following the fifth interview as a result of an interview discussion. The participant stated that one rarely finds typical constraints to leisure participation because the physical and social environment clearly facilitates easy access to a wide variety of recreation opportunities. He remarked that the real negotiation, in which leisure and recreation is central, is whether one can sustain the mountain recreation lifestyle. At that point I decided to add a question to address the unique recreation negotiation environment, and the question resonated well with all later participants. The results are presented in two parts, firstly a description of the people who stay and secondly, a description of the people who leave.

The people who stay are those with a strong sense of place attachment to either the aesthetics of mountain life, or to mountain activity, or to both. They are people who invariably have found good and stable employment or in some cases have started a small business; the latter are generally more locked to the Bow Valley because of the business. It was commonly stated that those who remain must possess a strong mountain recreation ethic to withstand the early challenges of residency. People who remain tend to have made peace with numerous trade-offs including not owning a home. Those working in hospitality report that one can quickly move up to supervisory positions if one can stay in the region long enough to show a commitment to remain in the region.

Those who leave (three interview participants had previously lived in the Bow Valley but had left for various reasons) were said to be those who could no longer make cost of living or career concerns secondary to the mountain experience. This basic point
was made in a variety of ways but with the same message: the desire for mountain recreation, and lifestyle, succumbs to societal pressures involving wealth, career, home ownership, and raising a young family. Some participants believed that people would often leave and return over a period of many years, each time trying again to create a satisfactory lifestyle. Other participants claimed that many people leave as a natural function of identity exploration of young people in their 20s who then return home for a stable and more socially accepted existence. Lastly, in virtually every discussion with interviewees it was assumed that people leave the Bow Valley for a larger centre in which they can purchase a home, find a career, etc. However, several participants offered a different view claiming their friends had left the Bow Valley for smaller centres (e.g. Revelstoke; Smithers; and Fernie, BC) because of their strong commitment to a mountain recreation lifestyle they sought to live in a place with simpler mountain values and more reasonable cost of living.

Leisure is at the centre of the negotiation to remain or leave the Bow Valley. Those who remain clearly possess a strong attachment to place in the form of mountain aesthetics, mountain recreation or social connectivity and they have managed to somehow fit into the tourism and amenity migration economy and structure of the region. Those who leave may possess similar attachments to place but likely were not able to fit into the economy and structure of the region.

10. Differences between Banff and Canmore

I asked no specific question regarding the differences between Banff and Canmore, however most participants commented on the subject if only to provide context to their specific responses. I included this brief section to add context to later interpretation. Most participants possess sound knowledge of both communities and many have lived in both or work in one and live in the other.

Participants described Banff as having a different "feel" from Canmore and most attributed that to its location within a national park and its tourism focus. They described Banff as being more cultured, cosmopolitan, nightlife oriented and vibrant overall.
Several noted that it held more of a community feel because one could walk everywhere, unlike Canmore. Banff is identified as a place of considerable breadth of leisure and recreation opportunities. Canmore was described by several participants as a large suburb, as having a strong sense of community among permanent residents but generally lacking the vibrancy of Banff despite possessing more recreational amenities. In summary, these long time residents of both communities view Banff as having considerably more variety and depth of recreation opportunity than Canmore.

11. Recreation, Quality of Life and Mobility

Early in the interview data collection process (following the sixth interview), participants were asked to comment on whether they believed recreation opportunities were increasing or decreasing in town and in the backcountry and to add any final thoughts. Considerable and often passionate discussion resulted from this final question. Two basic categories of responses resulted relating more to Canmore than Banff.

Firstly, participants commented on the changing character of local recreation including increased catering to traditional and more urban sports such as ice-hockey and swimming and related growth of facilities supporting those activities. Participants also suggested that new residents partake in outdoor recreation activities at a more recreational level than others who have lived in the area longer. Several participants reiterated their belief that golf course and residential development have eliminated important recreational trails but at this time several participants added that they have no problem trespassing on and otherwise disrupting golf course activity as it was “theirs first”. Comments were offered that areas surrounding Canmore had lost its “wild-ness” due to development.

A second set of comments refer to reasons why other residents would consider moving to a smaller, less expensive and more remote community. Reasons for considering such a move included frustration in fighting the town establishment over recreation, development and quality of life issues, high cost of living, the impact of
Canmore’s growth on Banff, loss of sense of community and difficulty in keeping young families in the area. Despite the appearance of this set of responses as decidedly negative toward Canmore, such were the views of participants. Several participants remarked that Banff’s need-to-reside policy will shield it from runaway growth and that its position within a national park ultimately will allow for more reasonable growth.

6.4 Lived Experience Interview Reduction Criteria

Interview data was analyzed using the following criteria to extract concepts:

- Motivation to reside in the Bow Valley
- Meaningful everyday leisure experiences while in the Bow Valley
- Daily stressors in relation to leisure pursuits
- The relationship between recreation and lifestyle
- Lifestyles in the Bow Valley
- Negotiation of leisure constraints via constraints model and recreation coping with a focus on exactly what is being negotiated and how?
- Place attachment – who stays who leaves and why?

6.5 Lived Experience Interview Concepts

This section presents the forty four initial concepts derived from the data. Each concept is supported by one or more quotes for additional context.

1. Mountains and the mountain recreation lifestyle represent an authentic way of life for many people and a strong fit with their personal identity.

Coming out to the mountains I was 18 and I just wanted to get away from Saskatchewan and do something else and adventure for the summer but I kind of just fell in love with the place and I kept trying to leave and I couldn’t find any atmosphere that had recreation opportunities like this and diversity of people with progressive thinking and different thinking. Like people plan their life around working for 8 months and traveling for 4. Never seen that before. Not in Saskatchewan at least. So that really hooked me, how people would plan for their
leisure time or their lifestyle. More so they’d plan for the lifestyle. So I kept trying to leave and I kept coming back. (RS.08)

2. **For some people mountain activity is less important and living in the Bow Valley represents an aesthetically pleasing lifestyle of mountain beauty.**

I’m a person who my environment is very important to my way of life... I have to be in a place that is aesthetically beautiful. I was raised in a lakes and a forested area. So I’ve just, I’ve grown up in that environment.... (LM.4)

3. **Some people come to the Bow Valley to find a small town lifestyle but with access to specific urban entertainment amenities that make it a place that is seldom ever boring (Banff more than Canmore).**

I like Banff because it has all the traits of a small town. You can get to know the people that are staying here long term. But then it has the benefits of a city. It never gets old. It’s not like Canmore. I would never want to stay in Canmore just because that is a small town. I moved from a small town everybody knows everybody. I can go downtown in Banff and not recognize one person. It’s good that way. (MF.5)

4. **Some people are drawn by specific lifestyles amenable to a tourism based mountain community.**

It’s not a reality. This is not a reality world... There are 9 to 5 lifestyles here in Banff as well, but for the majority everyday is a weekend. Every day here is a Saturday, especially in the summer time.... (KF.3)

Huge to me it’s just a central part of the lifestyle and it’s what made the difference in the people out here. Just people going out and pursuing mountain living to its fullest and that’s what I wanted to be a part of.(LM.7)

5. **It is common to decide to return to live in the Bow Valley after one has first visited it as a tourist – this is a very common theme**

I’m here because there were 3 of us at Lakehead... I threw out the option of doing a road trip out west for the weekend... we drove up here in 21 hours straight and it was a beautiful blue sky weekend, picture perfect and just fell in love with the mountains.... And that was my first time out here and I knew then and there that this is where I wanted to be and I nearly dropped everything at home and stayed but priorities took over, went back. I was in school at the time doing my masters and I went back, finished things up and then moved out... I’ve always been an outdoorsy type person and I think between the mountains and everything available to do out here, outdoorsy was what drew me. (AH.17)
6. **An ideal day for those seeking a mountain recreation lifestyle involves a variety of components such as activity (from mountain sport to nightlife to passive walks), food, friends and the flexibility to carry-out the activities spontaneously. The last element is an essential component of the Bow Valley lifestyle.**

Does it have to involve work? Cause virtually I do a lot of that and it interrupts with my ideal day but, just getting up and having the time to cook a nice big breakfast and head out, I think probably my most, my activity of choice would be hiking or loading up a backpack and getting away for a couple of days into the backcountry, just having a big lunch on the trail and just eating because you can, because you burn so many calories...(JC.22)

If I wasn't spending the night out on the trail and I was coming back, again, I'm a big fan of food and eating. So, cooking a nice meal or going out for dinner with some friends and just having that satisfaction at the end of the day of being outdoors tired versus working indoors tired. (KT.12)

7. **Securing a satisfying career or desirable employment is essential to sustaining the mountain recreation lifestyle; it is also an aspect of structure that requires considerable negotiation.**

If I moved to Calgary there'd be a lot of work. Whereas, in Canmore there's not so much. So I'm a little bit limited. I mean there's some in some areas. Like in the summer time if I wanted to do some tour guiding thing or whatever. Seasonal work out here, it's good but make it consistent long term... (JC.8)

Well there's definitely give and take to begin with. I've given up a career in teaching to begin with, to move out here and actually worked up at the ski hill in Lake Louise. So financially, gave up a lot of things but what I got was excellent downhill skiing, hiking and kayaking in the summertime... (AH.10)

I'm at a point where I'm about career and professional placements not about serving and running sled dogs. You know, so it's just great if you're young but if you want a career and be in a place. (DO.15)

8. **The mountains are seen as motivating because it includes a community of like minded people who want to live a similar mountain recreation lifestyle.**

...living here too is really motivating because the mountains are here. You're surrounded by really healthy people that are active and they want to get up. So it's really easy to accomplish and achieve those things.(JC.8)

What do I get? A smaller community that I identify with. I find that...fellow classmates ended up in their Ontario lifestyles was not something that I wanted to
pursue. So, a community of like minded outdoorsy active adventurist traveling types that even though we’re in a small community, it’s a very worldly community, very diverse that way...(KT.12)

The other thing is it allows me to live an active lifestyle. Sometimes I bike home from work, from Lake Louise and it’s a great ride. People are highly active, they’re visionaries, they do things…I don’t want to sacrifice myself in paying $300,000 or $400,000 for a starter home....(RS.14)

9. Most people recognize and accept the trade-off of mountain lifestyle over wealth and financial security.

…the wages here are generally a little bit low except for some specialized things. But it’s a lifestyle choice…. I think a lot of people live here for the lifestyle more than anything. It’s hard to become wealthy here, but at the same time, if you love skiing, you can ski the whole year which is something that most wealthy people can’t do. So that is what I mean by a lifestyle. (AN.9)

…it’s expensive to live here and the job opportunities largely within the tourism industry are low paying. So, I would be making more money, anywhere else, I mean I have a master’s in education but yet I’ve had difficulty getting a teaching job. Nobody leaves, I mean I could move to Lloydminster and pick up a job and buy myself a $100,000 house which represents 2 years of work. So financially you give up quite a lot. What do I gain, I gain lifestyle. (AB. 10)

10. The environment offers a wide array of recreational opportunities that, although not truly specific to the Bow Valley, represents activities that are unique with the combination of mountain access and urban styled opportunities. For many people this could represent a strong attachment through place dependence.

I think the Banff Centre does a great job of providing, some of those theatre and music attributes that you wouldn’t get in a small town of a similar size. I do feel there’s a lot of diversity here in choice of activities that maybe you know pick another small Alberta community with 8,000 people. I don’t know if I could think of one, like Hanna you know, would they have the same options. I don’t think so. I think this is a really unique community. (KT.12)

I get physical fitness. I get to enjoy the mountains. I get to enjoy the culture the shows up at the Banff Centre, that sort of thing and the good restaurants, that sort of thing. It’s hard to be career orientated here unless you really love tourism which is my thing. Can be a little bit expensive but I think everywhere is that way.
Groceries are more here, but after you live here as long as I have you find ways of
taking advantage of how inexpensive it can be up here as well. (AN.9)

11. Those who stay make a conscious decision to work through the many trade-offs.

Well it took me a long time to find my niche…I’m lucky that way, but in regards to
career, generally speaking, well I was a cook out here for 15 years and that was
underpaying and hard. So it’s tough to find career orientated work out here as far as
I’m concerned. That is acceptable for an intelligent man like myself. (FG.19)

12. The decreased emphasis on career and increased emphasis on lifestyle means
that one’s identity is more closely linked to one’s ‘play’ than ‘work’
representing a difference from what one would see in most other parts of urban
society.

[in the city]…you are what you do as far as employment, and here you are what
you play more I suppose. So it’s irrelevant to me if my friends are doctors or bus
boys. You know, and I have friends that are both and we talk about canoeing or
skiing or our kids. We don’t really talk about work or things like that. Work is just
what you do to finance your time off and everyone has that in common. (AB. 10)

13. Living in the Bow Valley is like living in a fantasy-land setting that can include
lifestyles that emphasize mountain recreation to partying and to somehow living
outside the real world. There is an associated concern that the fantasy will have
to end.

Why would I leave here? Because sometimes the reality has to become the real
world. I got here when I was 23. 20’s and now I’m 40, going on 41 so eventually
the reality kicks in that I mean, ok, it’s been a good ride and I mean, it’s been a
hell of a ride, and I would never change the last 17 years, ever…I’m gonna have to
move to a city, you know. To the real world. Because this is not. (KF.12)

…I have to drive to the city to be able to have the career that I want as well as the
lifestyle. And then, I don’t know if it’s something I negotiate daily, but it’s
something that’s on my mind all the time in terms of whether my lifestyle here is
sustainable… so I’m very well aware that I can’t really afford to live here and it’s
sort of this, it feels temporary. (SB.23)

I think what you’re giving up is a regular life because I’ve always said that Banff
is like Never, Never Land. Cause you never grow old here. I’m 28 years old. When
I came out I was 21. You can still go out with the younger crowd and stuff. Yeah
it’s Never, Never Land. (KW.29)
14. *Vampires* is a self-ascribed term associated with a group that is characterized as long time hospitality employees with an urban recreation bias and vampires tend to experience fewer trade-offs with daily life in the Bow Valley.

...I don’t really think I give up a whole lot of anything...anything that’s in a big city, I can get here. And we have the Banff Center so there’s shows there, like in Calgary, movie theatres, I think the one trade-off is that I miss the ocean. (JJ.11)

...We live in Canada’s number 1 National Park. What I give up by living here? It’s very expensive to live here...But I mean, take a look at Calgary today. Other than that, I don’t give up a whole lot. (KF.11)

I prefer to do very little. Very little. I try to ski quite a bit but I ski maybe once a year I mean, I hate the cold. Why I moved here I had no idea. I like the lifestyle, if you don’t mountain bike and hike and ski and whatever, I mean, what’s left to do is party and that’s what I do. I’d probably be working more to stay. (KF.19)

15. **The high cost of living is challenging but it can be a negotiated trade-off.**

What I give up by living here? It’s very expensive to live here... you’d have to have a lot of money,[to buy a home] that’s the downfall about this town. (KF.11)

...it’s getting to the point now where there’s very few opportunities if you just want, as a local if you just want to grab a quick lunch for a few bucks....(SB.14)

16. **An important trade-off is that new residents have to give up affordable housing and most people have to accept not owning a home.**

Yes, lack of affordable housing you know, buying...I would like to own one day, but what could be a reality and a 5 bedroom home in another community isn’t here you know, and because of a lower salary that you sacrifice to live in an area like this and to be close to what you love....(KT.15)

17. **There are contrasting views of lifestyle in relation to place attachment and place identity.**

I’m willing to give up more and I’m willing to take that risk and to me life’s too short not to be doing what you love and be where you want to be. They’re short term sacrifices, that I could make for my career and for my future and for financial stability but long term, I think people get so attached to possessions or a certain lifestyle that’s fuelled by finances that ends up being what they make their decision around....(KT.13)

A different view is that...
Canmore was getting to be a place where you couldn’t live and work because it was getting so expensive…The prices had gone up so much, that there’s no way we could’ve gotten anything reasonable for what we had so. And I mean we had to have a roommate at the house to afford it and we just didn’t want to live with people anymore especially with the baby. We wanted our own place and we just wouldn’t have been able to buy anything in Canmore without a monstrous mortgage and a roommate. (DO.15)

18. **Seasonality and its stark contrasts represent challenges that require negotiation.**

...I own my own business and I’ve been a contractor so I take contracts as soon as I can because I don’t know when the next meal is coming in. So there’s this feast or famine that I tend to live in and it’s very stressful. It’s burned me out a couple of times and to the point where I have considered leaving here and considered doing other things because I just, it’s just so tiring. (RS.14)

19. **Gaining access to the mountains for mountain recreation is not difficult.**

...what I get for sure is being closer to the areas for recreational opportunity so it’s not as big a planning thing to actually just like ride to, you don’t have to drive an hour from the city to do anything, you can just do a ride from your back yard. So, the accessibility is probably the big thing and I get the small town living which is good and there’s a lot of opportunities. I love it here with the Nordic Center....(SB.14)

20. **The ability to commute to Calgary for work or career makes the lifestyle more likely and sustainable.**

...if I didn’t commute to the city for work I would be really limited in terms of what I could do for sure. I mean there’s a couple of places, I would love to work for like the Banff Centre and there’s a few other places like that but otherwise you’re working for a small company and most of my friends that don’t have their career set a little bit, they’re just sort of working for peanuts and just barely scraping by. (SB.14)

21. **For many people who are involved in mountain sports at a fairly high level the weather is a constraint – a structural level constraint.**

... the weather and the relative safety related to that. If it’s really wet outside for mountain biking, we’re not gonna go. So weather is a big factor. (MF.33
22. **Financial, career, and housing stresses permeate daily life.**

I think finances are one of my biggest stresses combined with a little bit of looking towards the future. I mean some of that’s related to finances and when are we ever going to start getting ahead? When are we ever gonna be able to own property? .... Day to day is less so, aside from the constant worry about money.... It depends on the day, for us, I think it’s quite relevant on a daily basis given the point in our lives that we are at. (ADB.24)

... it’s about your job. It’s about making money and it’s about being at a certain level of income to sustain your life. (LP.16)

I work as a full time teacher and in the summer time I run a small business in the tourism industry (AK.17)

I have always worked 2 jobs....(KF.19)

... it’s hard to afford a condo, so at my age, having to deal with roommates... find affordable housing so that’s hard, you know what I mean?..for a person who enjoys his privacy and all the rest. (AN.16)

23. **Crime and fear of becoming a victim of crime is a widely held concern.**

There’s lots of alcohol and drugs. (Banff) It has it’s drawbacks. I mean there’s a bar around every corner in Banff and if you’re downtown late nights or something, it kinda gives you the creeps sometimes with all the drunkenness you’re surrounded with. You know...I got mugged. It was scary. (AN.17)

24. **The less stable lifestyle involving contract and seasonal employment appears more suited to a younger person or one with fewer responsibilities.**

... Like I’m young and I don’t have anybody to support. I don’t have a family right? So, I’m ok with the money I’m making right now.(SB.18)

25. **Flexibility in work, whether on a weekly or seasonal basis, is important in offering the individual more opportunities in temporal substitution, thus better coping ability.**

Well there’s no point in living here if you don’t have time to enjoy it. So what you negotiate I suppose in job negotiations and things like that, is flexibility of schedule... When I first started working here, I told them how much money I wanted. They said they didn’t have that much. I said no problem, just start knocking weeks off that you want me to work. You know, so they came back to me and said alright you get 8 weeks off a year. And I thought ok cause the thought
of working 50 weeks with 2 weeks off was just crazy to me. I said I want
significant flexibility and I only pick the days I want to work and when it’s a
powder day, I’m gone. You know, I’ll just come in on Saturday or whatever.
(AB.18)

So that’s another thing I’m always trying to negotiate and compromise, is how
much guiding do I do in the summer when I can get a ton of work vs how much do
I enjoy the area I chose to live in because you kind of, I mean I enjoy it in the
winter out here too but the summer is definitely the highlight for me. So I work all
year to have the summer recreational time and it, even like just before you came, I
had a whole bunch of calls about work over the weekend and I had recreational
plans. So there’s constant battle back and forth in the summer of ok, do I give up
this weekend to make some money, because you can and it’s a short season.
(SB.30)

26. A mountain recreation lifestyle values seamless integration of work and leisure.

...when I was working on the ski hills as a ski patroller, I was skiing everyday
anyway. So that was fine. I’d work for Parks where I’d sit outside doing things.
I’ve been a rafting guide, hiking guide. So more often than not my jobs have
enjoyed getting paid to do what I do on my days off anyway....even ski
patrolling there’s days when the last thing you want to do is slip your feet in a
frozen pair of boots and go out in a blizzard and pull fence. So there’s nasty
days. The pay off for that is there’s great days too. I mean it’s not my best days
of skiing, being at work. You know when there’s 2 feet of fresh, you’re the first
one skiing it and you’re working....(AB.19)

27. People negotiate through traditional financial leisure constraints.

Money comes into play in the sense that I gain to work and I’m not a woman of
leisure like that I choose my schedule base purely on what I’d want to do that day.
As far as the cost of the activities, gas to get to the trailhead, money for lunch but,
the beauty of hiking and back packing is that it doesn’t cost a whole lot of money.
Skiing on the other hand does. You generally pay for the pass and it kind of
motivates you to get out there and get your money’s worth, I guess. (KT.20)

28. Finding partners can be a social constraint especially for those engaged in
mountain recreation activity where solo activity is more difficult.

Finding partners there’s certain activities that I’m happy to do independently.
There’s other activities from a safety perspective with all the recent bear activity
that, yes I would like partners for. And Banff is a difficult community because it is
highly transient and I think a lot of people find they have difficulty making strong
relations that last. And there’s surprisingly large number of people who live here that don’t really engage in that mountain lifestyle which always shocks me....(KT.20)

....It’s very transient, so all my family partners and the gals that I’ve been scrambling with or used to scramble with, a lot of them are gone and so having to re-define friends who do those different things or who I can connect with in those different ways, it doesn’t always happen. (RS.20)

29. **Unplanned animal encounters represent a fear and a structural level constraint.**

...my fears are reality based, or healthy or unhealthy, it’s hard to determine but with you know, recent attacks, you know, Isabel Duvet, the guy who worked for the town of Banff...it does become quite frightening, having run into bears on the trail... definitely keeps me off certain trails at certain times of the day. (ADB. 34)

30. **Trail closures caused by animal activity or otherwise represent a structural leisure constraint – institutional.**

...we’ve planned certain hikes before and gotten turned around because of bear activity or running into a bear, so.... (KT.21)

On trail closures:

....those activities are tempered by improvements in bike technology.... People want that now and I’m saying well I don’t’, even though I like to go out every so often I don’t think it’s appropriate in a National Park for development, for trail enhancement to allow that. (RM.21)

31. **There is a belief that recreational land has been lost to residential and recreational development, which affects one’s daily recreation – structural constraint (Canmore more than Banff).**

The Silvertip, Benchlands, and Eagle Terrace developments have eliminated the best walking and mountain biking terrain in the valley. Here, golf course development - or should I say land sales surrounding a golf course - has gobbled up a huge amount of land. Being the south facing side of the valley, this was the most desirable land for both human and wildlife activity. If it had been developed without the golf course and over a smaller area, significant space could have been set aside to protect space for both human and wildlife traffic. There was little or no forethought. That is now lost. Result: although a law-abiding, middle-aged citizen; I am quite inclined to break the law and continue riding my favourite (closed) trails or trespass on the golf course.(FG.22)
32. **Displacement (spatial and temporal) exists as a way of life — it is a part of the lived experience of a Bow Valley resident.**

...when it gets busy on weekends, you stay away from downtown...you walk downtown, you don’t drive. Although I’m 3 blocks from downtown so, I can walk anyways, but for example when it gets really busy in Banff, I live 3 blocks off the main street, there’s cars parked all the way up to my street. So I know when it’s a busy on a long weekend in Banff because people are parking that far up. I go for hikes on trails when I know they’re either not busy or I go further that I know they’re not popular. I avoid going out to Lake Louise when I know it’s going to be a busy weekend. I know the routines and I just choose to do something else at that time. Is it an inconvenience? I wouldn’t say it’s that major. It’s just means your shifting one or two days. It’s a big deal maybe once in every 5 years it might be a big deal that it’ll stop you from doing what you want. (JC.24)

Like I actually wonder that sometimes when I’m here on weekends and I’m seeing all the tourists. I’m wondering where all the locals are hiding...There’s tons of people around so it kind of defeats the purpose of being in a small town. (SB.17)

33. **Rationalization is experienced yet generally does not emerge in a top-of-min manner.**

Generally speaking, the line-ups in a tourism town like Banff, aren’t that bad. I mean the people in Calgary for example, you’re probably gonna be waiting in line a lot more ways than you would be in Banff...So that’s part of the tourism thing. With me, I know, like being a mountain man, you know if I don’t want to be around the tourist, I go to where there’s nobody. (AH.25)

34. **To successfully negotiate crowds and crowding one needs to have the ability to be spatially and temporally flexible — beyond a flexible work schedule.**

I do have a steady 9 – 5 job though and I’m used to being a weekend warrior because of that, so I’m always sharing the trails at peak times with more crowds in the evenings but at the same time my employer’s also really flexible....(KT.25)

There are those who do more extreme activity and go farther afield and indicate that where they go they do not run into crowds as it requires specialized skills. (MR.25)
35. **Crowding is generally limited to the town site and ski areas.**

The only place that I find crowded is the town site. Like at the end of the day 95% of the people in Banff are in the town site so every once in awhile you get to the ski hill and encounter too many people....

(YK.27)

I hate to say it and you know we get a lot of bus activity but I don’t find that negotiating crowds really big, well I suppose maybe with alpine skiing again. If I think about that specifically, yes I probably wouldn’t be skiing on Good Friday and probably wouldn’t be skiing on the busiest days of the year. (ADB.27)

36. **Attempting to define the lifestyle is hard as it is elusive, but virtually everyone speaks of and aspires to a ‘lifestyle’ whether it is a mountain recreation (sport) lifestyle or an urban escape lifestyle. The lifestyle is casual, flexible, deliberately resisting normal societal pressures, with a focus on recreation versus financial success and the like.**

I wasn’t a climber until I moved to the Valley so it’s not about one activity. It’s about being outdoors and being healthy. It’s things like never having to get dressed up. Someone’s dressed up downtown they must have been to a funeral or had to go to the city for something. And I like that, like people don’t get judged for the car they drive cause a lot of people drive beaters here and the clothes they wear and you know, whether they have their hair done or not. Because it’s more important for the people in my circle anyway, that we spend time to get together or we get out and go biking. We don’t stay home and clean the house, go out and enjoy the mountains. I mean there is that tourism piece and that housing thing, but in spite of all that I think there’s just this certain kind of energy which is a totally non-descriptive thing but, but that’s why I’m here and that’s why a lot of people are here. (AB. 27)

.... yeah to me it’s about a lifestyle. It’s about choosing green exercise and living in a space where I’ve got trails that are you know, 5 minutes from my house and that I can run 20 km on trails without ever cutting pavement... (KT.29)
37. **Lifestyle and place identity appear to be highly linked.**

Oh absolutely! I had it when I first got here. I thought it was really cool because I lived here. Yeah, I’m so and so and I’m in Banff. I’m cool. I totally think that and I think there’s often identity in terms of what we do, the activities we do, I’m a climber, I a paddler, I am an outdoor fanatic. We get really attached to that and yeah there really good for us and gives a bit of a buzz but we’re more than that. And I don’t know. I don’t think everyone’s explored that. (RS.30)

38. **It can be difficult to find and access the actual ‘community’ in Banff (and Canmore).**

Sometimes I guess, with tourism a town can lack it’s own feeling of community, but Banff has a fairly strong community and those who come here quite often they become disillusioned by that because the community is kind of hard to find but once you find it, it’s very strong. And that’s because the community keeps itself somewhat aloof from the tourist community which is of course, transient. (AN. 31)

...when I moved to Banff I wasn’t part of the young transient, meet a lot of people, connect, you know just for a short periods. I was too old for that but I wasn’t married or have a child and so I wasn’t really part of that sector of the community either. And so I think that it, a lot of people who end up being in the Bow Valley, this is just based on, just people who I know. But people who end up living here in late 20’s, early 30’s who are single, I don’t know, I think that there are social constraints and you know both, and this is only to a certain degree I think with leisure. But I think that that’s a little bit of a factor. (ADB. 34)

It’s always that, a hurtful thing when you see a friend go and you don’t know when you’re gonna see them again. Now, for me, if I’d see someone who’s a drifter I just don’t, like it’s not that I don’t give you any of my time but I’m not gonna make you my best friend, I know you’re leaving, you know, and if you’re gonna stick around then I’ll make a good go of it... (KF.32)

39. **Contrary to some who need privacy, others need more constant social contact.**

The best thing. That would have to be the people... People you work with, people that I live with, people that I just know in town. (JJ.32)
On the social aspect:

Yes. I’m just a social butterfly… if it wasn’t for the social side like if all people were… No, I wouldn’t be here… I have to go where everybody knows my name. I do, the more, the better. (RC.32)

Oh, it’s very important. I wouldn’t be here. I could never live alone. You know, like I enjoy having roommates, like I don’t know, it’s very important… (KW.32)

40. Social status and ability to fit into the community are related to lifestyle.

I don’t think people realize it. I have it nailed down that Banff is very intense. There’s an overemphasis on activity. It’s a hard place to sit still. There’s a lot of guilt trips. You know if you come in here Joe and I go, “Joe, what did you do this weekend?” and you go, “oh I sat around”, and I hear a lot of that like and you’re sort of looked upon what do you mean you didn’t cycle to Lake Louise and back, like what’s your problem? (RM.33)

Well it’s funny, in my status here, I’m a lot less local because I commute to work. I would definitely rank lower and so, I mean partly I live in the Three Sisters so already you’re not considered part of the community and then I commute to the city. So there’s like 2 big strikes against you so… how people kind of rank in Canmore. There’s the people here who just come for the vacations, they’re the lowest of the low, right. They just own their real estate and they’re pushing all the locals out of town. They come for a few months and they travel for the rest of the year. And they probably have 2 or 3 other vacation homes you know, but yeah. It’s definitely a really interesting kind of social status ranking in Canmore and even in terms of what bike store you affiliate with or you know, which restaurant you go to or you know which clubs you join and that kind of thing. (SB.33)

41. There is general acceptance of the negative irritations of tourism in light of the positive economic impacts it yields.

…living in a place like this, serving tourism is bread and butter… everybody here is making their living from tourism. Even the guys building houses in Canmore, they’re busy because they’re tourists houses and there people working in the tourism industry buy them. So every level of society in Banff is either dealing directly with tourist or servicing the tourism industry. So you can’t get too down on tourism because that’s what makes it feasible to live here. (AH.37)
We need tourists. Not so much in the Banff Center but I mean, they’re annoying every once in awhile when you’re walking downtown and they’re in your area and their like, heads in the clouds...we need them. (KW. 37)

42. **Banff is generally viewed as possessing a greater range of cultural and urban opportunity than Canmore.**

...I would never live in Canmore. It’s too boring for me. (KF. 50)

Because people walk everywhere. In Canmore you have to drive. (but) I think there are advantages to living in Canmore, grocery stores there but those are small things that I can deal with...when I moved here (Calgary) I didn’t go to Canmore until I got the job in Banff but I’ve been to Banff a number of times. I think Canmore is a weekend getaway for people who live in the city and Banff is a tourist attraction. (SBB. 53)

43. **There is a general belief among residents that residential and recreational development in Canmore is altering local recreation by eliminating trails and eroding its ‘wildness’.**

... Actually, why should bikers or hikers have more rights than golfers? Because bikers and hikers don’t leave anything behind. When I’m gone, I’m gone. There’s not a golf course left behind to be fertilized and watered and mowed and have houses built around it. Before there was a golf course there, there were no more bikers and hikers out and that place was wilderness. (AB. 53)

Residential development and governmental decisions resulting from the increasing development (not necessarily the population), over the past 5-10 years, have completely changed (negatively) my recreational and leisure experience, as a resident of Canmore. (FG. 39)

The Three Sisters side of the valley has similarly devoured space crucial to preserving the human and wildlife needs of valley residents. The various levels of government have permitted development that has eliminated many recreational opportunities and has sufficiently compromised wildlife needs to the point that the Bow Valley may become "sterile of wild-ness" in comparison to my past experience. Recreationally, this development has fractionalized recreational opportunities and replaced traditional use with "baby-stroller and arthritic" oriented choices. (FG. 54)
44. **There is a general belief that because of its position in a national park and associated policies such as the need-to-reside policy, Banff will be better able to manage future growth.**

Canmore’s changed enormously in the last 10 years and mostly because of the second home ownership I think is fundamentally changing it. There are enormous challenges there because Canmore is attracting a different type of amenity migrant. And the need to reside legislation keeps all those people out of Banff. So we don’t have a large amount of retirees in Banff and a very small percentage relative to population. There isn’t a home ownership issue because Banff has the ‘need to reside’ and it restricts who can own a home here. (RM. 55)

6.6 Lived Experience Interview Phase 1 Categories and Interpretation

The purpose of this section is twofold: to present the Phase 1 Category findings for the Lived Experience research phase; and to relate the findings to relevant theoretical frameworks and literature where possible. The sections, 6.6.1 through to 6.6.11, represent the Phase 1 category-level data for the Lived Experience Interview research phase. All eleven Phase 1 Category-level findings represent highly saturated data as this is the third (qualitative) research and analysis phase. A number of statements may appear redundant or as common knowledge which is a result of the saturation process.

1. **People are drawn to a mountain tourism (high amenity) community because it provides an opportunity to pursue various lifestyles (from mountain sport to highly urban). (Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

That people are drawn to the Bow Valley to pursue a recreation lifestyle is a finding one can readily situate within the literature. Informants characterize the Bow Valley as a place with extraordinary leisure opportunity to suit a wide array of lifestyles. From the perspective of leisure constraints, the amenities of the Bow Valley represent the leisure facilitators related to setting affordances as described by Raymore (2002). Leisure facilitators function in opposition to leisure constraints, and Raymore (2002) argues that individuals will seek facilitators when pursuing leisure. The Bow Valley acts as a
magnet for those seeking a recreation-based lifestyle, an attraction that can also be explained through the concept of place attachment. Williams & McIntyre (2001) explain attraction to high amenity destinations as identity seeking in light of the complexities of modern life. That is, individuals attracted to the Bow Valley believe at some level that it is a place better suited to their identity or that their identity can flourish in such a place. This point is further supported by Stokowski (2002) in her explanation of place creation and how people tend to seek a place that is suited to their identity. In essence, the recreation setting affordances within the Bow Valley attract individuals who seek to incorporate those setting affordances in a broader daily (lived experience) lifestyle. The finding that people are drawn to the Bow Valley to pursue a recreation-based lifestyle also has found within previous qualitative research phases.

2. Structural constraints include challenges of seasonality, weather, fear of unplanned animal encounters, high cost of living, lack of appropriate career and housing options, loss of recreational land to development and other trail closures. (Concepts 18, 21, 30, 22, 32, 33)

The recognition of structural constraints is a highly saturated finding. Weather and fear of unplanned animal encounters represent environmental structural constraints (Walker & Virden, 2005). Seasonality (as it pertains to employment), inflexible work schedules, lack of career options and housing represent more typical structural constraints (Jackson & Scott, 2005). However, a lack of good career and housing options can be specific to the unique setting of a high amenity community given that those items seldom are linked to ‘leisure’ negotiation in most other settings. Loss of recreational land due to development and other trail closures represents a hybrid of territorial and institutional structural constraints. The former emphasizes access that is restricted by informal means (e.g. one is ‘unwelcome’) while the latter emphasizes access that is more formally restricted (e.g. trail closure due to bear activity) (Walker & Virden, 2005). Regardless, the result is a loss of recreational space that is deemed out of the control of the individual.
Structural constraints have appeared in a fairly consistent manner throughout all three qualitative research phases. Some of the structural constraints listed match those cited in the general constraints literature, while others such as loss of recreational land to development, and difficulty accessing good career and housing represent leisure constraints more specific to a high amenity community.

3. **Social constraints are perceived as difficulty in finding partners, fear of crime, and accessing the ‘community’.** (Concepts 23, 28, 38)

Difficulty in finding partners represents a typical inter-personal level constraint (Jackson & Scott, 2005). Fear of crime (of becoming a victim) and difficulty in accessing the community offer insights into the social environment of the Bow Valley. Perhaps it is difficult to access the community because of the recognition of the threat of crime. Difficulty in accessing the community may be a function of the behavioural community (Johnston, 1989) that it will be closed to new arrivals until such time that a satisfactory level of comfort may be achieved. Accessing the community and fear of crime are labelled here as inter-personal level constraints because of the heavy reliance on ‘others’ actions to create such situations. An argument can be made to label difficulty in accessing the community and fear of crime as territorial structural constraints (Walker & Virden, 2005) if the spatial element (community, streets, trails, etc.) is emphasized over the social element. In this case they are labelled as inter-personal because informant dialogue did appear to emphasize human interaction over access to certain spaces.

The social environment within high amenity communities may become, over time, more important to the individual than the physical environment (Brehn, et al: 2004). Social aspects of daily life were reported to be important in all three qualitative research phases. In some cases the social element added to the experience when other like minded individuals could be found, in other cases the social element detracted from the experience as in the case of second home owners’ experience of resentment, or statements from the Initial Focus Group phase regarding the negative aspects of a transient population. Throughout the three research phases, informants readily identified
value and/or behavioural based groups that either added or detracted from the recreation environment. The social element of the Bow Valley appears as prominent in shaping daily life as any other aspect of the setting.

4. People generally report little, if any, intra-personal level constraint, they believe they work through their constraints and that gaining access to recreation is not a constraint. (Concepts 19, 27)

In some cases intra-personal level constraints are simply not significant. Hudson & Gilbert (1999) reported a similar finding for a group of downhill skiers. Auster (2001) reported a similar finding for a group of female motorcycle riders. It appears that if there exists a strong connection between the individual and the activity there will be little intra-personal constraints reported. This basic connection between the person and the activity is further supported when an intra-personal leisure facilitator is considered, which implies a strong connection between the individual and the nature of the activity or setting (Raymore, 2002). This can explain the relative lack of intra-personal constraints reported by informants of this research project. It can be further explained by insights offered in 6.6.1 regarding the connection between the individual and place in relation to identity seeking. Informants for this study have lived in the Bow Valley for at least one year (except those of the Seasonal Worker focus group) thus I assumed that after such time these people have determined whether there was a good fit with the Bow Valley. Perhaps that by selecting interview participants who have lived in the area for at least one year, the likelihood of uncovering intra-personal constraints was less.

A common and related response throughout all three qualitative research phases was the sentiment that access to recreation, whether mountain or urban based, was not an obstacle in any way. Intra-personal level constraints were least reported of the three levels of constraints for all three qualitative research phases. The final point of the finding that people generally work through constraints is well accepted within the literature (Jackson & Scott, 2005).
5. **It is perceived by participants that recreational and residential development has significantly altered the recreational landscape of Canmore and that Banff is less susceptible to such change. (Concepts 42, 43, 44)**

This finding may appear similar to the structural constraint findings of loss of recreational land due to development and other trail closures found in 6.6.2, but it differs on the point of signifying a broader pattern of change within the community. Community change resulting from recreational and residential development within amenity migration previously has been reported (Lynch, 2006; Buckley, 2005). The tone of this finding is that such development has resulted in more than a loss of access to trails, development has altered the nature of the community and in basically a negative direction according to informants for this research project. Community change (physical, social and structural) has been conceptualized within various models (Butler, 1980; Perdue et al., 1999). The application of Plog’s Venturesome model (2004) appears most appropriate because it incorporates three planes of data: the psychographic make up of the individual in daily life; as a traveler; and the most likely destination for that person. A fourth plane can be inferred with its implication of the birth and ‘death’ of a destination - despite its touristic orientation. Plog (2004) claims that early arrivals to a destination are the venturesome type who require few amenities and that with growing popularity of a destination more ‘dependable’ types arrive. ‘Dependables’ seek more comfort amenities, causing the destination to change to suit their needs. In this research project, the mountain bike trail is symbolic of the venturer while the golf course is symbolic for the dependable. With the influx of those seeking more comfort amenities, there is a change of the behavioural environment resulting in contrasting values and behaviours (as previously noted in 4.6.7 and 4.6.8) and taken together, there is a sense that the ‘community’ has changed or is changing.

The Lived Experience interview participants expressed concerns surrounding over development and there is a perception that Banff, with its limits to growth and residency requirements, will experience less change than Canmore in the future. This is not surprising given that the growth limits and controls arising from the BBVS (1996)
signalled Canmore as the new target for recreational development. The quote below
characterizes the sentiment that Canmore is more susceptible to change than Banff:

Cradled by some of the world's most inspiring mountains and close to three ski
resorts, the picturesque Canadian hamlet of Banff Alberta with its hot springs,
fashion boutiques, and upscale restaurants, would be a tantalizing place to own a
vacation home if you only could. But since the town is located entirely in Banff
National Park property ownership is off-limits to all but park employees and
business operators, who can acquire real-estate only through renewable 42-year
leaseholds.

Not to worry. Fifteen minutes east on the TransCanada Highway the town of
Canmore has rolled out a welcome mat...with its location next to a national park
and its reputation as an easy to reach temperate climate zone on the doorsteps of the
mountains, Canmore has doubled its population over the last decade. (Castle, 2005,
p. 62)

Furthermore, the finding listed in 6.6.5 present implications for place attachment
of Bow Valley residents. Place attachment is largely a function of place identity and
place dependence (Kyle et al., 2004). The loss of trails due to development may
represent a slow erosion of place dependence while the overall change in the community
may represent a slow erosion of place identity for the venturesome type. The result
implies an element of mobility that with perceived changes some residents may leave to
find places more suited to their needs and values, while others will arrive as the same
changes are viewed as improvements that make the place more attractive.

6. Positive everyday trade-offs of living in the Bow Valley include easy access
to mountains and mountain recreation, a wide range of recreational
opportunities including cultural and urban, and access to a like-minded and
motivating group or community. (Concepts 19, 8, 10); and

7. Negative everyday trade-offs of living in the Bow Valley include concern
over career, concern over cost of living and concern over not being able to
own a home. (Concepts 7, 15, 16, 20)

The findings pertaining to positive and negative trade-offs of daily life in the Bow
Valley are discussed together because the two combined present the lived experience of
negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley. Everyday positive trade-offs include the ‘recreation’ precinct of daily life cited earlier (4.6.5) and the negative trade-offs represent the ‘sustainability’ precinct of daily life. For example, easy access to mountains, other recreation and other like minded individuals is negotiated in light of daily concerns over cost of living, poor career and housing options and the acceptance that one is not likely to own a home. The sustainability precinct is, essentially, sustaining a good quality of life or even remaining in the Bow Valley. It should be noted that considerable variation exists within this negotiation. For example, some participants harbour few concerns over career options (because they may have a good job) while others struggled over the daily commute into Calgary for employment.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no directly related literature to situate these findings. At best, literature related to resident support for tourism and specifically, aspects of tourism support studies that address quality of life for residents of tourism communities, can be applied. Most of these studies report a direct relationship between economic benefits and a reported improved quality of life (Getz, 1994; Johnson, Shepenger & Akis, 1994; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). Andereck & Jurowski (2004) carried out a comprehensive analysis of quality of life for residents of several tourism communities in Arizona and concluded that tourism and tourism amenities can improve overall quality of life for residents but these benefits are often overridden by negative effects such as increased noise, crime and cost of living. These authors go on to point out that living within a tourism community can result in considerable stress in the conduct of daily activities. While economic improvements of tourism are important to the residents of the Bow Valley, in general residents do not live for economic gain first, but for recreational reasons. The results of findings 6.6.6 and 6.6.7 appear to represent an extension of the existing literature pertaining to resident life in tourism (and high amenity) destinations.
8. The process of negotiation is imbedded in the lifestyle. (Concepts 9, 11, 42, 24, 25)

Recognition that the process of leisure negotiation is embedded in daily life and lifestyle is an extension of the previous findings (6.6.6 and 6.6.7). The daily life precincts of recreation and sustainability, or recreational aspirations and daily concerns are posited here to function concurrently. Leisure constraint literature presents negotiation in two basic ways. Firstly, as a process that we engage in when we are presented with a want or opportunity for leisure and generally specific to a particular activity (Nyapane et al., 2004). Secondly, constraints are reported in a general manner—for example, general constraints to leisure for a particular population (Hultsman, 1995; Gilbert & Hudson, 2000). The assertion underlying finding 6.6.8 is that the unique environment (physical, social and structural) of the Bow Valley gives rise to more constant consideration of leisure opportunity than in most other settings and consequently more constant negotiation. The basis for the assertion is two-fold. Firstly, since residents tend to migrate to the Bow Valley to pursue a recreation-based lifestyle recreation may be assumed to occupy a higher position in daily life than other environments. Secondly, the amenity rich environment appears to encourage a constant pursuit of recreation. For example, informants characterized the area as a fantasyland, a place that exists outside of everyday life, that every night is a weekend, that one needs to obtain a flexible job so that one can take full advantage of recreation opportunities (e.g. to ski on powder days). It can be argued that the Bow Valley represents a unique environment whereby the pursuit of recreation is more intense and constant than other settings, thereby making the negotiation both more constant and imbedded into everyday life,
9. The lifestyle in the Bow Valley for most people is characterized as living outside of everyday life where the recreation, community and everyday satisfaction are valued over career, financial success and delayed quality of life gratification. (Concepts 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 26, 36, 39, 40)

Category finding 6.6.9 is a further extension of previous findings 6.6.6 to 6.6.8. This finding frames earlier data into a more cohesive statement regarding daily lifestyle. Virtually every informant within the three qualitative research phases spoke of lifestyle as a way to explain either how one lives, or what one is pursuing. Lifestyle, as a term and concept, appears to be a central organizing principle of daily life and a way to communicate quality of life satisfaction - for example, "I have a pretty good lifestyle here", was a common statement. Furthermore, it is through the expression of a unique lifestyle that most informants distinguished themselves from others either within the Bow Valley or elsewhere. The lifestyle that is most often referred to is one that values recreation satisfaction and one where recreation is highly integrated into daily life above values that generally are revered by society such as a high paying job, a house, and a rising career.

There is little reference to lifestyle within the leisure literature as it tends to adopt a specific activity as the unit of analysis. Stebbins (2005) conducted a study of mountain recreation enthusiasts in the Canmore area from the perspective of serious leisure. He concluded that a leisure lifestyle is central to their identity and defined it as

...a distinctive set of shared patterns of tangible behaviour that is organized around a set of coherent interests or social conditions or both. It is explained and justified by a set of related values, attitudes and orientations and under certain conditions, becomes the basis for a separate, common social identity for its participants (p.43)

Stebbins' description of the leisure lifestyle in the Canmore area supports my research findings. The basic positive and negative trade-offs of daily life, when engaged in a conscious manner, result in a negotiation process that is imbedded in daily life and a shared lifestyle of accepted circumstances and values that distinguishes each group from all others.
10. Recreation coping strategies are experienced on a daily basis with temporal and spatial substitution (displacement) being most prominent and rationalization and product shift also present. (Concepts 24, 32, 33, 36, 37)

Phase 1 category data 6.6.10 represents a highly saturated finding. Although not all recreation coping strategies are reported to be experienced on a daily basis, they are all common and the majority of interview informants reported that spatial and temporal displacement is recognized to be a part of daily life. There is little directly comparable literature, as noted earlier, however the work of Manning & Valliere (2001) who reported on recreation coping strategies of residents adjacent to Acadia National Park in Maine, is most comparable. Their research findings offers support for finding 6.6.10 they found over 90% of respondents reported using some strategies, and spatial and temporal displacement was most common. The methodological approach of my research project represents an extension of recreation coping research to include a broader spatial and temporal frame, of recreation and daily life, while maintaining a similar context of recreation to other research. The specific extension is the assertion that daily life of residents of a high amenity destination who are there primarily for a recreation motive represents a unique recreation application of the theoretical framework.

Recreation coping as a data category has emerged as prominent in all three qualitative research phases, because spatial and temporal displacement was consistently experienced.

11. Place attachment appears to be linked to place identity and lesser to place dependence. (Concepts 1, 8, 6, 17, 39, 42)

Place attachment broadly refers to the emotive aspect of the human-environment relationship (Stokowski, 2002). Within recreation it has been associated with two sub-categories - place identity and place dependence (Kyle et al., 2004). Place identity refers to personal connection with place because of its ability to support one’s perceived identity, while place dependence refers to a reliance on place to carry out specific, desired activities (Kyle et al., 2004). Concept data numbers 10 and 37 specifically refer to place...
dependence and place identity respectively. Numerous other concept-level data refer indirectly to the concept by noting either positive or negative factors that affect one’s negotiated relationship with place and may include crowding, access to recreation amenities, perceived changes to the environment, social aspects and more.

It is clear that much can be written about place attachment and the Bow Valley resident, however in the discussion in this section place identity appears to be more prevalent among residents than place dependence. This statement is supported by Williams & McIntyre (2001) who claim that place attachment within high amenity destinations is largely a function of people seeking a place that supports a perceived notion of themselves. Those who chose to reside in the Bow Valley and remain for an extended period of time generally have exhibited strong place identity through statements about how Banff or Canmore represents who they are, how they feel they can be themselves, or that it is the place they have been searching for a long time. I assume that place identity is strong for those who chose to remain in the Bow Valley as their resolve to remain constantly is challenged by the sustainability precinct of daily life. Place identity is likely more prominent than place dependence, because recreation activities within the Bow Valley are generally substitutable within other mountain settings. The initial attraction to the Bow Valley may involve high place dependence, such as mountaineering for someone from Saskatchewan, but over time it is understood by the new arrival that mountaineering or skiing can be carried out widely in the Rockies. This is true for most activities that may be engaged within the Bow Valley. The only exception appears to be an eclectic assortment of leisure opportunities offered in Banff that range from hard mountain-sport through to world class arts. Someone who is motivated to obtain for such variety may be connected strongly through place dependence (no specific examination of this question was carried out). People who are considering a move from the Bow Valley generally indicated they would move to a smaller centre that offers similar recreation opportunities (mountain sports) but is less urban, signalling that’s for the, the attachment to the Bow Valley is less a function of the ability to carry
out specific activities or place dependence. Place identity, although not stated explicitly in the literature, includes the social element which appears to be a central draw to the Bow Valley following a certain amount of time or after social connections have been established. Brehn et al. (2004), make the claim that over time place attachment to high amenity communities becomes a function of the social connections as the initial draw of the environment becomes less important. Despite the presence of both place identity and place dependence it is, I suggest, that place identity is more prominent in daily life for residents of Banff and Canmore than place dependence.

The concept of place attachment has been noted throughout the previous qualitative research phases from statements of place creation and re-creation (place identity) in the Initial Focus Group phase, through to sanctuary and respite offered by a second home (place dependence) in the Second Home Owner research phase.

6.7 Lived Experience Interview Phase 2 Categories

The following statements represent a further reduction of Phase 1 category data into cohesive statements about the Lived Experience interview research phase.

1. The Bow Valley (Banff and Canmore) is a high recreation amenity and tourism environment. It possesses extraordinary breadth and depth of recreation opportunity for a residential community and distinct from other typical residential centres. (Phase 1 Categories 1, 9)

2. Most residents are motivated to live in or migrate to the Bow Valley to experience a lifestyle that is focussed on recreation satisfaction, and that is distinct from normal everyday urban life. (Phase 1 Categories 1, 9, 6)

3. Within the Bow Valley, which is biased toward recreation and leisure, a person’s leisure constraints serve to influence the person’s fit or place within the community. Constraints act as parameters for fit within community. (Phase 1 Categories 2, 3, 4)

4. Within the Bow Valley, recreation coping strategies influence everyday decision making (about recreation and leisure pursuits and other everyday activities) within the community. (Phase 1 Categories 10, 6, 7)

5. For most residents, living in the Bow Valley involves everyday trade-offs. These trade-offs favour recreation and community based satisfaction, while tending to hinder
satisfaction in achieving typical societal goals involving wealth creation, career advancement, and home ownership. (Phase 1 Categories 2, 3, 4, 6, 7)

6. Place attachment is constantly negotiated as a function of a person’s motivation to migrate to the Bow Valley, desired lifestyle, consideration of trade-offs, and perceived threats to place. (Phase 1 Categories 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11)

6.8 Lived Experience Interview Summary

The Lived Experience Phase 2 categories above provide a summary of the results of the interview data. Additional insight is offered in terms of the results I found not surprising in their presence, surprising in their presence and what findings were surprising in their absence.

Three findings I felt were not surprising in their presence given previous emergent findings of previous research phases and associated literature. Firstly, the presence of a strong recreation and leisure motive to reside, regardless of the type of recreation sought from mountain to urban. Secondly, that virtually all participants emphasized that everyday negotiation was in relation to sustaining the lifestyle or ability to remain in the Bow Valley in a satisfying manner, more than any leisure specific negotiation (this finding is supported earlier by focus group research). Thirdly, different groups or types of residents emerged based on their motivation to reside in the area and the level of resources (financial, career security, education, general fit into the existing economy) at their disposal to negotiate with (and sometimes increased with length of tenure in the Bow Valley).

Emergent findings I found surprising were twofold. Firstly, those leisure constraints which generally emerged in a post hoc manner served to guide, if not dictate, the way in which an individual fit into the community. That within a high amenity recreation environment leisure constraints known as intra-personal, inter-personal and structural level constraints mostly determine what recreation activities one can do or not do, where one can live, social reference groups, and so on despite that these constraints
can and are often negotiated. Secondly, the prominent role of mobility as a central feature of daily life in the Bow Valley proved surprising. From the time of arrival, or mobility to the area, one is connected with concerns such as: 'is life in the Bow Valley feasible?', and if so, for how long?; loss (mobility) of friends moving out of the area, and creating a meaningful social life in a transient community. The entry of others who do and do not share similar values and recreation preferences and even competing activities can alter the physical and built environment accordingly. Also, there is a desire to limit mobility into the area to only those who share similar values and recreation preferences. It was surprising to find that to remain and avoid mobility out of the area, one will likely need to accept significant trade-offs relative to both an urban and smaller community reference. Essentially, from the time of arrival one is concerned with in and out bound migration as it relates to everyday quality of life, recreation pursuits and lifestyle. Mobility emerged to be a central feature of daily life in the Bow Valley.

What was surprising in its absence was minimal as a high degree of data saturation had occurred to this stage. However, if I had to select one item it was the relatively low degree of conflict and stress in relation to tourists (short stay) and tourism. The spatial and temporal corridors of tourists appear to be well recognized, accepted, and negotiated.

Finally, there appears to be sufficient cohesive data or themes to begin to form theory surrounding observed action/interaction within the specific conditions of amenity migration in the Bow Valley. The process of building and verifying theory is central to the grounded theory approach (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) as described earlier in Chapter Two. The next chapter aims to summarize the considerable data emerging from three phases of qualitative research and form it into a cohesive working theory.
7 Summary of Qualitative Findings – Typology of Amenity Migrants

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is threefold: firstly to present a cohesive summary of the three phases of qualitative research; secondly, to present working theory in the form of a typology of amenity migrants; and lastly to situate the role of the final quantitative research phase. The three preceding chapters have yielded considerable data and while each has included a chapter summary, what is needed is a review of the sum of the qualitative data into a more cohesive form. Corbin & Strauss (1990) state that patterns and variations and regularity need to be accounted for and while this has been carried out within each chapter, this point, following three qualitative research phases, represents a natural break with the transition to the quantitative research phase, therefore a more cohesive summary of patterns and regularity of data will be presented here (as presented in Figure 7.0).
Corbin & Strauss (1990), state that hypotheses about the relationships among categories should be developed and verified throughout the process. The typology of amenity migrants, within this chapter, represents the development of a working theory which serves to summarize data and provide a working theory to be verified in the following research phase. The chapter begins by summarizing the three Phase 2 Category-Level statements of each of the phases with interpretation and discussion. Next, thirteen qualitative research summary statements are presented as further analysis but with the aim of addressing the qualitative data in summary rather than each phase as has been the process. Next, the typology of amenity migrants is presented and discussed as the working theory. The chapter closes with a brief section that links the qualitative results to the final phase of research, The Bow Valley Recreation Survey.

7.2 Summary of Phase 2 Category Data

An appropriate first step is to present the summary of the three Phase 2 Category-Level findings which appears in Table 7.1. Each of the columns in Table 7.1 represents the final Phase 2 Category-Level data for each of the three research phases.

The three Phase 2 Category statements for the Initial Focus Group research emphasize the relationship of residents to tourism and general tourism related development. The first statement is about residents and tourists and that each attempts to find a place within the community such as the behavioural community of Johnston (1989) and later the work Walker & Virden (2005). The second statement relates to the way that participants spoke of their communities in light of tourism and related development, acknowledging that they benefit from the development yet most bemoan the requirement of living within it. This theme is evident throughout the ‘resident support for tourism’ area of literature.

Anderereck & Vogt (2000) report on a similar situation with residents of several small Arizona tourism communities. They emphasize that tourism can result in substantial economic benefit, access to extra-ordinary recreation amenities as well as
considerable stress in the course of daily life. The third statement relates to leisure negotiation. At this early stage of research there was some recognition that residents actually were negotiating with the structural aspects of place more than access to any one particular recreation activity. This finding is well situated within the call to expand leisure constraints research into non-traditional environments (Jackson, 2000). Within the revised model of leisure constraints (Walker & Virden, 2005), which acknowledges a variety of structural constraints related to the environment and the presence of broader setting attributes or broader phenomenon, both elements are directly applicable to the findings of this research project.
The three Phase 2 Category-Level findings of the Second Home Owner interview research are presented in the second column in Table 7.1. The three summary findings are largely descriptive statements which provide insights into this group. The first statement describes the general presence of the second home owner within the community, their motivation and general pattern of activity. The recreation of this group is mostly solitary and close to home. Their motivation is related to themes of escape and respite, which leads to more solitary forms of recreation. The result resembles distancing techniques used by some hikers to achieve similar goals (Schneider, 2000).

The second summary statement reports on the overall low levels of stress reported in recreation and daily life, as well as with the presence of leisure constraints. This is not a surprising result given that the goal of the experience is to escape and rejuvenate and that recreation patterns tend to remain close to home, thus minimizing the likelihood of stress from crowding and congestion. It can be argued this represents somewhat of a reverse-displacement, that is, rather than being displaced out of the area; second home owners are, by choice, displaced within their homes and surrounding areas. The most notable type of constraint is that of resentment, as previously noted.

The final summary statement relates to satisfaction and it is both similar to and different than to that of the full-time resident group. This finding is similar because satisfaction is said to be related to frequency of use for the second home owner or how much time they have in the Bow Valley (although lending the home to others also accounts for satisfaction) which is a similar struggle of ‘sustainability’ for some full-time residents. The finding of second home owners is different from that of full time residents because it is understood to be sporadic use or visitation with little desire to be a part of the community and thus different from full-time residents.

The Phase 2 Category-Level responses for the first two research phases indicate that the Bow Valley is a contested place. Recreation and/or leisure are consumptive acts and thus understood to be political (Stokowski, 2002). It has been soundly demonstrated that a variety of groups are present within the Bow Valley at any one time and that in
many cases their recreation goals and behaviours are not in sync. Communities of like-minded people are formed similar to the phenomenon of behavioural communities (Johnston, 1989). These recreation-based communities vie for a seemingly limited resource of accessible recreation space whether adjacent to the town-site or beyond, thereby implying that the Bow Valley represents a contested space of recreation.

The six Phase 2 Category-Level responses for the Lived Experience research phase are found in column three of Table 7.1. It is clear by now that the Bow Valley is not a typical residential community. The majority of participants and informants report migrating to the area specifically because it contains an abundance of recreation amenities and opportunity, which is different from their previous communities. The Bow Valley represents a different residential setting and one that fits the general understanding of a high recreation amenity setting (Moss, 2006).

The second summary statement, and related to the first, makes clear that the overwhelming majority of residents in the area are there to experience a distinct recreation-based lifestyle that better (compared to their previous setting) integrates recreation into daily life. This notion rests well with what is known about the motivation of amenity migrants in general, that they are motivated to reside in areas of exceptional recreational and cultural opportunity (Price, Moss, Williams, 1997; Perdue 2004).

The third summary statement, as previously noted in Chapter Six, suggests that the phenomenon of leisure constraints (intra-personal, inter-personal and structural) serves to guide the individual in deciphering their fit within the community more than dictating access to specific recreation. Intra-personal level constraints or facilitators suggest a strong value-based fit with the place (Raymore, 2002). Inter-personal level constraints or facilitators suggest direction in the selection of reference groups and the general formation of the behavioural communities (Raymore, 2002; Johnston, 1989; Walker & Virden, 2005). Structural level constrains or facilitators suggest one’s parameters of lifestyle - what they can afford to do or not, where they can live, and the number of jobs they require to maintain ability to reside in the area. This application of
leisure constraints represents an alternate understanding of the construct and one that extends it to behavioural geography's human-environment relationship framework.

The fourth summary statement relates to the preceding statement: if leisure constraints act to guide a person's fit within the community, then the recreation coping model serves to guide a person's daily life through temporal and spatial displacement and substitution, rationalization of negative stress, product shift[ing] the community toward enhancing a person's place attachment and connection with place or detracting attachment and connection to place, and direct action of attempting to make change. The notion that recreation coping strategies affect a person's daily life is supported directly and indirectly in studies of the recreation coping model that involve resident populations (Manning & Valliere, 2001; Robertson & Regula, 1994).

The fifth statement emphasizes that trade-offs of the recreation and sustainability precincts are a part of daily life in the Bow Valley. The trade-offs are characterised as those which offer a person a unique alternative to traditional daily life but also hinder a person's ability to achieve traditional marks of success such as wealth, career advancement and even at times home ownership. This is an important statement which perhaps best underscores the negotiation undertaken by most residents. The negotiation of trade-offs that include elements of leisure constraints and recreation coping strategies (as noted earlier) but in the end are framed by simple trade-offs of lifestyle where at one end is recreation and mountain life and the other is the hallmarks of societal success. This finding does not easily situate within known literature related to this field. Perhaps the ideas of Williams & McIntyre (2001) that the underlying driver for amenity migration is contemporary society's loss of connection with traditional anchors of identity and that search for identity is now permitted to roam far from home.

The final statement is critical to understanding a basic level of daily tension which is understood to be a person's on-going connection with the place. For virtually all research participants the Bow Valley represents a place other then home and the potential to leave always remains despite that one may have lived in the area for more than twenty
years. The elements of place attachment (Kyle et al., 2004), together, underlie the constant struggle to remain or leave and how to perceive the place, as experiencing threats to its integrity, as embracing oneself through penetration of the community, etc. Phase 2 Category statements of the Lived Experience interview phase suggest, as did previous findings, that the Bow Valley is a contested place with respect to leisure, and identity (Stokowski, 2002).

7.3 Summary of Qualitative Findings – Final Categories

Following is a summary of the final qualitative research category statements for the three qualitative research phases of the research project. The final qualitative research category statements represent additional analysis of data but with the aim of combining themes of the three phases together rather than addressing each separately. The purpose of this combination is two-fold: the first is to take stock of saturated data that serve as the foundation of theory building; and the second is to further analyze the category level data in light of the research project goals, to bring them back to the aim of the research (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The final statements are presented in relation to the negotiated human and environment relationship which frames the research project.

Statements that generally relate to the environment include:

1. Bow Valley is a unique place to live in relation to most other places. Its heavy emphasis on the supply of physical and built recreation amenities and culture of recreation activity make it different from other non-tourist residential centres.

2. Residents of the Bow Valley are, for the most part, amenity migrants. The exception is those who are there by birth, have followed another there, or those who have migrated for purely economic reasons.

3. Residents demonstrate a love–hate relationship with tourism and tourists as they recognise the value and necessity of tourism but find it bothersome at times.
Conversely, most residents feel that rapid residential recreational development related to second home ownership is largely negative.

4. Mobility is a central feature of daily life in the Bow Valley manifested in concerns brought about by the constant threat of possible exit by the individual through to concerns about in-and-out-bound migration of friends or potential friends to the area.

5. The community and surrounding area (environment) change by the expression of recreation activity as a function of demand. The more perceived demand there is for a specific type of activity and resource, the more supply will emerge over time (wherever possible). The destination evolves with the recreation demands of its residents. As the type of resident changes so does the type of recreation and supply of that recreation amenity (where possible) and the destination continues to evolve.

Statements that generally relate to the human aspect of the relationship include:

6. Most people migrate to the Bow Valley for the amenities and the associated belief that they will be able to experience a recreation-rich lifestyle that is out-of-the-ordinary; to live outside of what most consider normal everyday life.

7. There are different types of residents who are distinguished by their motivation to live in the Bow Valley: their lifestyle and resources they possess to negotiate the structure of the environment.

8. Residents distinguish tourists by motivation to visit, financial resources, and activities carried out while in the Bow Valley.

Statements that generally relate to the negotiation aspect of the relationship include:

9. Negotiation specific to leisure participation does exist but it is overshadowed by the everyday negotiation (primarily with social and structural aspects of the environment) of sustaining a satisfactory lifestyle within the Bow Valley.
10. Leisure constraints are not readily apparent to residents although they clearly emerge in various discussions and post-hoc analysis. Within an environment that is heavily biased toward recreation and leisure experiences (such as the Bow Valley) leisure constraints serve to determine the fit or how and where the individual will fit within the community. That is, intra-personal constraints (facilitators) are high and there is generally a strong fit between individual values and the place. Inter-personal (social) constraints provide direction for who one will connect with or not, reference groups, whether one can find partners to carry out specific recreation activities, and if one can connect with the larger community or not. Structural constraints (financial, physical, weather, skills, access, work) largely will determine one’s expressed identity based on what activities (lifestyle) one can or cannot carry out, what one can afford, and where one can live and how. Structural constraints provide an individual with parameters for their place within a leisure-based community.

11. All recreation coping strategies are present at some level, and temporal and spatial displacement and substitution appear to be imbedded in daily life. Coping strategies often are socially learned over time: these strategies include, substitution options, collective acceptance of rationalization, collective notions of product shift, and comfort and entitlement in seeking direct action. Recreation coping strategies mostly are developed over time as a person learns more about the resource (displacement and substitution), its history and future plans (product shift), its position (within tourism and amenity migration) and rhythms (rationalization) and its institutions (direct action). Recreation coping strategies guide one’s daily life in recreation and often beyond.

12. People who stay in the Bow Valley generally are those who are highly motivated to experience a mountain and resort recreation lifestyle and to live outside of typical everyday life, and they have managed to negotiate through the many
challenges of living a satisfactory lifestyle in the Bow Valley. They have strong place attachment to the Bow Valley specifically.

13. Generally, people who leave are those who are highly motivated to experience a mountain and resort recreation lifestyle and to live outside of typical everyday life but have not managed to negotiate through or find a satisfactory lifestyle in the Bow Valley. The people who leave may be as motivated as those who stay but they do not have the means and/or the same level of place attachment to the Bow Valley specifically, so they will seek out other destinations to satisfy their needs.

In summary, people move into the Bow Valley largely to experience the recreation, culture and aesthetic attributes of the environment. There, most discover that recreation and culture opportunities generally are accessible and satisfying but one must continually negotiate with the broader environment (physical, social, and structural) in order to remain and maintain a satisfying lifestyle. It is further understood or simply assumed that this negotiation tends to be most intense in early stages of residency, that it gets better if one can manage to remain through the lean years. As others migrate to the area the environment changes in many ways from the cost of living, to increased competition for resources, to the overall community character, which in turn makes the very environment which is being negotiated dynamic. Each potential resident is attached to the place in varying degrees. For some residents, the Bow Valley would represent an attachment of identity and it appears that they are likely to remain. For others the attachment represents more of place dependence such that they depend on the environment to carry out the activities they desire and attachment to place appears more precarious for this group as they can often move to other mountain (or party) communities that may be more liveable (cost of living, etc.). Some will stay and others will leave although each arguably imprints the environment during their stay.

The relationship between the amenity migrant and the Bow Valley is such that amenity migrant is drawn to the environment (Bow Valley) by its attributes and
subsequently imprint the environment through recreation expression resulting in a changed environment. For example, those residents who express their recreation demand by riding mountain bikes, reinforce the presence of existing trails, create informal trails, or are the reason for the development of purpose built mountain bike parks/trails, (they may also precipitate the presence of mountain bike shops in town). The behavioural expression of recreation alters the environment and thus the constantly evolving attributes that serve to attract others amenable to those new attributes. This same pattern of imprint can be identified for many forms of recreation and leisure expression. The new attributes in sum add to the evolving character and perhaps even identity of the place which further serves to attract, retain or repel those who may wish to make the Bow Valley their new home. The high amenity recreation environment evolves with the recreation expression of its residents.

7.4 Typology of Amenity Migrants in a Mountain Resort Community

In the section that follows I present the Typology of Amenity Migrants in a Mountain Resort Community (Table 7.1) and its underlying rationale. The typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of Amenity Migrants in a Mountain Resort Community</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five amenity migrant types of the Bow Valley

1. Those seeking a mountain-recreation-lifestyle and, rely on the community for a livelihood and **make it work** through either sacrificing of career, home ownership and/or work life.

2. Those seeking a mountain-recreation-lifestyle and rely on the community for a livelihood and **can not make it work** as concerns of cost of living, home ownership, career, and education result in **leaving the community**.

3. Those that seek a career and/or a mountain-recreation-lifestyle and have found careers compatible with the community (Parks, senior tourism, etc.) and have carved out relatively normal lives (children play hockey etc.) and stay.

4. Those who are seeking hospitality careers (not senior positions) and very strong social connections and not interested in a mountain-recreation-lifestyle (i.e. the vampires) and they stay (as they say until the party is over which may be many years)

5. Those second home owners and/or Canmore residents who commute to work elsewhere and thereby do not rely on the community for a livelihood who can make it work and stay.
represents working theory in accordance with grounded theory protocols (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) resulting from the three-part qualitative research component of my research project. The first part of this section presents the rationale for the typology while the latter part presents a complete typology and a brief explanation.

Three key findings from the qualitative research iterations emerged to form the basis of support for the typology. The three key findings or variables include motivation to reside, the ensuing lifestyle resulting from the motivation to reside, and the nature of one’s negotiation. A fourth overarching finding is that five separate groups can be abstracted based on the three variables presented.

Figure 7.1 presents the link between emergent findings and the typology. Questions regarding one’s motivation to reside in the Bow Valley were included in all three qualitative data collection iterations. The most common response was to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle that involves a connection to both mountain (including backcountry) and urban recreation and that is generally associated with seeking employment in the Bow Valley. This finding supports Types 1, 2, 3 and to lesser extent Type 5 given that mountain recreation can be broadly defined. Motivation to experience urban type recreation within a mountain resort environment emerged in focus group and interview research in relation to both urban nightlife and urban family type of recreation lifestyle. This finding supports Types 3 and 4. Closely related to one’s motivation are the ensuing behaviours, or a set of behaviours referred to as lifestyle.
Three distinct types of lifestyles emerged from the results of all three data collection iterations: the mountain recreation lifestyle, the family recreation lifestyle and the urban-nightlife lifestyle. The mountain recreation lifestyle can be broadly defined from an extreme mountain sport recreationist to an avid downhill skier to a person who regularly walks the perimeter of the town site. The mountain recreation lifestyle has been well documented throughout all iterations and relates to Types 1, 2, 3, 5. Another lifestyle type is the family recreation lifestyle which emerged from the all three iterations.

Focus group data included participants who had tempered their more extreme recreation and shifted almost exclusively toward family recreation typical of any urban centre (swim lessons, hockey, dance classes, etc.). Second home owner interview results reported on participants whose primary motive for purchase was 'family recreation'. Lived Experience results included participants who’s ideal day and lifestyle was family recreation oriented. The family recreation lifestyle refers to Types 3 and 4. The urban-
nightlife lifestyle emerged from the Lived Experience interview findings and relates to Type 4.

Completing the conceptualization of the typology is the nature of the reported conflict (between the individual and the environment) which includes four basic types with some additional variation. Firstly, what is established is that leisure negotiation, as commonly noted throughout the chapter, occurs primarily with aspects of the environment and less so with typical leisure pursuits. The negotiation with the environment also generally involves significant trade-offs for the individual. This finding clearly emerged in all three iterations and supports Types 1, 2, 3, and 4 but considerably less for Type 5. Within this broad negotiation scenario the Type 1 group accepts the various trade-offs and remains in the Bow Valley. The Type 2 group does not accept the trade-offs for various reasons and migration out of the Bow Valley is an important part of the negotiation. The Type 3 group reports having experienced that intense negotiation phase as reported in Types 1 and 2 but they have since become considerably more established and/or gained increased resources, or they have become satisfactorily integrated into the social and structural environment and report less intense negotiation.

Emerging from the Lived Experience interview iteration was a unique form of negotiation associated with Type 4 who represents a person who is generally described as a long-time tourism or hospitality worker. This group of participants reported considerably less intensity of negotiations and trade-offs in general. They struggled less with issues of home ownership, work schedules, presence of tourists, educational advancement, career stress, and living in a transient community compared to Types 1, 2 and 3. Type 5 represents a person that generally is focussed on a mountain recreation lifestyle but unlike all other types they do not rely on the Bow Valley for their livelihood. This group emerged in the Second Home Owner interview and to a lesser degree in the Lived Experience interview iterations. This group reported considerably less and in some cases no confliction with the social and structural elements of their environment.
The three findings of motivation to reside, ensuing lifestyle, and nature of negotiation combine to support the development of the working theory of the Typology of Amenity Migrants in a Mountain Resort Community.

7.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of three distinct qualitative data collection and analysis iterations involving exploratory focus group research, second home owner interviews, and lived experience interview research. The results were presented in accordance with grounded theory whereby data was presented from the broader concepts and reduced to two category stages (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). A summary for each iteration was included along with the Phase 2 categories. Cumulative data reduction culminated in a series of thirteen statements. Grounded theory calls for constant theory building and testing (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) and this chapter closed with a working model, a typology of amenity migrants for mountain resort communities.

The typology represents the evolution of my research project to this point. My research project began with the goal of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley and while leisure negotiation clearly is addressed in the typology, other themes and categories of data emerged to shift inquiry towards mobility and the changing character of the destination or environment as a result of recreation expression. The human-environment relationship remains the over arching framework and perhaps more relevant as leisure negotiation has been linked to destination or environmental change.
8 Descriptive Results of Bow Valley Recreation Survey (BVRS)

8.1 Introduction

Chapter Eight presents a statistical description of the sample and questionnaire items for the BVRS prior to the presentation of the related segmentation analysis in Chapter Nine. Survey results are presented in two separate but related chapters. Each research phase builds upon the previous phase toward the development of theory. In Chapter Two the process of theory building, within the grounded theory approach, was explained as observing activity within a phenomenon as action/interaction in light of changes in response to prevailing conditions (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) which is the approach undertaken for my research project.

Figure 8.0 presents the phases of research that together have served as the basis of theory building. The purpose of this final phase of research is threefold: to verify the
working theory of the typology of amenity migrants in a mountain resort community, in doing so; to return to the field to further explore the relevance of mobility and perceived changes on the environment in relation to the original goal of exploring negotiated leisure utilizing a quantitative method. Corbin & Strauss (1990) stress that it may be important for the researcher to return to the field to verify certain key propositions toward theory building. Quantitative research methods within grounded theory is not common, (Jennings, 2001) but as in the case of Hardy (2005) qualitative and quantitative methods in researching the stakeholder dynamic related to tourism development in a small community in Australia.

Descriptive results in this chapter are presented in tables. Descriptive statistics are the product of SPSS Version 14 for Windows. Frequency tabulations are presented as frequency tables and, where appropriate, with interval data. Descriptive statistics including the mean standard deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis are presented and explained (Creswell, 2008). Response bias is discussed in conjunction with the chapter summary. Missing values are few in number and presented with each table. Missing values represent either one missed section or a missed category response. Missing values are discussed but not presented as a separate category. Discussion is presented with each table, including observations of the results in relation to the sample and the broader research project in accordance with grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Reference is made to specific concept and category-level data in brackets where appropriate, otherwise reference to broader findings is made in a more general manner.

8.2 Description of the Data Set

This section describes the data set for the BVRS in relation to the population. Tables 8.2.1 through to 8.2.4 provide a description of the response rate, the stratified response rate, and age and gender comparisons between the sample and population.
8.2.1  **Response Rate**

Table 8.1 describes the overall and stratified response rate for the BVRS. Questionnaires were distributed in a proportional manner. The total population for the Bow Valley is 25,128 (Banff 2007 Census, Canmore 2006 Census), the Banff population is 8,721 and the Canmore population is 16,407 resulting in a proportional distribution of questionnaires of 65% or 784 for Canmore and 35% or 416 for Banff. A total of 264 usable questionnaires were returned for Canmore resulting in a 33.6% response rate. A total of 99 usable questionnaires were returned for Banff resulting in a 23.7% response rate. The combined response rate for the study is 30.25%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Questionnaires Distributed N</th>
<th>Response N</th>
<th>Response Rate Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canmore</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements of what constitutes a reasonable response rate vary greatly due to the wide range of hybrid sampling procedures employed. Perez & Nadal (2005) carried out a study of host community perceptions of tourism in the Balearic Islands of Spain employing a mail-back sampling procedure similar to this study, also targeting residents similar to my research. Perez & Nadal (2005) mailed a total of 4,500 questionnaires and 850 were returned for a response rate of 19% and once incorrect addresses were taken into account they determined to have achieved a 28% response and noted that it was comparable to other studies. Additionally, I was cautioned that Bow Valley residents have been survey-saturated which may have contributed to the response rate.

8.2.2  **Description of the Sample to Population by Community Stratification**
I made an effort to stratify the sample by the two communities of Banff and Canmore. Table 8.2 reports on how representative the sample was to the Banff and Canmore populations. Frequency analysis revealed that 72.7% of the sample was from Canmore in relation to its 65.2% of the total population of the two communities. Conversely, 27.3% of the sample was from Banff in relation to its 34.8% of the total Bow Valley population. Overall, the sample is 7.7% over-representative of Canmore residents. Reasons for this result are somewhat unclear given the concurrent nature of the questionnaire’s administration. I speculate that it may be partially due to a greater concern or worry over recent rapid and possible future change in Canmore and a greater sense of confidence in that Banff will not be subject to rapid changes due to its position in the Park. This sentiment emerged in both the Initial Focus Group (as concepts) and Lived Experience interview research phases. Canmore residents may have felt more compelled to respond, to be heard, than Banff residents. Furthermore, Banff households may contain more units with transient workers who I speculate may be less interest in replying to a community-based survey. Data from the Banff Seasonal Workers focus group support this claim as they made it clear that they did not believe their voice was heard in the community. Regardless, it should be noted that the sample is slightly over-representative of Canmore residents.

### Table 8.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid Percent Sample</th>
<th>Actual Pop</th>
<th>Valid Percent Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canmore</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>16,407 (1)</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>8,721 (2)</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25,128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Canmore (2006 Census) states 11,599 permanent and 4,818 non-permanent residents totalling 16,417 residents.  
(2) Banff (2007 Census) states a total population of 8,721 including non-permanent residents

8.2.3 Description of Sample to Population by Age Categories
Table 8.3 provides a description of the sample to the population by age categories based on frequency analysis. What is apparent is that my sample is generally older than the population (see columns four and six). The sample varies from the population (combined Banff and Canmore) as follows: the sample for 20 – 24 is 11.45% underrepresented; for 25 – 34 it is 7.85% under-represented; for 35 – 44 it is 7.8% over-represented; for 45 – 54 it is 13.1% over-represented; for 55 – 64 it is 13.81% over-represented; for 65 and older it is 5.31%. Systematic sampling across households ensured no bias for age categories occurred.

The possible reason for the under representation of the people aged 34 years and younger and over representation of those 35 years and older is the emergent theme of uncertainty of tenure of residency and feeling of community alienation on the part of younger residents. Data from the Initial Focus Group investigation and Lived Experience interviews chronicled a sense of uncertainty on the part of many younger residents as to how long they could remain in the Bow Valley in light of the cost of living and other structural challenges. Furthermore, the Banff Seasonal Worker group clearly noted that they felt little to no ability to influence local community matters. Uncertainty and a sense of alienation may have added to a sense of apathy for the younger population under the age of 34 years. Also, recognizing that respondents for this survey were not specifically students but that they may be of a similar age to post-secondary students, Dey (1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Sample (%)</th>
<th>Canmore (%</th>
<th>Canmore Variation from Sample</th>
<th>Banff Actual %</th>
<th>Banff Variation from Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+5.5%</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>+17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>+2.8%</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>+12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>-15.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>-4.86</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>-5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported that student survey response rates have continually decreased over time since the 1950s from 58% to 21% in 1991. The sample is slightly under representative of younger age groups and over representative of older age groups.

8.2.4 Description of Sample to Population by Gender

The sample was examined in relation to the population by gender as presented in Table 8.4. Frequency analysis revealed that women are about 10% over-represented. Reasons for this result are somewhat unclear given the systematic sampling procedure employed. Over representation may be due to the procedure of household sampling versus individual sampling whereby women may have been more likely to be home at the time of delivery or even more likely to complete the survey. In my experience, through 20 years of recreation-based market research, women tend to be the recreation decision makers within households and therefore somewhat more likely to have interest in and complete the recreation survey. The sample is slightly over-representative of women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Banff Sample</th>
<th>Banff Actual (1)</th>
<th>Canmore Sample</th>
<th>Canmore Actual (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Banff 2007 Census (2) Canmore 2006 Census
8.2.5 Summary of the Data Set and Response Bias

The Bow Valley Recreation Survey is an exploratory study that represents the final phase in a four phase research project following the grounded theory approach. The goal of the research project is to develop a ‘grounded theory’ which is understood to be a messy process (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). My data set is made up of 363 complete responses (30.25% response rate) and generally is representative of the population. It varies from the population in three key areas: it is slightly over-representative of Canmore over Banff residents; it is slightly over-representative of older over younger residents; and it is slightly over-representative of women over men. In a sample such as this an effect of response bias may occur therefore it is important to discuss response bias and mitigation strategies.

Response bias is understood to be the effect of non-responses on survey estimates (Fowler, 1988 cited in Creswell, 2003). There are a variety of ways to address response bias including wave analysis and respondent/non-respondent analysis (Creswell, 2003), comparison with known values for the population, and subjective estimates (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). Mitigation strategies generally are offered in the context of a single study constituting the sum of the research project but in the case of this research, the BVRS is one of four studies within the research project and there is considerable overlap or slurring of data from all four research phases as is to be expected in grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

The areas of deficiency are addressed using an adapted approach of comparison with known values for the population based on previous qualitative research phases. Armstrong & Overton (1977) describe the technique as the use of known values for the population abstracted from other studies, using different instruments to address shortcomings within a data set. They state that abstraction is not an exact procedure and may introduce other forms of response bias but the technique is helpful and well accepted. In my research project the populations for the three previous qualitative research phases were the same and although the four key measures (motivation to reside,
importance of recreation amenities, perceived change in community and quality of life) employed in the BVRS were not specifically employed in the qualitative work, in some cases there was direct overlap (motivation to reside and quality of life) and in other cases post-hoc review of qualitative concepts and categories offered considerable insight into the areas of importance of recreation amenities and perceived change in the community and quality of life. Further, of the 71 informants of the three qualitative research phases, just fewer than 50% were under the age of 34, another 33 were male, and 38 were from Banff. Although representative sampling is not the goal of grounded theory there appears to be enough data to provide valuable insight into the deficient areas of the sample. The following statements of the population are based on previous qualitative concept and category level data and they are intended to complement the sample for the purposes of future theory building, not to be specifically incorporated into the quantitative analysis.

Banff Population

In relation to the four major measures, the Banff population can be said to be motivated to reside for reasons similar to Canmore residents - the pursuit of a mountain recreation lifestyle but Banffites differ in that they likely include more of those seeking an urban recreation lifestyle and less of the Second Home Owner group. Importance of recreation amenities is likely similar but more emphasis on the value of urban, arts and cultural amenities than do Canmore residents. Several Banff interview participants commented that they would not choose to reside in Canmore because it did not possess the same range of urban and cultural amenities. Perceived changes in Banff likely differ among residents differ on regarding concern over the potential for rapid and generally unwanted changes through second home ownership. It is well understood that the Town of Banff rests within Banff National Park and that brings a sense of calm to the potential for rapid change to the natural landscape. Banff residents appear similar to Canmore residents in other matters pertaining to cost of living, employment, and other structural
matters. Perceptions of quality of life appear to be similar between the two communities excepting the point of perceived rapid changes.

Younger Age Groups

Numerous younger people (under 34 years of age) acted as informants for the qualitative component. The motivation to reside for this group is similar to older groups, which is to seek a balance between mountain or urban recreation and satisfying employment – that is, a mountain recreation lifestyle. The difference is that older participants tend to be more established with respect to careers and families and therefore struggle less with sustaining the lifestyle. Younger participants generally are still uncertain as to whether they will be able to remain in the Bow Valley and are open to other possibilities. Importance of recreation amenities appears to differ for younger age groups, as noted in numerous concept and category data, in that they tend to value outdoor and/or backcountry and more urban amenities (bars and lounges) than older groups. However, in most cases with trails, cafes, mechanized skiing, and even indoor fitness older and younger groups appear to be homogeneous. Perceived changes in the community for younger groups tend to be focused on recognition of the challenges and changes within structural elements such as housing, prospect of owning a home and suitable employment. This represents a difference from older groups who tend to be more structurally established and who focus more on community (Main Street) changes than backcountry changes. In matters of quality of life the primary difference would appear to be more evident with household structure and those with or without families. Young families tend to rely on similar services (health, municipal recreation and education) as do older families. A younger group with no children is more likely to place emphasis on a different set of community priorities; otherwise the difference likely is not to be substantial.
Men and Women

With respect to motivation to reside, there appears to be little difference between men and women. With respect to importance of recreation amenities, it appears that men tend to favour backcountry amenities more and women tend to favour indoor recreation facilities more. Otherwise the two are not very different strictly from a gender perspective. With respect to perceived changes in the community, it appears that men may perceive fewer changes or perhaps emphasize coping mechanisms more. As noted in the qualitative phases, men tend to avoid crowding by heading out further into the backcountry and they tend to avoid the ‘downtown’ as much as possible. In addition, they tend to be more accepting of lesser conditions with respect to employment and housing. In some ways it could be said that men exhibit greater place dependence than women and as long as they can continue with key activities they are less concerned with surrounding change. Women tend to be more aware of the broader environment (physical, social, and structural) and the specific ways that changes affect daily life (e.g. perceived increased in crime and its impact on late night mobility, temporal changes and community transformation). With respect to quality of life the two appear to possess no differences of note.

The preceding approach to address response bias may appear slightly lacking from a strict positivist methodological approach, but given that a central tenet of grounded theory is to incorporate all available data from multiple means it is deemed to be appropriate for this research project (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The intent of the section was to incorporate known aspects of the population under-represented in the BVRS into the process of theory building.

8.3 Description of Questionnaire Items

This section presents a description of questionnaire items excluding the four major measures (presented separately). This section includes a description of the tenure of residency, expectations of lifestyle in the Bow Valley, maintenance of recreation
activity over time, overall rating of quality of life, intention to stay or leave over the next five years and a series of items pertaining to socio-demographic variables.

8.3.1 Tenure of Residency

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years of residence in the Bow Valley as a continuous score. The range for tenure of residency is one year to 78 years. The mean is 15.59 years. Standard deviation is the square root of the variance and measures the spread of a set of observations. The larger the standard deviation is, the more spread out the observations are. In this case the standard deviation is fairly high, not surprising given the range of tenure periods. Skewness measures the degree and direction of asymmetry. A symmetric distribution such as a normal distribution has a skewness of 0. In this case the result is skewed to the right meaning that the mean is higher than the median. The Kurtosis score of 3.200 indicates that the sample has a tail and may be non-normal or non-parametric. The data for tenure of residency was later reformatted into four categories of 0-6, 7-13, 14-20, and 20 plus. The result reflects the data set as a slightly older sample with a mean tenure of over fifteen years and one that possesses the insight to report on perceived changes in the community.

<p>| Table 8.5 |
| Tenure of Residency |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max (years)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.2 *Expectations of Lifestyle in the Bow Valley*

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they believed they experienced the lifestyle they thought they would, or expected (Table 8.6). This item followed question two, the motivation to reside measure, such that an assessment of lifestyle expectations could be considered in the context of one’s motivation to reside in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the Time</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distribution to the question of ‘Do you think you are living the life you thought you would is generally positive’. Twenty-one percent report ‘always’, the majority of 54.7% report ‘most of the time’, 20% report some of the time and 1.4% report rarely. One can conclude that the sample generally is satisfied that they are meeting their expectation of lifestyle in the Bow Valley. That the sample may be an older means it may reflect the experience of those who are somewhat more established, confident in their ability to remain in the area and have negotiated a comfortable existence. Results of the previous qualitative research phases, in conjunction with the quantitative results, would suggest that

8.3.3 *Maintenance of Recreation Activity over Time*

In order to assess changes in recreation patterns in a high amenity recreation community, respondents were asked to indicate whether they believed their recreation activity had increased, decreased or remained about the same since having arrived in the Bow Valley. This item complemented an informal objective of understanding the relationship between resident’s motivations to reside in the area, which previously was Table 8.7 presents three recreation categories. Recreation activity was divided into three basic categories of backcountry recreation, in-town recreation and recreation in general.
No definitions were offered. Since this question employed an ordered response category format no descriptive statistics are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.7</th>
<th>Maintenance of Recreation Activity over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-town</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation in General</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No recreation activity category reported an overall decrease in activity but in general, reported increases in recreation activity were marginal except for 'in-town' recreation. This result is supported by qualitative results as being the most commonly reported category of recreation. The assessment of importance of recreation amenities (Table 8.11) also supports in-town recreation as being important to Bow Valley residents. A total 40.8% of respondents reported that participation in backcountry recreation increased while 35.8% reported it has remained about the same. This result implies that there is a considerable group of residents (35.8%) who likely participated in backcountry recreation prior to their arrival to the Bow Valley versus those who arrive and take up backcountry activity. Conversely, about double the number of respondents reported an increase in ‘in-town’ recreation indicating that it is perhaps what is taken up by many of those who arrive. Overall the finding supports the assertion that Bow Valley residents view themselves as active recreationists.

8.3.4 Overall rating of Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.8</th>
<th>Overall Rating of Quality of Life N=353</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Bad</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to provide an overall rating of quality of life in conjunction with the final major measure pertaining to quality of life.
life. The item appeared later in the questionnaire so that respondents could have considered various aspects of his/her personal situation in the Bow Valley. Table 8.8 presents the results of this question. Overall quality of life was rated high. Over 93% indicated a response of either ‘Very Good’ or ‘Somewhat Good’ while no one indicated a response of ‘Very Bad’. The mean is 4.55 on a five-point Likert Scale whereby 5 is Very Good and 1 is Very Bad. The standard deviation is 2.273 indicating little variation of response. The Skewness is 16.031 and Kurtosis is 286.583 indicating a distribution highly biased toward the left as the frequency results also indicate. The result appears to support other items that address overall high satisfaction of life in the Bow Valley as high which may be more of a function of an older more established group. A common outcome of high amenity and resort communities is that long time residents are displaced by the high cost of living and a variety of perceived undesirable changes in the community and replaced by those intent on employment in the new tourism or tourism related economy (Price, Moss & Williams, 1997). Despite considerable anecdotal feedback that many ‘old-timers’ have left over the years it appears that there remains an older and established community. This result needs to be understood within the context of qualitative findings that emphasize there is a strong and established community in both Banff and Canmore, although it is also difficult to assess. Furthermore, and specific to Canmore, its history needs to be considered in relation to displacement. Canmore shifted from mining to tourism and/or recreational development circa 1980 following the closing of the last mine. The mean tenure of residency for this sample is just over fifteen years. It would appear that the majority of residents in this sample would have arrived in Canmore following its transition to tourism and recreation and Olympic preparations (as noted in Chapter One) and thus be representative of the new economy as having displaced the previous mining population.
8.3.5 Intention to Stay or Leave in the Next Five Years

Respondents were asked of their intention to stay or leave over the next five years later in the questionnaire (Question 11) in order to assess the likelihood of mobility in relation to quality of life satisfaction and perceptions of change in the community.

Item 11 employed an ordered response category format, thus no descriptive statistics are offered. Table 8.9 presents the results of Question 11. The overwhelming majority of respondents (72.1%) indicated that they will remain while 15.2% are unsure, another 8% will probably leave and 3.3% will likely leave for extended education or travel and return. In total 28% are unsure if they will remain in the Bow Valley in the near future. Qualitative findings suggest a fairly high rate of mobility in and out of the Bow Valley and residents' frustration surrounding how difficult it is to create long term friendships. The finding suggest two almost distinct communities a highly mobile community of younger people considering residency and an older community that is highly settled. This assertion is also supported by category-level data from the Lived Experience and Initial Focus Group research phases in statements that indicate it is difficult to find or penetrate the community, but once one does the community is very strong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.9 Intention to Stay or Leave in the Next Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay in the Bow Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure if I will Stay or Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Leave and Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.6 Socio-demographic Profile of Sample

A series of socio-demographic items were included in the latter part of the questionnaire. Table 8.10 presents the frequency distribution for the variables of age (revised as categories), household structure, home ownership, education achievement, personal income and gender for the sample. With respect to age the mean is 4.87
(between 35 and 54 years) the median is 5.00. The standard deviation is 1.314 indicating minimal variation around the mean. Skewness is -.061 and the Kurtosis is -.806 indicating a fairly normal distribution but biased toward the older age categories. The result again supports the assertion that the sample is generally older. The two largest category responses for Household Structure include couples without children living at home (39.6%) and couples with children living at home (35.1%). The next largest category is living alone with 11%, followed by living with roommates at 7.3%. The presence of the two largest categories supports the assertion that the sample represents a largely settled group. Living with extended family accounted for 1.1% and ‘other’ accounted for 2.5%. ‘Other’ consisted of nine open-ended responses with no consistent theme.

With respect to owning or renting, the majority of the sample (81.3%) reported owning while 17.9% reported renting. This result supports the assertion that the sample has captured the older age group. The 0.8%, or six responses, that indicated ‘other’ were examined from open-ended responses to the other category. Of the six responses, five report various situations whereby he/she lives at home, with employer or with common-law partner and one reported renting. Q14 (Owning or Renting) employed the ordered response category thus no descriptive statistics are presented.

With respect to education, most respondents report having completed post secondary education with 38.5%, 20.8% and 15% having a university degree, graduate degree and college diploma, respectively. The combined post-secondary graduate group makes up 74.3% of the sample. This result indicates the sample is highly educated with nearly three quarters of the sample holding a post-secondary degree or diploma. It also suggests that migration to the Bow Valley is a genuine lifestyle decision for many given that this group presumably possesses options for employment. The qualitative results of the previous research phases suggested that those with degrees that are not related to employment in the Bow Valley (i.e. tourism, parks, and related) reported considerable stress surrounding the long-term pursuit of career options. Six percent indicated ‘other’
which included responses of technical diplomas and trade certificates including hair styling, welding, auto-mechanic, and bartending. Q15 (Education) employed the ordered response category thus no descriptive statistics are presented.

Respondents were asked to indicate their annual personal (not household) income. The most common income response category was $40,001 to $60,000 with 20.4% of the sample, followed by the $100,001 or higher with 17.4%, thirdly $60,001 to $80,000 with 16% followed by $30,001 to $40,000 with 11.6% and followed by the $80,001 to $100,000 and $20,001 to $30,000 with 9% and 8% respectively. A total of 13% ‘Refused’ and 0.6% reported ‘Don’t Know’. The top two categories of $40,001 to $60,000 and $100,000 or higher suggests that there may be two groups living in the Bow Valley - those who are highly established and earning a higher income and those who are more newly arrived or simply earning considerably less.

The gender composition of the sample has been addressed previously but included herein to provide a more complete perspective of the sample’s socio-demographic profile.
Table 8.10  
Socio-demographic Profile of Sample  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (N=363)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Structure (356)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with children at home</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple without children at home</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent household</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with roommates</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with extended family</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership (N=295)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Achieved (N=361)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some school</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post secondary</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College diploma</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income (N=362) (estimated for the year 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 or less</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $30,000</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $40,000</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $60,000</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $80,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 and higher</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Description of the Four Major Measures

The purpose of this section is to provide a statistical description of the four major measures within the BVRS. The four measures include Motivation to reside in the Bow Valley (Q2), Importance of Recreation Amenities (Q5), Perception of Change in the Bow Valley (Q8), and Quality of Life (Q9). The four measures are intended to provide structure to the exploratory quantitative investigation by theoretically framing the amenity migration dynamic from arrival (motivation to reside) to recreation via the valuing of recreation amenities to one's perception of change as the community changes (perception of change) and toward an overall assessment of quality of life. Other single questionnaire items such as intentions to stay or leave in the next five years and overall satisfaction add to the framing of the amenity migration dynamic. In this section each of the four measures will be described using frequency and descriptive statistics.

8.4.1 Description of Measure – Motivation to Reside

Respondents were asked to respond to a seven-item measure to investigate motivation to reside in the Bow Valley. The basis of the scale was largely informed by previous qualitative research phases and included seven aided items and an unaided 'other' item. Literature pertaining to motivation of amenity migrants is scarce and generally reflects broad areas such as escape (Robertson & Stark, 2006) to pursue places of extraordinary physical and cultural beauty different from one's previous place of residence (Price, Moss & Williams, 1997) and to seek out places to support one's identity (Williams & McIntyre, 2001). The additional 'other' category response resulted in forty-four responses which are described in this section as well.

Table 8.11 presents the frequency response for the Q2 measure and includes the N for each item along with frequencies for each of the response sets. Table 8.11 allows the
reader to discern the amount of diversity in each response. For example, it is evident that

Table 8.11
Description of Measure the Motivation to Reside Measure by Frequency Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance work (general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>37 (10.4)</td>
<td>45 (12.7)</td>
<td>97 (27.4)</td>
<td>175 (49.4)</td>
<td>8 (.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just to be with a friend and/or partner</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>162 (46.4)</td>
<td>56 (16)</td>
<td>53 (15.1)</td>
<td>78 (22.3)</td>
<td>11 (.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away and escape from where I was</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>164 (47.1)</td>
<td>78 (22.4)</td>
<td>63 (18.1)</td>
<td>44 (12.6)</td>
<td>13 (.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue a career in tourism, hospitality and/or parks</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>220 (61.4)</td>
<td>49 (13.6)</td>
<td>29 (.08)</td>
<td>60 (16.7)</td>
<td>4 (.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To start a business</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>210 (60.8)</td>
<td>68 (19.7)</td>
<td>33 (.09)</td>
<td>34 (.098)</td>
<td>14 (.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived here all my life – not my choice</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>237 (79.7)</td>
<td>11 (.03)</td>
<td>16 (.053)</td>
<td>33 (11.1)</td>
<td>62 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To own a second home</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>273 (78.4)</td>
<td>25 (.07)</td>
<td>22 (.063)</td>
<td>28 (.08)</td>
<td>13 (.037)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent scores appear in brackets (%)

most respondents possessed one dominant motive and in most cases that was “to balance work (general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle”. Most other items received considerably less support but frequency responses are dispersed throughout the entire response set.

The frequency and descriptive results for the Motivation to Reside measure are presented in Table 8.12. The response scale is based on a five-point Likert scale re-coded to a four point scale whereby 1 is Not at all Important, 2 is Somewhat Important, 3 is Very Important, 4 is Extremely Important. The Ns for each scale vary with the lowest being 297. The means range from a low of 1.44 to ‘own a second home’ to a high of 3.16 for ‘balance work (general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle’. Standard deviations range from a low of 0.926 to a high of 1.223 indicating little variation around the Means. Both Skewness and Kurtosis range considerably from 0 indicating a fairly abnormal distribution of responses for several items such as ‘to pursue a career in tourism, hospitality, and/or parks’ and ‘to start a business’ and ‘to own a second home’. The
question allowed respondents to rate the importance of each item rather than select one (forced choice) response.

The rank order of responses from most to least important is as follows, with associated Means in brackets: to balance work with a mountain recreation lifestyle (3.16); Just to be with a friend or partner (2.13); to get away and escape from where I was (1.96); to pursue a career in tourism, hospitality and/or parks (1.8); to start a business (1.68); I have lived here all my life - not my choice (1.48); and to own a second home (1.44). The most common motivation is to pursue a balance of work and a mountain recreation lifestyle indicating a belief that the Bow Valley is a community of opportunity rather than just a second home enclave. The social element is evident in the next two responses which rank considerably lower than the first by Mean. To be with a friend, and to escape where I was, are highly reflective of a push–pull or two dimensional model of leisure motivation (Iso-Ahola, 1989) and reliant on the social dimension. To escape has been linked previously to the Second Home Owner interview research phase where it emerged as a central motivation for second home owners to purchase in Canmore. Further to the point of escape, a similar theme which emerged within previous research phases was that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Migrate</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance work (general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>-.938</td>
<td>-.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just to be with a friend and/or partner</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>-1.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away and escape from where I was</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>-.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue a career in tourism, hospitality and/or parks</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>-.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To start a business</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived here all my life - not my choice</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>1.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To own a second home</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>2.336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of re-invention, that informants believed that a move to the area offered a unique opportunity to reinvent oneself through the vehicle of lifestyle towards a desired image of oneself, similar to the idea of seeking identity Williams & McIntyre (2001).

The ‘other’ category was presented as a separate question thus no ‘other’ values were presented in Table 8.11 or 8.12. The other category yielded a total of 44 short (one to five words) open ended responses pertaining to other motivations to reside. The majority, or 31 of 44 responses were extensions of existing category responses and added to the explanation of who they arrived with (for example: arrived with my husband, etc.). Another nine responses related to additional explanations of when one arrived (for example: I have been here for 37 years), and another four responses described types of economic migration who have since remained (for example, came to do a welding job and stayed). Overall the ‘other’ category did not affect the analysis of the measure but responses were noted for future inclusion toward theory building. The results reported in Tables 8.11 and 8.12 are in keeping with the related results of the previous qualitative research (IFG Concepts 1,2; LEI Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7; P1 Category #1).
8.4.2 Description of Importance of Recreation Amenities Measure

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 17 different recreation amenities related to the Bow Valley. Q5 allow for an informal theoretical framing of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Amenity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In-town trails for walks</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>7(0.01)</td>
<td>46(0.12)</td>
<td>112(31.1)</td>
<td>195(54.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Back country trails for more remote</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>43(11.9)</td>
<td>67(18.6)</td>
<td>100(27.7)</td>
<td>150(41.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mechanized ski areas for skiing and</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>72(20)</td>
<td>73(20.7)</td>
<td>84(23.3)</td>
<td>131(36.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nordic ski areas</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>57(16)</td>
<td>99(27.8)</td>
<td>87(24.5)</td>
<td>112(31.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In-town restaurants and cafes</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>29(0.81)</td>
<td>126(35.1)</td>
<td>124(34.6)</td>
<td>79(22)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Town fitness centre and/or pool</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>61(16.8)</td>
<td>104(28.8)</td>
<td>105(29)</td>
<td>91(25.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Performance arts venues</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>39(10.8)</td>
<td>126(35)</td>
<td>127(35.3)</td>
<td>67(18.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Back country slopes for skiing and</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>79(21.9)</td>
<td>90(25)</td>
<td>84(23.3)</td>
<td>107(29.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Museums and galleries</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>53(14.8)</td>
<td>146(40.8)</td>
<td>108(30.2)</td>
<td>50(14)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recreation centre for children’s</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>126(35.4)</td>
<td>65(18.3)</td>
<td>63(17.7)</td>
<td>101(28.4)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rivers/lakes for canoeing and/or</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>76(21.2)</td>
<td>137(38.2)</td>
<td>75(20.9)</td>
<td>70(19.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kayaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Backcountry trails for mountain</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>108(30)</td>
<td>110(30.6)</td>
<td>63(17.5)</td>
<td>78(21.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Roadways for leisure driving</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>93(25.9)</td>
<td>131(36.4)</td>
<td>86(23.9)</td>
<td>49(13.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Backcountry trails for running</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>130(36.3)</td>
<td>84(23.4)</td>
<td>68(18.9)</td>
<td>76(21.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In-town trails for dog-walking</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>155(43)</td>
<td>54(15)</td>
<td>65(18)</td>
<td>86(23.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Back country climbing areas</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>211(58.9)</td>
<td>71(19.8)</td>
<td>32(0.08)</td>
<td>44(12.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In-town bars and nightlife</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>223(62.1)</td>
<td>106(29.5)</td>
<td>21(0.05)</td>
<td>9(0.025)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent scores appear in brackets (%) Scores for the Not Sure column range from 0.002 to 0.0029 and thus not presented.

recreation experience of the amenity migrant with the question’s emphasis on the valuation of recreation amenities. The question is intended to loosely capture recreation activity, through valuation, though no attempt was undertaken to solicit specific
Table 8.14
Description of Measure – Importance of Recreation Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Amenity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In-town trails for walks</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-1.013</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Back country trails for more remote hikes</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>-.624</td>
<td>-.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mechanized ski areas for skiing and riding</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>-1.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nordic ski areas</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In-town restaurants and cafes</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Town fitness centre and/or pool</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Performance arts venues</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Back country slopes for skiing and riding</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-1.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Museums and galleries</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rivers/lakes for canoeing and/or kayaking</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Backcountry trails for mountain biking</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>-1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Roadways for leisure driving</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>-.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Backcountry trails for running</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>-1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In-town trails for dog-walking</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>-1.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Back country climbing areas</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In-town bars and nightlife</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>2.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

responses to "what recreation/leisure activities do you do?" because I considered such a measure less important than connecting the person to the resources.

The frequency result of Q5 'Importance of Recreation Amenities' appears in Table 8.13. The scale for this question consisted of a five point Likert scale whereby 1 was 'Not at All Important', 2 was 'Somewhat Important', 3 was 'Very Important', 4 was 'Extremely Important' and 5 was 'Not Sure'. All category 5 responses were re-coded as missing in order to maintain a clean scale (Fox, 2003). Table 8.14 presents a further descriptive examination of Q5. Table 8.13 indicates the considerable range of response for each item – further supported by the standard deviation score in the following table. Some insights can be drawn from the table results such as the likelihood distribution of those with children and those without (Item 10), and the lack of importance placed on
bars and lounges (Item 17). Despite the clear importance placed on certain items, responses range across the entire response set.

Means ranged from a low of 1.49 for ‘bars and nightlife’ to a high of 3.38 for ‘in-town trails for walks’. The Standard Deviation and Kurtosis results generally are centrally situated indicating little variation surrounding the Mean and a normal distribution excepting results for ‘back country climbing areas’ and ‘bars and nightlife’ which indicate that observations are more varied. This result can be somewhat explained observationally given that many of those participate in rock climbing are also likely to frequent bars and nightlife thereby resulting in greater variation around the two items.

The seventeen items are presented below in order of importance by means thus helping to broaden understanding of recreation importance (the mean score is in adjacent brackets).

1. In-town trails for walking (3.38)
2. Backcountry trails for more remote hikes (2.99)
3. Mechanized ski areas for skiing and riding (2.76)
4. Nordic ski areas (2.72)
5. In-town restaurants and cafes (2.71)
6. Town fitness centre and/or pool (hotel or municipal) (2.63)
7. Performance arts venues (2.62)
8. Back country slopes for skiing and riding (2.61)
9. Museums and galleries (2.43)
10. Recreation centre for children’s activities (2.39)
11. Rivers and lakes for canoeing and kayaking (2.39)
12. Back country trails for mountain biking (2.31)
13. Roadways for leisure driving (2.25)
14. Backcountry trails for running (2.25)
15. In-town trails for dog-walking (2.23)
16. Back country climbing areas (1.75)
17. In-town bars and nightlife (1.49)

Several important insights arise from visual examination of the results. Firstly, the majority of amenities reported to be more important, (e.g. within the top ten) are in-town or urban in nature. Items 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 are in-town or urban based. Items 2, 3, and 4 are more related to a natural setting but not of a backcountry nature either. Otherwise the items appear to be varied with the remaining seven items including both nature-based and in-town or urban based amenities. McMillan (2006) claims that an outcome of amenity migration is the rise of ‘comfortable amenities’ which also coincides with Moore & Gill (2006) that amenity migration has resulted in the urbanization of Whistler, British Columbia. The emphasis on valuing in-town amenities also coincides with earlier qualitative concept and category level data. Specifically, informants were asked within the Lived Experience interview phase to describe their ideal day and what that would include. Of the four types of responses only one was based on backcountry activity while the other three included elements of friends, family and in-town activities. This result appears to be in keeping with a broader emergent theme of lifestyle and that lifestyle includes a wide variety of experiences that can be readily incorporated into daily life, hence the emphasis on in-town and readily accessible amenities over more committing backcountry activities. The result appears to support the importance of accessing a recreation-based lifestyle.

8.4.3 Description of Measure – Perception of Change in the Community

A central measure within the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether a series of 26 items related to community and recreation amenities had increased or decreased since they (respondent) had lived in the Bow Valley. The purpose of the measure was to explore individual perceptions of change in the physical, social and structural environment. Ns ranged from a low of 120 for ‘backcountry rock climbing areas’ to a high of 358 for ‘general cost of living’. The question was scored using a six-point Likert scale whereby 1 was Increased Greatly, 2 was Increased Slightly, 3 was Has
Not Changed, 4 was Decreased Slightly, 5 was Decreased Greatly and 6 was Don’t Know. The results are presented in Table 8.15. Results were re-coded to treat (6) ‘Don’t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation/Community Amenity</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Increased Slightly</th>
<th>Has Not Changed</th>
<th>Decreased Slightly</th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Don’t Know**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to good quality housing</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>312(88.6)</td>
<td>54(17.3)</td>
<td>54(17.3)</td>
<td>37(11.8)</td>
<td>54(17.3)</td>
<td>113(36.2)</td>
<td>40(11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of backcountry rec. opportunity</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>257(72.8)</td>
<td>9(0.03)</td>
<td>46(17.8)</td>
<td>120(46.6)</td>
<td>65(25.2)</td>
<td>17(0.06)</td>
<td>96(37.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of areas for canoe &amp; kayaking</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>191(53.2)</td>
<td>9(0.04)</td>
<td>15(0.07)</td>
<td>158(82.7)</td>
<td>9(0.04)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168(46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of areas for backcountry skiing</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>218(60.5)</td>
<td>11(0.05)</td>
<td>30(13.7)</td>
<td>160(73.3)</td>
<td>15(0.06)</td>
<td>2(0.009)</td>
<td>142(39.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>277(77.1)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82(22.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality of urban rec. opportunities</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>314(88.2)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42(11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of areas for ski &amp; snowboard</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>280(78.2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78(21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of informal trails</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>267(74.7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90(25.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of Nordic ski areas</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>279(77.9)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of areas for rock climbing</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>120(33.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238(66.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of good full time jobs</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>249(69.1)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111(30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of in-town parks &amp; pathways</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>344(95)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of indoor fitness areas</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>313(86.9)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Number of full time residents</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>328(91.3)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Number of festivals and special events</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>335(92.7)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Crowding &amp; congestion in backcountry</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>256(71.9)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100(28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of bars and lounges</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>283(78.3)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78(21.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Number of cafes</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>348(96.1)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Number of shopping opportunities</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>353(98)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of tourists</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>345(96.1)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Number of day-use Calgarians</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>283(78.1)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77(21.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number of restaurants</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>344(95.5)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Crowding &amp; congestion in town</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>351(97.7)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Amount of vehicle traffic</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>356(97.7)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of second home owners</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>319(89.3)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38(10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. General cost of living</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>358(99.4)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(0.0005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Valid N refers to percent of the sample following casewise elimination of cases in the cluster analysis
** The percent associated with the ‘Don’t Know’ column are in relative to the Total N
Two important observations are garnered from Table 8.15. The first observation is the considerable range of scores across the response set. Although not as evenly dispersed as the previous two measures (Q2 and Q5) they remain dispersed. The second observation is the scores for the ‘Don’t Know’ category response. These scores range from 2 for ‘General Cost of Living’ to 238 for ‘Areas for rock and ice climbing’. The missing values is due to the re-coding of the ‘Don’t Know’ to a missing value. The higher number of ‘Don’t Knows’ are predictable for the two items indicated, rock climbing and paddling sports, which are more niche type of pursuits.

Table 8.16 presents descriptive statistics for the Q8 measure. The means range from a low (indicating an observed increase in the item) of 1.37 for both ‘general cost of living’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation/Social Amenity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to good quality housing</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of backcountry rec. opportunity</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of areas for canoe &amp; kayaking</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>-1.818</td>
<td>5.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of areas for backcountry skiing</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>-0.749</td>
<td>2.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>-2.233</td>
<td>-0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality of urban rec. opportunities</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of areas for ski &amp; snowboard</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-1.103</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of informal trails</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of Nordic ski areas</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>-0.789</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of areas for rock climbing</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-1.124</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of good full time jobs</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of in-town parks and pathways</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of indoor fitness areas</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Number of full time residents</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Number of festivals and special events</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Crowding &amp; congestion in backcountry</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of bars and lounges</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>-0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Number of cafes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Number of shopping opportunities</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of tourists</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>2.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Number of day-use Calgarians</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td>2.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number of restaurants</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Crowding &amp; congestion in town</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Amount of vehicle traffic</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>2.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of second home owners</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>2.287</td>
<td>5.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. General cost of living</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>2.236</td>
<td>7.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
living’ and ‘number of second home owners’ to a high (indicating an observed decrease in the item) of 3.38 for ‘access to good quality housing’. The standard deviation scores generally indicate little variation from the mean except those for ‘number of informal trails’ and ‘number of good full time jobs’. The Skewness scores generally are situated closer to the centre (0) except those for ‘number of second home owners’ and ‘general cost of living’ indicating a less symmetrical distribution and thus more variation of responses. Similarly, Kurtosis results generally are centrally situated excepting the ‘general cost of living’, the ‘number of second home owners’ and the ‘number of areas for canoe and kayaking’ which indicates more variation in those responses. Table 8.16 includes two items reporting a more substantial number of missing values. Items 10 ‘Number of areas for rock climbing, and 9 ‘Number of areas for canoe and kayaking’ include Ns of 120 and 191 respectively which are related to the amount of ‘Don’t Know’.

The results presented in Table 8.15 offer important insights to behavioural geography’s human–environment relationship from a recreation perspective. The purpose of the question was to capture whether individuals perceive change, in increases or decreases of specific amenities or phenomenon. To highlight the responses to these question two additional tables have been produced. Table 8.17 highlights items (aspects of the community) which were reported to have increased and Table 8.18 highlights items or aspects of the community which have decreased. Only items with a mean score below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.17</th>
<th>Items Reported to have Increased Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of second home owners</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of vehicle traffic</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding in town</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of restaurants</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of day use Calgarians</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of tourists</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of shopping areas</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of cafes</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of bars and lounges</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 were included as 2.0 represent the mid-point of the 4-point scale. The lower the mean, the more it is perceived to have increased. It is important to note that 'cost of living' was reported to have increased the most along with 'number of second home owners' followed by 'amount of vehicle traffic' and 'crowding in town'. The first four items relate to what typically would be considered understood negative aspects of tourism and/or amenity migration (McMillan, 2006). Of the remaining six items, four relate to in-town recreation amenities: the number of restaurants, shopping areas, cafes and bars and lounges. This result suggests a leisure based urbanization of the town environment, a phenomenon reported in similar communities such as Whistler, BC (Moore & Gill, 2006) and Santa Fe, NM (Glorosio & Moss, 2006). The remaining two aspects reported to have increased are the number of day-use Calgarians and the number of tourists. Both aspects suggest increased traffic and support the previous crowding related items. Aspects of community change reported to have increased are those related to increased crowding, urban leisure, and tourists and Calgarians. This finding suggests that the environment is a place where recreation coping strategies may be at play similar to the findings of Manning & Valliere (2001) and their assessment of recreation coping of residents adjacent to Acadia National Park. Numerous concept and category level data from my qualitative research phases address this exact phenomenon. The crowding-related findings support previous claims within this research project that residents are engaged in recreation coping strategies on a regular basis, especially spatial and temporal displacement. These findings also suggests that residents are aware of changes in their community and accept trade-offs related to life in the Bow Valley given that previous descriptive findings related to assessment of quality of life and frequency of met expectations generally are high. My findings also suggest that residents do not consider such changes to impact personal recreation experiences. Alternately these findings may be a function of the 'rationalization' recreation coping strategy although this question was not asked. However, reported statements of one's place can be expected to have an impact on place attachment whether at the level of place identity or place dependence.
The aspects of the community that are reported to have decreased are reported in Table 8.18. The higher the mean, the more it is perceived to have decreased and this provides insights into perceived changes in the community by respondents. Items related to changes in the community include good quality housing and the number of full-time jobs, ranked first and ninth respectively. That the items presented in Table 8.18 have decreased is supported by concept and category-level data from my previous research phases and related to the ‘sustainability’ aspect of daily life (LEI Concepts 9, 22; P1 Category 2). Both items soliciting responses on quality of recreation opportunities are reported to have decreased: the quality of backcountry recreation is ranked second while the quality of in-town recreation is ranked fifth. Five of the 15 items listed in Table 8.18 relate to backcountry recreation including the number of areas for canoeing and kayaking, areas for backcountry skiing, mechanized areas for skiing and snowboarding, informal trails and areas for rock climbing. This finding suggests that whether an actual decrease has occurred or not there is a perception that backcountry recreation has decreased over time. This perception is supported by previous qualitative research.

As the means appear closer to 2.0 the strength of the result is less powerful, yet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.18</th>
<th>Items Reported to have Decreased Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good quality housing</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the backcountry</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of areas for canoeing and kayaking</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of areas for backcountry skiing</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of backcountry trails</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of in-town recreation</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of areas for skiing and snowboarding (mechanized)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of informal trails</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of areas for rock climbing</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of full time jobs</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of in-town parks and pathways</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of indoor fitness areas</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of full time residents</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of festivals and special events</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding and congestion in the backcountry</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...still indicates that respondents believe the items have decreased more than increased. The five items closest to the 2.0 scale mid-point include: the numbers of parks and...
pathways, indoor fitness areas, full-time residents, festivals and special events, and finally crowding and congestion in the backcountry. It is clear that residents also perceive that some in-town recreation opportunities have decreased over time (parks and pathways, indoor fitness areas, and special events and festivals) although the results are not ranked highly. Residents report a perception that full-time residents decreased, this finding could be interpreted as a function of increased second home owners relative to decreased full-time residents (which occurred in Canmore in 2007) or a relative decrease of full-time residents in Banff perhaps related to stricter residency requirements. Regardless, my findings suggest an important aspect of change and perhaps social displacement.

Another item, although it does not demonstrate a strong mean score, is a reported decrease in crowding and congestion in the backcountry. It is widely understood that overnight backcountry bookings in Banff National Park and Kananaskis Provincial Park have decreased over the past ten years. No such data exists for the level of backcountry day use, although personal communication with local land managers suggests that it is likely to have increased over time.

Descriptive data from Table 8.16 indicate that respondents are aware of changes in the community and recreation amenities. Data from this table also suggest that resident perceive a change toward increased urban recreation, aspects of crowding and tourism and recreation residential development. Furthermore, these data suggest that backcountry recreation, some in-town recreation (related to municipal government), and some aspects of community such as quality housing, have decreased. Together it begins to form a clear direction of change toward urbanization.

8.4.4 Description of Measure – Quality of Life
The fourth measure consisted of ten items pertaining to quality of life.

Respondents were asked to rate the influence of each item as having a good or bad impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Somewhat Bad</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to quality health care</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to make friends</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of backcountry recreation opportunities</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The sense of community</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Availability of career/work and/or job of my liking</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality of in-town recreation opportunities</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access to quality education opportunities</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of regulation regarding backcountry recreation</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amount of town development</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cost of living (housing to daily life)</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.19
Description of Measure – Quality of Life – Frequency Description

on quality of life. The result is presented in Table 8.19. A five-point Likert scale was used whereby 1 was 'Very Bad', 2 was 'Somewhat Bad', 3 was 'Not Sure', 4 was 'Somewhat Good' and 5 was 'Very Good'. Table 8.19 indicates that the range of response of good to bad is considerable across the response set. Table 8.19 presents the results of a frequency analysis of the Quality of Life measure. The results are in keeping with the overall ranking of items presented in Table 20 (Descriptive Analysis of the Quality of Life measure) whereby 'access to quality health care' is ranked highest in contributing to positive quality of life and 'cost of living' contributes the least.

Table 8.20 presents descriptive statistics for the Q9 Quality of Life measure. Means ranged from a low of 2.44 for 'cost of living' to a high of 4.22 'access to quality health care'. Standard Deviation scores generally are low indicating minimal variation around the Mean. Items which are perceived to have the most positive impact on quality of life are 'access to quality health care', 'ability to make friends', and 'quality of backcountry
recreation opportunities'. The rank of the ten items by means is as follows (the mean appears in brackets):

1. Access to quality health care (4.22)
2. Ability to make friends (3.82)
3. Quality of backcountry recreation (3.81)
4. The sense of community (3.49)
5. Availability of career/work and/or job of my liking (3.45)
6. Quality of in-town recreation opportunities (3.42)
7. Access to quality education opportunities (3.24)
8. Level of regulation regarding backcountry recreation (2.84)
9. Amount of town development (2.53)
10. Cost of living (2.44)

The preceding items are ranked in consideration of having a good or bad impact on one’s quality of life and the higher the Mean, the more positive is the reported impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.20</th>
<th>Description of Measure – Quality of Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Life Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to quality health care</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to make friends</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of backcountry recreation opportunities</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The sense of community</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Availability of career/work and/or job of my liking</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality of in-town recreation opportunities</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access to quality education opportunities</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of regulation regarding backcountry recreation</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amount of town development</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cost of living (housing to daily life)</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to quality health care, in-town recreation opportunities and access to quality education opportunities are considered to be ‘comfort amenities’ which are reported to
increase with increased amenity migration to an area (Glorioso & Moss, 2006). My results also reinforce a consistent theme of the research which is the importance of the social element: that is, the ability to make friends and the sense of community were both ranked highly. Place attachment is linked closely to social attributes of a place and over time, social attributes tend to be more important than natural, cultural or place dependent amenities that originally attracted the individual to the place (Brehn et al., 2004). The importance of being able to make meaningful social connections has been emphasized in the concept and category level data of previous phases of my research.

Regulation related to backcountry recreation, town development and cost of living are reported to have the least positive impact on quality of life. Of the three findings, town development and cost of living are viewed negatively and supported by previous findings of my qualitative research. The level of regulation related to backcountry was included because of emergent qualitative data that suggested Banff residents and Bow Valley recreationists understood and valued the role of regulation by nearby parks and protected areas in mitigating the effects of change. The position of this item within the ranking suggests that it may not be highly valued.

8.5 Chapter Summary

The goal of this chapter was to provide a statistical description of the sample and questionnaire items prior to the presentation of the segmentation statistical results in the following chapter. Descriptions of the data set, questionnaire items, and the four measures were offered, interpreted and discussed in the context of the sample, population and previous research phases. Conclusions were drawn as to the representativeness of the sample to the population, and the amenity migrant dynamic within environment was explained though an understanding of the motivation to reside in the area, how various recreation amenities are valued, the manner in which individuals perceive changes in their structural, social and physical environment, and what factors are considered to positively and negatively impact quality of life.
The descriptive results of Chapter Eight provide support for theory building by offering important insights into the character of the sample and community. Firstly, respondents appear to be motivated by a combination of factors that include a desire to live a mountain recreation lifestyle, to pursue that lifestyle with a significant other or friend and to escape where one was located previously. This combination represents the top three quantitative responses and supported strongly by numerous qualitative findings (IFG concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7; SHO P1 and P2 Category 1; LEI P1 Category 1, P2 Category 2), related literature.

Results of the Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities suggest that Bow Valley residents tend to favour built or more urban forms of recreation amenities over natural amenities in general. This finding is supported by previous qualitative research pertaining to the 'ideal day' description where only one of the four ideal day types involved a backcountry foray and, in general this result suggests a maturing amenity migration community. Results of the Q8 Perception of Change suggest Bow Valley residents are mindful of changes occurring in their community including, increased traffic (vehicle, tourist, resident, Calgarians, etc), increased urban types of recreation amenities and decreased backcountry recreation opportunities. When considered in light of the Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities this finding suggests that residents are accepting of the changes. In addition, when the results of Table 8.6 Expectations of Lifestyle in the Bow Valley are considered, residents achieve their expectation of lifestyle most of the time. In Table 8.9 Intention to Stay or Leave in the Next Five Years, the overwhelming majority of respondents intend to stay. All of this suggests that despite the often negative observances of change, residents appear to be quite satisfied with life in the Bow Valley.

The results of Q9 Quality of Life further support the assertion that the Bow Valley is a mature amenity migration destination given that services pertaining to residence and even “normal” life such as education, health, and municipal types of recreation exist.
The next chapter will extend the exploration of the Bow Valley Recreation Survey data analysis by focusing on the presentation of segmentation analysis of the four major measures.
9 Segmentation Statistical Results for the Bow Valley Recreation Survey

9.1 Introduction

The Bow Valley Recreation Survey (BVRS) represents the final phase of my research toward theory development. The purpose of this final phase of research within the context of theory building was to expand upon the Typology of Amenity Migrants within the Bow Valley (Chapter Seven) toward a broader model of leisure negotiation within amenity migration. Following the development of the typology I concluded that two important gaps of understanding existed that required further exploration.

The first gap involved mobility. That mobility in and out of the Bow Valley occurs and that it is employed as a coping strategy (absolute displacement) is not in question. The question is how to situate mobility specifically within the broader context of the amenity migration phenomenon. There are many possible reasons for mobility but previous qualitative findings suggest that people move into the Bow Valley because of the recreation amenities (and promise of a particular lifestyle) and move out of the Bow Valley because they struggle with the sustainability aspect of quality of life and because of dissatisfaction with change related to recreation amenities and the community in general. The Perception of Change (Q8) measure was to provide insight into residents’ perception of change in relation to amenities within the community.

The second gap of understanding was the nature of the attraction of the Bow Valley as a high amenity destination. That the mountains and a mountain recreation lifestyle act as attractors for many is clear but less clear is what specific amenities of the environment appeal more and less to the present amenity migrants. The Importance of Recreation Amenities (Q5) measure was to provide insight into the human- (recreation) environment relationship and subsequently aspects of leisure negotiation specific to the Bow Valley. I believed that a deeper understanding of mobility and importance of recreation amenities could allow me to develop a more encompassing theoretical model and leisure negotiation within amenity migration.
I also believed that it was important to return to field and verify aspects of one's motivation to reside given that motivation is central to the presence of the individual in the first place. Thus the Motivation to Reside (Q2) measure was included. To a lesser degree I believed that I could capture stray aspects of mobility and its related construct of place attachment by exploring aspects of quality of life. Thus the Quality of Life (Q9) measure was included. In the end, I believe the Importance of Recreation Amenities (Q5) and Perception of Change (Q8) measures proved to be most valuable in the development of my theoretical model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration which I present in Chapter Ten.

Chapter Nine presents the segmentation results of statistical analysis of the four measures of the Bow Valley Recreation Survey. The statistical analysis of the four
measures is referred to as ‘segmentation analysis’ because its basis lies in factor and cluster analysis and the basic principle of exploring data by its segmentation into homogenous sub-groups (Pallant, 2001). The four measures include the Motivation to Reside (Q2), Importance of Recreation Amenities (Q5), Perception of Change in the Community (Q8) and Quality of Life (Q9).

Figure 9.0 presents the position of the Chapter Nine analysis in the grounded theory process. The chapter builds on the descriptive results of the previous chapter toward a comprehensive analysis of the survey data. The chapter begins with a review of the statistical analysis procedures in section 9.2. Sections 9.3 to 9.6 present the results of each of the four measures and section 9.7 presents a final chapter summary. Presentation of results of each measure includes: a statement of the specific statistical tests employed in the analysis; a description of each table; and discussion in relation to other relevant results and theoretical frameworks. The presentation of the four measures follows an established procedure of presentation and discussion of a multi-stage segmentation analysis including factor analysis, cluster analysis and cross tabulations with chi-square analysis. Thurau, Carver, Mangun, Basman, & Bauer (2007) used a procedure similar to mine in their exploration of cruise ship tourists visiting Panama. The presentation of my segmentation results follows a similar but slightly modified procedure.

9.2 Review of Statistical Analysis Procedures and Presentation

The same analytical procedures were used to analyze each of the four measures with some minor variation, which will be discussed where appropriate. The section first presents an overview of the step-by-step analytical procedure followed by a description of each step.

Numerous studies involving similar configurations of segmentation analysis (Factor, Cluster, Cross-tabulation, Chi-Square) were reviewed to discern a format for what results were to be included in presentation and what results should not be included (Perez & Nadal, 2005; Vincent & Thompson, 2002; Smith & Carmichael, 2006; Kim,
There is considerable variation in presentation approaches. Therefore, the approach offered within Thurau et al. (2007) was adopted because it most closely resembled the approach I undertook for my research. Thurau et al. (2007) claim that their method of focusing on a three-stage approach of factor analysis, cluster analysis and cross tabulations with chi-square analysis is similar to other segmentation studies in tourism and offer examples (Beiger & Laesser, 2002; Chat et al., 1996; Formica & Uysal, 1998; Johns & Gyimoto, 2002, quoted in Thurau et al., 2007).

9.2.1 Overview of Analytical Procedure

The following is an overview of the multi-phased analytical procedures used to produce the results presented in this chapter.

Step 1 - Data preparation, including:
- Modification of some scales to include interval scales

Step 2 - Descriptive Analysis
- Presented in Chapter Eight and will not be addressed herein

Step 3 - Factor Analysis, including:
- Exploratory Factor Analysis, Principle Component Analysis;
- Tests of Factorability; and
- Tests of Reliability

Step 4 - Cluster Analysis, including:
- K-means Cluster Analysis (non-hierarchical) using factor components as inputs including three, four, and five cluster solutions tests to determine most appropriate cluster solution;
- Analysis of Variance; and
- Post Hoc Sheffe analysis.

Step 5 - Cross Tabulation analysis including:
- Chi-square analysis
Each step will be discussed in detail.

### 9.2.2 Explanation of Analytical Procedures

The goal of the analysis was to explore the homogeneity of distinct groups (segmentation) of the data in a theoretical manner and in accordance with grounded theory. The basic theoretical proposition guiding analysis of my research is that distinct segments of the population exist within the Bow Valley in relation to relevant variables (i.e. motivation to reside, importance of recreation amenities, perception of change in the community and overall quality of life). Segmentation of the sample by key variables follows the theory building of the previous section (Typology of Amenity Migrants) and was further supported by two important themes arising from previous research phases. First, different groups of amenity migrants alter the environment (physical, social and structural) by their specific expression of recreation demand, and an expression of demand affects recreation supply, changes in recreation supply, ultimately change the environment. Second, and building on the first point, specific groups may migrate to and out of the Bow Valley as environmental conditions change (become desirable or undesirable) within the community. Thus, the exploratory analysis is intended to segment the sample by the key variables listed earlier.

**Step 1 – Data Preparation**

Data was prepared for analysis by re-coding three scales. All changes occurred within the statistical program of SPSS Version 14. First, Q2 Tenure of Residency was re-coded data from a continuous scale to an interval scale. Data was initially obtained in the form of number of years one has resided in the Bow Valley, which ranged from 1 to 75, and adjusted to an interval scale using the following categories 18 – 19, 20 – 24, 25 – 34, 35 – 44, 45 – 54, 55 – 64, 65 plus. Q2, Tenure of Residency, was re-coded such that it could be used as variable in cross-tabulation analysis. Second, the Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities scale initially consisted of a five point Likert scale whereby 1 was
‘Not at All Important’ through to 4 being ‘Very Important’ and 5 was ‘Not Sure’. All category 5 responses were re-coded from ‘Not Sure’, to missing, in order to maintain an interval scale of meaningful values. Third the Q8, Perception of Change in the Community scale consisted initially of a six-point Likert scale whereby 1 was ‘Decreased Greatly’ through to 5, which was ‘Increased Greatly’ and 6 was ‘Don’t Know’ and was re-coded such that 6 ‘Don’t Know’ was treated as missing. Recoding of the scales was carried in order to allow for ANOVA, Cross-tabulations, and the Post-Hoc Sheffe.

Step 2 – Descriptive Statistics for questionnaire items

Frequency and/or descriptive statistics were carried out on all questionnaire items and reported in Chapter Eight.

Step 3 – Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a data reduction technique which can be used to reduce a large number of variables, such as measure items, into a smaller group of factors or components (Pallant, 2001). Using SPSS Version 14, Factor Analysis was carried out on the data as a first step within the segmentation process. Exploratory factor analysis seeks to uncover or explore the underlying structure or a relatively larger set of variables (Pallant, 2001). With exploratory factor analysis, the researcher’s a priori assumption is that any indicator may be associated with any factor. This is the most common approach and no underlying theory is required (Pallant, 2001). The aim of factor analysis in my investigation was to explore the nature of the data, evaluate of the measure, and data reduction for the next step of cluster analysis. The Principle Component Analysis (PCA) was used along with a varimax rotation. The PCA is the most common form of factor analysis and involves a principle axis method which results in orthogonal factors. The varimax rotation method is a default in SPSS and it is used to add clarity to results as it makes it easier to identify each variable as a single factor (Garson, 2004 cited in Thurau, et al., 2007).
The first step in the factor analysis was to compute a correlation matrix to determine how each of the items correlated with one another within each of the four measures. Based on literature, it is common to eliminate variables with a correlation value of 0.4 ((Thurau et al., 2007; Pallant, 2001). The second step was to carry out the PCA with the varimax rotation. Once rotated, the factor loadings and eigen-values were examined to determine the number of factors and variables found with each factor. The factor loading is the percent of variance explained by the factor, and the eigen-value indicates the amount of variance underlying all the variables associated with a factor. Generally, only factors with eigen-values with a value of 1.0 or higher and that explain at least 4.5% of the variance are considered in analysis (Thurau et al., 2007).

SPSS Version 14 provides two tests of factorability as default within factor analysis. Tests of factorability offer insight into how well the data is suited to the factor analysis. The two tests are the Kaiser-Milken-Olkin test of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. The former should ideally yield a score of 0.6 or above and the latter should yield a significant (.05) value. In all four measures in my research the factor analysis tests produced adequate scores for the tests of factorability. The final step within the factor analysis involved a test of reliability carried out with SPSS Version 14 for Windows. The Test of Reliability was carried with each sub-scale or factor grouping for each measure in order to assess its internal consistency. Sub-scales were used because internal consistency refers to the manner in which items are measuring the same basic construct, therefore statistically generated sub-scales are generally considered more appropriate (Pallant, 2001). The Test of Reliability within SPSS yields a Cronbach alpha value which should generally be over 0.7 to indicate strong internal consistency. However, short measures with less than ten items tend to yield low Cronbach alpha values (Pallant, 2001). The Cronbach alpha value for each sub-scale of each measure is presented with each factor analysis table result.

Step 4 – Cluster Analysis
The cluster analysis component is divided into two important sections. The first is the determination of an appropriate number of cluster solutions for input into the K-means cluster analysis. The second section involves the cluster analysis test through to the post-hoc Scheffe test. Even though the cluster analysis is divided into two distinct section the actual analysis I carried out involved a constant trial and error of testing and review in which the two were blurred because one needs to run the cluster analysis in order to determine the most appropriate number to be used in the broader analysis.

Cluster analysis is used to segment a sample based on its ability to isolate homogeneous subgroups that minimize within-group variation and maximize between-group variation (Mueller & Kaufmann, 2001). Cluster analysis is especially useful in quantitative exploratory analysis because of its ability to systematically deconstruct groups or samples (Smith & Carmichael, 2006).

I used the K-means, or non-hierarchic cluster procedure whereby the researcher must pre-determine the number of clusters desired. I choose the K-means procedure because agglomerative hierarchic methods are more unstable with samples larger than 200 to 300, resulting in more unreliable results. The sample for the BVRS was 363. The non hierarchic method tends to create more uniform groups and it is less influenced by atypical data and by the incorporation of irrelevant variables (Perez & Nadal, 2005). The K-means cluster procedure requires the researcher to pre-determine the number of clusters.

It is important to clarify the reasoning behind my decision of the number of clusters for this research. Cluster validity is assessed in a variety of ways. Kovács, Legány, & Babos (2005) indicate that cluster validity can be assessed using external, internal and relative means. External methods involve an intuitive assessment based on known variables, and internal methods involve complex computational analysis as does the relative method which also includes a validity index. Lu & Traore (2005) proposed a new evolutionary algorithm method, support for which has not yet been determined. Other researchers claim that cluster validity is based on three criteria: size, or that all
clusters should have enough cases to be meaningful (no specific number was offered); meaningfulness, or that each cluster should be readily intuited from previous constituent variables; and cross tabulation of identification numbers by other variables known from theory or prior research to correlate with the concept which the cluster is supposed to reflect (Statnotes, North Carolina University, N.D.). Published research involving cluster analysis reviewed for this research project did not indicate the specific methods used to determine the number of clusters selected (Thurau et al., 2007; Lawton, 2005; Havenar & Lochbaum, 2007).

I used the following three criteria to determine the most appropriate number of clusters for input into non-hierarchical cluster analysis: theoretical grounds - that is, a number of clusters in keeping with the objective of verification of the amenity migrant typology and in keeping with grounded theory; an adequate number of cases to be contained in each cluster; and the use of the SPSS Version 14 Classification Results(a) test, which is provided as a default test and allows for a basic assessment of cluster reliability by indicating the percent of originally grouped cases grouped in the cluster analysis.

A series of K-means non-hierarchical tests were carried out with each of the four measures using three, four and five cluster solutions. The result was the adoption of a five cluster solution for each of the four major measures. I have presented the results of the five cluster solution selection process later in the chapter. An additional test of the meaningfulness of the five cluster solution is the post-hoc Scheffe test which was applied (following the ANOVA test) to assess significant differences between Means of the clusters. Numerous significant tests resulted from the post-hoc Scheffe test, adding to the confidence of the appropriateness of the selection of the five cluster solution.

Upon determination of the five cluster solution, the K-means cluster analysis was carried out for each of the four measures. SPSS Version 14 provides numerous default tests which assist in interpretation of results for specific purposes. Brief review of tests such as the Wilks Lambda test and others, were carried out and it was determined that no
tests revealed cause for concern (personal communication with Dr. T. Fung). Therefore, the next phase of analysis involved the ANOVA to determine whether differences existed among clusters. The ANOVA was carried out for each of the four measures and yielded significant results in each case. The final test was the post-hoc Scheffe test to determine differences between clusters. The post-hoc Scheffe test also yielded numerous significant results. The results of the cluster analysis including ANOVA and post-hoc Scheffe tests are presented later in the chapter.

Step Five - Cross-Tabulation Analysis

Cross tabulation analysis is carried out to explore the nature of the segments or clusters and to provide a general profile of each cluster (Thurau et al., 2007). Cross-tabulations also provide an important descriptive tool in the exploration of a subject and therefore is appropriate herein (Jennings, 2001). Cross-tabulation analysis was carried out using all descriptive variables as inputs. Each cross-tabulation test was followed by a chi-square test to determine whether differences among groups or clusters existed. Chi-square analysis produced several significant results. The results of the cross-tabulations and chi-square analysis are provided later in the chapter.

9.3 Segmentation Results for Q2, Motivation to Reside

The purpose of this section is to present the segmentation results of the Q2, Motivation to Reside measure. Section 9.3.1 presents the factor analysis results including tests of reliability. Section 9.3.2 presents the results of the determination of the five cluster solution. Section 9.3.3 presents the results of the cluster analysis and ANOVA and the post-hoc Scheffe test. Section 9.3.4 presents the results of the cross-tabulation analysis and chi-square analysis, and section 9.3.5 provides a brief section summary.
9.3.1 Factor Analysis Results for Q2, Motivation to Reside

Table 9.1 presents the results of the factor analysis for the Motivation to Reside measure. Using SPSS Version 14, the Principle Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation procedure was carried out on the eight items of the Motivation to Reside measure. Results indicate that there are two factor groupings that explain 43.28% of the variance. Table 9.1 presents their loadings, mean, standard deviation, eigen values, and percentage of variance explained. ‘I have lived here all my life – not my choice’ did not yield a result above the 0.4 cut-off and was therefore removed. Two tests of the factorability of the data are the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. The former score ranges from 0 to 1 and a score of 0.6 is considered strong while latter should yield a significant (p<0.05) score. For Table 9.1 the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy is 0.573 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity score is 0.000 indicating the suitability of the data for factor analysis. In addition reliability tests for each subscale were conducted yielding a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.487 for To Live and a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.421 for To Escape.

Means for each factor item are also included and based on the response scale of a five-point Likert scale re-coded to a four point scale whereby 1 is Not at All Important, 2 is Somewhat Important, 3 is Very Important, and 4 is Extremely Important. This result resonates with what is known about the communities involved. An assessment of means reveals that ‘To balance work with mountain recreation lifestyle’ yielded the highest mean of 3.16 while ‘Just to be with friend or partner’ yielded the second highest mean of 2.06 and ‘To get away and escape from where I was ‘ yielded the second highest mean of 1.90. The mean score for each factor item offers insight into the strength of each factor item.
Table 9.1 indicates the presence of two factors, *To Live*, made up of four items and *To Escape*, which contains two items. The *To Escape* factor grouping likely addresses the second home owner population in the Bow Valley which is generally restricted to Canmore and it is also difficult to target (although it may also form part of the motivation of other non-second home owners). The items in the *To Live* factor grouping include: To pursue a career in tourism, hospitality or parks; To start a business; To balance work (in general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle; and Just to be with a friend or partner. The sum of the items implies a desire to live (full time and establish oneself) in the community whether through seeking a related career, a balance of work and recreation, to start a business, or to be with a friend. It further implies that the community or destination is mature enough to present the potential for employment in a variety of areas. This finding is supported by qualitative data which revealed that informants had settled in the Bow Valley for its ability to potentially sustain a lifestyle (IFE P1 Category1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Eigen Values</th>
<th>Percent of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Live</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pursue a career in tourism, hospitality or parks</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To start a business</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To balance work (in general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just to be with a friend or partner</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Escape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town a second home</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away and escape from where I was</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To balance work (work in general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle; and Just to be with a friend of partner. The sum of the items implies a desire to live (full time and establish oneself) in the community whether through seeking a related career, a balance of work and recreation, to start a business, or to be with a friend. It further implies that the community or destination is mature enough to present the potential for employment in a variety of areas. This finding is supported by qualitative data which revealed that informants had settled in the Bow Valley for its ability to potentially sustain a lifestyle (IFE P1 Category1).
There is scarce literature on motivation to reside for amenity migrants, and what there is concerns broader categorizations such as seeking of one’s identity (Williams & McIntyre, 2000) or typologies such as that put forward by Perdue (2004) that is rather specific and includes traditional ski bums, new ski bums, migrants, trust fund babies, techies, and entrepreneurs, which implies a motivation to reside. Robertson & Stark (2006) reported on some motivations to reside for Alberta based amenity migrants and specifically those within Canmore. They reported that ‘to escape’ was important for their group, supporting the high ranking (descriptive analysis) of the same motivation item within this research project.

Finally, the results of Table 9.1 are reflective of traditional push–pull models of leisure/travel motivation such as that of Iso-Ahola (1989); Mannell & Kleider (1997), and Cohen (1979). The pull aspect of residing in the Bow Valley is the opportunity or prospect of living a life that is highly desired by the individual. This finding emerged repeatedly in the qualitative research phases whereby individuals reported a desire to re-locate to the Bow Valley to live the life they had, at some level, envisioned for them. It is as though the prospect of living in the Bow Valley represents, an opportunity to re-invent oneself in a subjective ideal, or perhaps a search for greater authenticity such as examples cited earlier in the qualitative research phases whereby the desire to live in a ‘real mountain town’ or to live in a place where the ‘people are real’ was noted and not so different from Cohen’s (1979) tourist typology which included the search for authenticity as a central tenet. Conversely, the push aspect is the escaping of where one has been, which is also present but resonates more with a short stay tourist who can be said to be escaping the mundane aspect of everydayness (Suvantola, 2002) or the short stay (generally one four month season) tourism worker. Clearly both elements (push and pull) are present in this group; however the pull aspect of living in the Bow Valley appears considerably more defined within the result.
9.3.2 Determination of Five Cluster Solution

Table 9.2 presents the results of the number of cases for each of the K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis for the Motivation to Reside measure. The number of clusters to be used in the cluster analysis was determined by theoretical reasoning, assessment of an adequate number of cases in each cluster, and the results of the Table 9.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Five Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Four Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Three Cluster Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification of Results(a) test. Theoretical reasoning suggested that a five cluster solution would best parallel the number of types within the typology of amenity migrants, but it was not critical to use five clusters in the cluster analysis. Table 9.2 suggests that an adequate number of cases were present in the each of the five clusters with a range of 132 in cluster four to 21 in cluster three. The four cluster solution did not necessarily yield any stronger case per cluster results. The Classification of Results(a) for the five cluster solution for the Motivation to Migrate scale reported that 100% of the originally grouped cases were classified correctly. The five cluster solution was thus adopted and furthermore, the five cluster solution yielded a significant ANOVA result and numerous significant post-hoc Scheffé results further supported its viability within the analysis.
9.3.3 *Cluster Analysis Results for Q2, Motivation to Reside*

The cluster analysis results for the Motivation to Reside measure are presented in two parts. The first part focuses on the presentation of the descriptive group statistics for the five clusters. The second part focuses on the presentation of a summary of the clusters, means, and post-hoc Scheffe results toward verification of the presence of distinct groups based on the motivation to reside variable. The ANOVA results are presented in text form.

Table 9.3 presents the group statistics for the five cluster solution for Q2 measure, Motivation to Reside. Factor groupings generated from the factor analysis, of *To Live* and *To Escape* were loaded into the cluster analysis. The response scale is based on a five-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Factor Components</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid N Listwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>2.7208</td>
<td>.52504</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>2.2193</td>
<td>.25031</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>1.6229</td>
<td>.29897</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>2.9000</td>
<td>.48305</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>3.0952</td>
<td>.52723</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>3.4524</td>
<td>.47183</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>1.5914</td>
<td>.33467</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>1.2652</td>
<td>.36778</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>2.6958</td>
<td>.44781</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>1.1699</td>
<td>.23798</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>2.1900</td>
<td>.71304</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>1.7068</td>
<td>.81168</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

point Likert scale re-coded to a four point scale whereby 1 is Not at All Important, 2 is Somewhat Important, 3 is Very Important, and 4 is Extremely Important. The group statistics presents the means for each factor grouping and cluster, with the corresponding standard deviation and the number of cases in each cluster. The means range from a high
of 3.45 for the *To Escape* Cluster 3 group to a low of 1.16 for the *To Escape* Cluster 5 group. Standard Deviation scores range from a high of 0.811 to a low of 0.237 and generally little deviation from the means.

Table 9.4 presents a summary of the cluster analysis results based on the K-means, non-hierarchical five cluster solution analysis. Each of the five clusters is presented from the left beginning with cluster 1 and columns 1 through 5. The sixth column presents the mean for each factor grouping To Live and To Escape, for reference. Of note is that overall the *To Live* mean is higher than the *To Escape* mean indicating its greater importance as a motivation to reside. The last column on the right includes the post-hoc Scheffe test results for each of the clusters by factor grouping. Furthermore, each of the first five columns includes the factor grouping mean for the *To Live* grouping and the row below is the same for the *To Escape* factor grouping.

An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences among the means of the clusters which yielded a p-value of 0.000 indicating that differences exist within the clusters. A post hoc analysis of a Scheffe Test was conducted to determine which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clu 1 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 2 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 3 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 4 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 5 and Mean</th>
<th>Total and Mean</th>
<th>Scheffe Test Results (p=.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live 2.7</td>
<td>Live 1.6</td>
<td>Live 3.0</td>
<td>Live 1.5</td>
<td>Live 2.6</td>
<td>Live 2.1</td>
<td>(1&gt;2,1&gt;3,1&gt;4,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape 2.2</td>
<td>Escape 2.9</td>
<td>Escape 3.4</td>
<td>Escape 1.2</td>
<td>Escape 1.1</td>
<td>Escape 1.7</td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsere Escapers</td>
<td>Just Livers</td>
<td>Little Importance</td>
<td>Livers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&lt;1,3&lt;2,3&lt;4,3&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences among the means of the clusters which yielded a p-value of 0.000 indicating that differences exist within the clusters. A post hoc analysis of a Scheffe Test was conducted to determine which
clusters are significantly different from which. Numerous significant tests \((p=0.05)\) were reported with the direction of difference indicated by the arrow. Post-hoc Scheffe results imply that both factor groupings are different among and between the five clusters. The \textit{To Live} factor grouping reported clusters 1, 4 and 5 to be different from three of the four other clusters and clusters 2 and 3 are different from all four other clusters. The \textit{To Escape} factor grouping reported clusters 1, 2, and 3 to be different from all four other clusters and clusters 4 and 5 to be different from three of the four other clusters.

The cluster analysis result that different groups exist in the Bow Valley with respect to their reported motivation to migrate supports theory building two ways. Firstly, throughout the qualitative research phases numerous references to the presence of different groups (different from 'me' the informant) were made such that it saturated several category level findings \((\text{IFG Concepts 5, 11; P1 Categories 7, 8; LEI Concept 17})\). The 'other' groups were noted as a source of excitement, frustration, a point of negotiation, and a force behind change. It supports the supposition that people do arrive to the Bow Valley with different recreation related motives. Secondly, the verification of different groups by motivation to reside supports the potential for different lifestyles based on different leisure preferences and individual resource access. Finally, it lays the groundwork for the possibility that different types of people are attracted to the Bow Valley as the character and physical environment (natural and built) changes over time.

### 9.3.4 Results of Cross-Tabulation for Q2, Motivation to Reside

The results of the cross-tabulation and chi square analysis are presented in Table 9.5. The frequency and percent (in brackets) is given for each variable for each cluster. The first column in Table 9.5 includes each of the demographic variables, residence (community), tenure of residency, household structure, home ownership, education, income, gender and age. Chi-square results indicate that residence \((p=0.005)\), tenure of residency \((p=0.037)\), household structure \((p=0.040)\), education \((p=0.009)\), income \((p=0.016)\) and age \((p=0.003)\), yielded significant results, or that there exist significant
differences among the five clusters with respect to each of the variables listed. The results suggest that the five clusters are different and offer further support for the typology of amenity migrants in Chapter Seven.
Table 9.5 Baseline Subject Characteristics by Cluster Grouping for Q2, Motivation to Reside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cluster 1 N=57</th>
<th>Cluster 2 N=49</th>
<th>Cluster 3 N=21</th>
<th>Cluster 4 N=132</th>
<th>Cluster 5 N=103</th>
<th>(df)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Canmore N=257</td>
<td>46 (17.9)</td>
<td>36 (14)</td>
<td>16 (6.2)</td>
<td>96 (37.4)</td>
<td>62 (24.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Banff N=96</td>
<td>11 (11.5)</td>
<td>4 (4.2)</td>
<td>5 (5.2)</td>
<td>36 (37.5)</td>
<td>40 (41.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 yr N=87</td>
<td>20 (23)</td>
<td>16 (18.4)</td>
<td>5 (5.7)</td>
<td>31 (35.6)</td>
<td>15 (17.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 yrs N=94</td>
<td>13 (13.8)</td>
<td>9 (9.6)</td>
<td>6 (6.4)</td>
<td>40 (42.6)</td>
<td>26 (27.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20 yrs N=74</td>
<td>12 (16.2)</td>
<td>11 (14.9)</td>
<td>4 (5.4)</td>
<td>25 (33.8)</td>
<td>22 (29.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and longer N=94</td>
<td>12 (12.8)</td>
<td>4 (4.3)</td>
<td>6 (6.4)</td>
<td>34 (36.2)</td>
<td>38 (40.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.832</td>
<td>.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple w/kids N=123</td>
<td>17 (13.8)</td>
<td>15 (12.2)</td>
<td>5 (4.1)</td>
<td>38 (30.9)</td>
<td>48 (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple no kids N=136</td>
<td>29 (21.3)</td>
<td>17 (12.5)</td>
<td>12 (8.8)</td>
<td>46 (33.8)</td>
<td>32 (23.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent N=11</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone N=38</td>
<td>4 (10.5)</td>
<td>3 (7.9)</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
<td>24 (63.2)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/ R-mates N=26</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Extended N=4</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>2 (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership N=353</td>
<td>42 (14.7)</td>
<td>27 (13)</td>
<td>17 (6)</td>
<td>111 (38.9)</td>
<td>78 (27.4)</td>
<td>11.011</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own N=285 (100)</td>
<td>14 (21.5)</td>
<td>3 (4.6)</td>
<td>4 (6.2)</td>
<td>19 (29.2)</td>
<td>23 (38.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent N=65 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education N=351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.478</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some School N=3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School N=31</td>
<td>5 (16.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.2)</td>
<td>5 (16.1)</td>
<td>14 (45.2)</td>
<td>6 (19.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Secondary N=51</td>
<td>10 (19.6)</td>
<td>3 (5.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.9)</td>
<td>19 (37.3)</td>
<td>17 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Diploma N=54</td>
<td>13 (24.1)</td>
<td>4 (7.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>19 (35.2)</td>
<td>17 (31.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree N=137</td>
<td>21 (15.3)</td>
<td>14 (10.2)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td>47 (34.3)</td>
<td>48 (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School N=74</td>
<td>7 (9.5)</td>
<td>17 (23)</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td>32 (43.2)</td>
<td>12 (16.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income N=352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.516</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000 N=14</td>
<td>2 (14.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (42.9)</td>
<td>6 (42.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $30,000 N=27</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>13 (48.1)</td>
<td>7 (25.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $40,000 N=42</td>
<td>6 (14.3)</td>
<td>2 (4.8)</td>
<td>2 (4.8)</td>
<td>20 (47.6)</td>
<td>12 (28.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $60,000 N=73</td>
<td>16 (21.9)</td>
<td>5 (6.8)</td>
<td>2 (4.1)</td>
<td>25 (34.2)</td>
<td>24 (32.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$80,000 N56</td>
<td>4 (7.1)</td>
<td>3 (5.4)</td>
<td>3 (5.4)</td>
<td>25 (44.6)</td>
<td>21 (37.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000 N30</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and higher N=62</td>
<td>11 (17.7)</td>
<td>16 (25.8)</td>
<td>7 (11.3)</td>
<td>15 (24.2)</td>
<td>13 (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused N=46</td>
<td>5 (10.9)</td>
<td>10 (21.7)</td>
<td>3 (6.5)</td>
<td>13 (28.3)</td>
<td>15 (32.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender N=351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female N=213</td>
<td>36 (16.9)</td>
<td>18 (8.5)</td>
<td>14 (6.6)</td>
<td>79 (37.1)</td>
<td>66 (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male N=138</td>
<td>21 (15.2)</td>
<td>22 (15.9)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td>51 (37)</td>
<td>37 (26.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age N=353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.280</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 N=9</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
<td>4 (44.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 N=50</td>
<td>13 (26)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>18 (36)</td>
<td>18 (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 N=85</td>
<td>12 (14.1)</td>
<td>7 (8.2)</td>
<td>6 (7.1)</td>
<td>29 (34.1)</td>
<td>31 (36.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 N=94</td>
<td>14 (14.9)</td>
<td>12 (12.8)</td>
<td>2 (2.1)</td>
<td>36 (38.3)</td>
<td>30 (31.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 N=73</td>
<td>11 (15.1)</td>
<td>14 (19.2)</td>
<td>5 (6.8)</td>
<td>26 (35.6)</td>
<td>17 (23.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older N=42</td>
<td>5 (11.9)</td>
<td>6 (14.3)</td>
<td>7 (16.7)</td>
<td>21 (50)</td>
<td>3 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9.3.5 Section Summary – Q2 Motivation to Reside

The segmentation analysis for the Q2, Motivation to Reside measure included a series of statistical tests beginning with factor analysis, to cluster analysis and cross-tabulation. The analysis of the Motivation to Reside measure presents four important implications for theory building.

Firstly, the findings support the proposition that distinct groups of residents exist in the Bow Valley based on their motivation to live in the area. Motivation to reside presents implications for the type of lifestyle sought, and array of recreation based implications related to expression and demand and subsequent growth of specific types of recreation amenities in response to demand. Secondly, it supports the assertion that the recreation amenities of the Bow Valley appeal to a relatively wide array of individuals and motives. Thirdly, the Bow Valley, with its ability to draw people with diverse motives, has the potential to become a contested space as individuals attempt to act upon their motivations and lifestyles which is further supported by the typology of amenity migrants in Chapter Seven. Fourthly, the umbrella-like motivation of To Live which covers aspects of work/life balance, to be with a partner, the pursuit of a mountain recreation lifestyle, and mountain related careers, can be said to characterize why most people choose to live in the Bow Valley. It implies a lifestyle mix of tourism-related employment (though not exclusively but generally characterized as tourism related) and the pursuit of a recreation based lifestyle. Despite some resentment towards tourism as noted in earlier qualitative research phases, this mix is not odd and research has suggested that tourism-related employment can be amenable to a recreation based lifestyle (Vaugeous & Rollins, 2007; Szivas, Riley & Airey, 2003). Therefore, the prominence of the To Live motivation category further supports conceptual and real-life links between tourism and amenity migration. Lastly, the segmentation analysis of the Q2 Motivation to Reside measure yielded numerous significant results arising from the cluster analysis post-hoc Scheffe test, and the chi-square tests of the cross-tabulation analysis. The results offer support of adequacy of the sample as possessing a diverse
population and to some degree mitigates the earlier concerns of Chapter Eight in relation to the sample's under-representation of certain groups.

9.4 Segmentation Results for Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities

The purpose of this section is to present the segmentation results of the Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities measure. Section 9.4.1 presents the factor analysis results including tests of reliability. Section 9.4.2 presents the results of the determination of the five cluster solution. Section 9.4.3 presents the results of the cluster analysis and ANOVA and the post-hoc Scheffe test. Section 9.4.4 presents the results of the cross-tabulation analysis and chi-square analysis, and section 9.4.5 provides a brief section summary.

9.4.1 Summary of Factor Analysis Results for Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities
Table 9.6 presents the results of the factor analysis for the Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities measure. Using SPSS Version 14 the Principle Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation procedure was carried out on the fifteen items of the Importance of Recreation Amenities measure. Results indicate that there are four factors that explain 53.76% of the variance. Table 9.6 displays their loadings, means, standard deviations, eigen values, and percentage of variance explained. Two tests of the factorability of the data are the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. The former score ranges from 0 to 1 and a score of 0.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Eigen Values</th>
<th>Percent of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry slopes and trials for skiing and riding</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry climbing areas for rock and ice climbing</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry trails for more remote hikes</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers and lakes for canoeing and kayaking</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-town Nordic ski area</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums and galleries</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance arts venues</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-town trails for walks</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town fitness centre</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation centre for children’s activities</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-town bars and nightlife</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-town restaurants and cafes</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski areas (mechanized) for downhill skill and riding</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways for leisure trips</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is considered strong while the latter should yield a significant (p<0.05) score. For Table 9.6 results, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy is 0.792 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity score was 0.000, indicating the suitability of the data for factor analysis. In addition, reliability tests for each subscale were conducted yielding a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.763 for Backcountry (bc), 0.696 for Culture, 0.654 for Recreation (rc) and 0.542 for Entertain. Four factor groupings arose from the Importance of Recreation Amenities measure. The Backcountry factor grouping explained 23.14% of the variance and it is made up of six items including: backcountry slopes and trails for skiing and riding; backcountry climbing areas for rock and ice climbing; backcountry trails for more remote hikes; rivers and lakes for canoeing and kayaking; backcountry trails for running; and in-town Nordic ski area. All six items relate well to convergent and discriminate validity, whereby the researcher intuits constructs that should theoretically be related, are related within factor groupings, and those that theoretically should not be related, and are not related (Cable & DeRue, 2002). The items within the Backcountry factor grouping in theory should all be related. The one item which may be considered an outlier is the in-town Nordic ski area item, however within the context of lifestyle, which includes a set of coherent interests and/or social conditions (Stebbins, 2005), which in-town Nordic skiing may be considered a related activity to backcountry activity for convenience and/or training.

The Culture factor grouping explained 14.12% of the variance and includes the three items of museums and galleries, performance arts venues, and in-town trails for walks. The three items appear to demonstrate convergent and discriminate validity despite the inclusion of in-town trails for walks, because not only can the trails be a part of the experience but in-town walks emerged as a popular form of recreation for virtually all groups. The Recreation factor grouping explained 8.44% of the variance and includes the two items of town fitness centre and recreation centre for children's activities. Both items are highly related. The Entertain factor grouping explained 8.06% of the variance and includes the four items of: in-town bars and nightlife; in-town restaurants and cafes;
mechanized ski areas; and roadways for leisure trips. The four factor groupings appear to demonstrate sound convergent and discriminate validity.

The means reported in Table 9.6 indicate that factor items related to walking ‘in-town trails for walks’ and ‘backcountry trails for remote hikes’ scored highest with means of 3.27 and 3.01 respectively. This finding is supported by other research such as the Alberta Recreation Survey (2008) which reported walking for pleasure as and hiking as two of the more popular activities in the province. ‘In-town Nordic ski area’, ‘In-town restaurants’, ‘mechanized ski areas’ and ‘Town fitness centre’ also reported means that rounded up the top six factor items. The higher ranking of these factor items are supported by previous qualitative findings, especially that of the ‘ideal day’ as reported in Chapter Six’s Lived Experience interview research. Standard deviation scores reported in Table 9.6 indicate that responses are generally evenly dispersed.

Several insights related to theory building may be garnered from the findings. Firstly, the factor groupings suggest an environment high in recreation amenities with extraordinary cultural and natural amenities similar to the definition of amenity migration (Price, Moss, & Williams, 1997) and supported by the qualitative findings (LEI P2 Category 1). Secondly, the results suggest that four different groups favouring specific amenities exist with the possibility of associated goal-achievement conflict, also supported by qualitative results (LEI Concept 17; IFG P2 Category 3). Thirdly, the findings suggest the potential for different recreation-based lifestyles realized in a daily basis within the community by the diversity factor groupings.

9.4.2 Determination of Five Cluster Solution for Importance of Recreation Amenities Measure

Table 9.7 presents the results of the number of cases for each of the K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis for the Importance of Recreation Amenities measure. The number of clusters used in the cluster analysis was determined by theoretical reasoning, assessment of an adequate number of cases in each cluster and the results of the Classification of Results(a) test. Theoretical reasoning suggested that a five cluster
solution would be best to parallel the number of types within the typology of amenity migrants, but it was not imperative to use five clusters in the cluster analysis. Table 9.7 suggests that an adequate number of cases were present in each of the five clusters with a range of 88 cases in cluster two to 59 cases in cluster one. Additionally, Classification Results(a) test reported that 96.7% of the originally grouped cases were classified correctly. According to the SPSS Guidebook, a classification result of 85% or higher is considered good. The five cluster solution was thus adopted. Furthermore, the five cluster solution yielded a significant ANOVA result, and numerous significant post-hoc Scheffe test results further supported its viability within the analysis.

Table 9.7
Number of Cases in Each Cluster for Three, Four and Five Cluster Solution for Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Five Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Four Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Three Cluster Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4.3 Cluster Analysis Results for Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities

Cluster analysis for the Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities measure, was carried out similar to the previous Q2 result with the K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis test. Cluster analysis results for the Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Factor Components (Subscales)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid N Listwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>1.7004</td>
<td>.45483</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2.2175</td>
<td>.44663</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1.6780</td>
<td>.51497</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>1.7373</td>
<td>.42907</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>2.7716</td>
<td>.49172</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2.4413</td>
<td>.48082</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1.9318</td>
<td>.54235</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>2.3996</td>
<td>.50162</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>2.0381</td>
<td>.44685</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3.3443</td>
<td>.39776</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1.6967</td>
<td>.59357</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>2.2117</td>
<td>.48102</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>3.1192</td>
<td>.55925</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3.4804</td>
<td>.46121</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3.4485</td>
<td>.55409</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>2.9706</td>
<td>.55404</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>2.3098</td>
<td>.66913</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2.7054</td>
<td>.61233</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3.4884</td>
<td>.40567</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>2.1221</td>
<td>.49071</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>2.4290</td>
<td>.72283</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2.8149</td>
<td>.68396</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>2.5055</td>
<td>.98393</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>2.3013</td>
<td>.62456</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presented in two parts, the first is the presentation of the descriptive group statistics and the second is a summary of clusters, ANOVA result and the post-hoc Scheffe result. Table 9.8 presents the group statistics for the five cluster solution for Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities. Group statistics are presented to visually review the overall (mean, N, and standard deviation) result of the cluster analysis with factor groupings as inputs. Factor groupings generated from the factor analysis test of Backcountry, Culture, Recreation, and Entertain were loaded into the cluster analysis test. The response scale is based on a five-point Likert scale re-coded to a four point scale whereby 1 is Not at all important, 2 is Somewhat Important, 3 is Very Important, and 4 is Extremely Important. The group statistics present the means for each factor grouping and cluster, with the corresponding standard deviation and the number of cases in each cluster. The means range from highs of 3.4 for Cluster Three, Culture and Cluster Five, Recreation to lows of 1.6 Cluster One, Recreation and Cluster Three, Recreation. Ns range from a high of 88 cases in Cluster Two to a low of 59 cases in Cluster One. Standard Deviations range from a low of .397 to a high of .983 and generally indicate normal distributions.
Table 9.9 presents the summary of the cluster analysis results based on the K-means non-hierarchical five cluster solution analysis. Each of the five clusters is presented from the left beginning with cluster 1 and through columns 1 through 5. The sixth column presents the mean for each of the four factor groupings Backcountry, Culture, Recreation and Entertain. The sixth column provides some insight as to the importance ranking of each of the factor groupings by means. The scale for Q5 was a five point scale with the final scale item of ‘Unsure’ recoded as missing, thus it is based on a four point scale whereby 1 is ‘Not at All Important’ and 4 is ‘Extremely Important’ with higher means indicating higher reported importance. Culture is ranked highest with a mean of 2.81, followed by Recreation with a mean of 2.50 and Backcountry 2.42, and lastly, Entertain with a mean of 2.30. The final column on the right of Table 9.9 includes...
the results of post-hoc Scheffe results. Each of the five cluster columns includes the factor grouping Means in the rows below.

An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences among the means of the clusters and yielded a p-value of .000 indicating that significant differences exist within the five clusters. A post hoc analysis of a post-hoc Scheffe test was conducted to determine which clusters are significantly different from which, and in what direction. The Culture factor grouping garnered numerous significant results, clusters 1, 2, 3, 4 are reported to be different from three of four other clusters and cluster 5 is different from all four other clusters. The Recreation factor grouping resulted in clusters 1, 2, 3 being different from two of the four other clusters and clusters 4 and 5 are different from three of four clusters. The Backcountry factor grouping is highly distinct among clusters; all five clusters are different from all four other clusters. The Entertain factor grouping reported that clusters 1 and 4 are different from all four other clusters, clusters 2 and 5 are different from three of four other clusters and cluster 3 is different two of four other clusters.

The Table 9.9 results present four important implications for theory building for this research project. Firstly, the ANOVA result along with the range of post-hoc Scheffe results, suggest that there are five distinct groups or clusters of residents with respect to the ranking of importance of recreation amenities in the Bow Valley. This finding supports theory building by suggesting that the presence of groups who value different types of recreation amenities (such as the typology of amenity migrants, Chapter Seven) means that one category (factor grouping) of recreation amenity may dominate over another depending on the size of the group of people. For example, if the proportion of people that support or value cultural amenities increases, the depth and breadth of cultural opportunities are likely to increase in response, thereby affecting the physical character of the community, thereby altering the image of the community over time to attract more of those who value such a community, (LEI P1 Category 2) thereby perpetuating the
evolution of the community. An important underlying tenet of my theory is that distinct groups of residents exist who value different types of recreation amenities.

Secondly, the ranking of importance from Culture, Recreation, and Backcountry through to Entertain suggests a resident community that values culture and recreation or in-town recreation amenities higher than backcountry amenities, despite its obvious mountain and related nature-based assets and image. This finding is supported by descriptive results of the previous chapter whereby the majority of the top ten recreation amenities were dominated by in-town or urban types of amenities. It is further supported by qualitative findings from previous research phases, that indicated a resident’s ‘ideal day’ was primarily urban-based, that new residents were not as keen to venture off to the backcountry, and that crowding, even recreation related, was more pronounced in town than in the backcountry.

Thirdly, culture and recreation amenities pertaining to the factor groupings are ‘built’ amenities, implying a certain degree of evolution of the environment or community from primarily nature-based, which would suggest that the backcountry grouping would be more prominent to a more urban leaning of recreation preference. This finding further suggests that an evolution of the community may be taking place.

Finally the results of the cluster analysis, with the post-hoc Scheffe results, suggest that there is a presence of resident types (clusters) closely linked to a model such as Plog’s Venturers and Dependables (2004). A basic principle of Plog’s work is that destinations move from newly discovered to old by the visitation of Venturers through to Dependables, and most destinations are seen to move from a nature or rugged character through to one that includes numerous comfort types of amenities to accommodate more of the ‘dependables’. Recognizing that Plog’s (2004) work was not intended to address amenity migration, but rather short-stay tourism, the similarities with respect to chronicling the evolution of a destination by its users (tourists and/or amenity migrants) is remarkably relevant to the findings of this research project. One can relate to Plog (2004) by first proposing that the Backcountry Lifestyle Cluster 2 be similar to the
'venturer', while Culture Lifestyle Cluster 3 and the Recreation Lifestyle Cluster 5 are similar to the 'dependables'. The culture and recreation lifestyle clusters are related to the dependable because both cultural and recreation amenities are largely built, implying more of the comfort amenities, while backcountry amenities are more natural. If a Plog (2004) type of evolution is evident in this research, then post-hoc Scheffe results would be as follows:

i.) The Backcountry Lifestyle (Clu2) would be greater than the Culture Lifestyle (Clu3) and the Recreation Lifestyle (Clu5) on the Backcountry Factor Grouping; and

ii.) The Culture Lifestyle (Clu3) would be greater than the Backcountry Lifestyle (Clu2) on the Culture factor grouping; and

iii.) The Recreation Lifestyle (Clu5) would be significantly greater than the Backcountry Lifestyle (Clu2) on the Recreation factor grouping.

Table 9.9 post-hoc Scheffe results state that Cluster 2 is greater than Cluster 3 and Cluster 5 on the backcountry factor grouping. Further the Recreation Lifestyle (Cluster 5) is significantly greater than Backcountry Lifestyle (Cluster 2) with respect to the Recreation factor grouping. Also the Culture Lifestyle (Cluster 3) is significantly greater than the Backcountry Lifestyle (Cluster 2) on the Culture factor grouping. This result suggests that there are distinct groups based on the types of recreation amenities individuals report to be more and less important, and that these types (clusters) suggest a maturing of the community and evidence of an evolutionary process model (Plog, 2004) by chronicling resident preference for natural through to built or more comfort-type recreation amenities (Glorioso & Moss, 2006). This is an important finding with respect to my theory building because it supports an evolutionary process linked to recreation expression.
9.4.4 Baseline Characteristics by Cluster Grouping for Q5, Importance of Recreation Amenities

Importance of Recreation Amenities measure, was the cross-tabulation with the chi-square test. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 9.10 with the first row including each of the five clusters and Ns, the next to last column from the right includes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
<th>Cluster 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Canmore N=263</td>
<td>48 (18.3)</td>
<td>56 (21.3)</td>
<td>45 (17.1)</td>
<td>51 (19.4)</td>
<td>63 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Banff N=99 (100)</td>
<td>11 (11.1)</td>
<td>32 (32.3)</td>
<td>16 (16.2)</td>
<td>17 (17.2)</td>
<td>23 (23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 yrs N=88 (100)</td>
<td>12 (13.6)</td>
<td>27 (30.7)</td>
<td>17 (19.2)</td>
<td>16 (18.2)</td>
<td>16 (18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 yrs N=94 (100)</td>
<td>9 (9.6)</td>
<td>29 (30.9)</td>
<td>15 (16)</td>
<td>15 (16)</td>
<td>26 (27.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20 yrs N=79 (100)</td>
<td>16 (20.3)</td>
<td>17 (21.5)</td>
<td>8 (10.1)</td>
<td>14 (17.7)</td>
<td>24 (30.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and longer N=96 (100)</td>
<td>20 (20.8)</td>
<td>13 (13.5)</td>
<td>21 (21.9)</td>
<td>22 (22.9)</td>
<td>20 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Structure N=355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple w/kids N=124 (100)</td>
<td>13 (10.5)</td>
<td>19 (15.3)</td>
<td>7 (5.6)</td>
<td>28 (22.6)</td>
<td>57 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple no kids N=141 (100)</td>
<td>26 (18.4)</td>
<td>38 (27)</td>
<td>38 (27)</td>
<td>25 (17.7)</td>
<td>14 (9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent N=12 (100)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>3 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone N=59 (100)</td>
<td>13 (33.3)</td>
<td>9 (23.1)</td>
<td>9 (23.1)</td>
<td>4 (10.3)</td>
<td>4 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/ R-mates N=26 (100)</td>
<td>5 (11.5)</td>
<td>15 (57.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>5 (19.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Extended N=4 (100)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>3 (75)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership N=362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own N=284 (100)</td>
<td>53 (18)</td>
<td>62 (21.1)</td>
<td>56 (19)</td>
<td>58 (19.7)</td>
<td>65 (22.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent N=65 (100)</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
<td>25 (38.5)</td>
<td>5 (7.7)</td>
<td>9 (13.8)</td>
<td>20 (30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education N=360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some School N=0</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (63)</td>
<td>6 (18.8)</td>
<td>11 (34.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School N=32</td>
<td>12 (37.5)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Secondary N=56</td>
<td>8 (14.3)</td>
<td>14 (25)</td>
<td>9 (16.1)</td>
<td>15 (26.8)</td>
<td>10 (17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Diploma N=54</td>
<td>8 (14.8)</td>
<td>11 (20.4)</td>
<td>8 (14.8)</td>
<td>11 (20.4)</td>
<td>16 (29.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree N=138</td>
<td>18 (13)</td>
<td>42 (30.4)</td>
<td>22 (15.9)</td>
<td>26 (18.8)</td>
<td>30 (21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School N=75</td>
<td>11 (14.7)</td>
<td>19 (25.3)</td>
<td>18 (24)</td>
<td>10 (13.3)</td>
<td>17 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income N=361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000 N=14</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td>4 (28.6)</td>
<td>3 (21.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $30,000 N=28</td>
<td>9 (32.1)</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>8 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $40,000 N=42</td>
<td>9 (21.4)</td>
<td>14 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (14.3)</td>
<td>5 (11.9)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $60,000 N=74</td>
<td>11 (14.9)</td>
<td>19 (25.7)</td>
<td>1 (14.9)</td>
<td>17 (23)</td>
<td>16 (21.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$80,000 N=58</td>
<td>9 (15.2)</td>
<td>16 (27.6)</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
<td>12 (20.7)</td>
<td>15 (25.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000 N=33</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and higher N=63</td>
<td>9 (14.3)</td>
<td>17 (27)</td>
<td>10 (15.9)</td>
<td>16 (25.4)</td>
<td>11 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused N=47</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
<td>10 (21.3)</td>
<td>14 (29.8)</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
<td>11 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender N=360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female N=216 (100)</td>
<td>27 (12.5)</td>
<td>45 (20.8)</td>
<td>34 (15.7)</td>
<td>50 (23.1)</td>
<td>60 (27.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male N=144 (100)</td>
<td>32 (22.2)</td>
<td>43 (29.9)</td>
<td>26 (18.1)</td>
<td>18 (12.5)</td>
<td>25 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age N=362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 N=9</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
<td>5 (55.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 N=51</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>21 (41.2)</td>
<td>3 (3.9)</td>
<td>12 (23.5)</td>
<td>15 (29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 N=86</td>
<td>7 (8.1)</td>
<td>23 (26.7)</td>
<td>4 (4.7)</td>
<td>25 (29.1)</td>
<td>27 (31.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 N=94</td>
<td>21 (22.3)</td>
<td>19 (20.2)</td>
<td>15 (16)</td>
<td>14 (14.9)</td>
<td>25 (26.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 N=76</td>
<td>13 (17.1)</td>
<td>14 (18.4)</td>
<td>26 (34.2)</td>
<td>11 (14.5)</td>
<td>12 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older N=46</td>
<td>16 (34.8)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>14 (30.4)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>4 (8.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.10 Baseline Characteristics By Cluster Grouping for Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities
the Pearson value from the chi-square analysis and the final column to the right includes
the p-value for that particular variable. The frequency and percent (in brackets) is given
for each variable for each cluster. The first column in Table 9.10 includes each of the
demographic or descriptive variables from residence (community), tenure of residency,
household structure, home ownership, education, income, gender and age. Chi-square
results indicate that five variables resulted in significant scores indicating differences
exist within those clusters, they include: community of residence (p=0.040), household
structure (p=0.000), home ownership (p=0.26), gender (p=0.002) and age (p=0.000). The
cross-tabulation and chi-square results support the development of theory through the
exploration of cluster characteristics and to offer further support of the presence of
distinct groups within the Bow Valley.

9.4.5 Section Summary for Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities

The purpose of the preceding section was to apply a variety of segmentation
analysis to the Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities measure toward theory building
within a grounded theory approach. The results of the factor analysis yielded four factor
groupings of Culture, Recreation, Backcountry and Entertain. The factor groupings were
then input to the PCA cluster analysis test with the post-hoc Scheffe test which uncovered
five clusters that were generally distinct.

The results of this section contributed to theory building in two ways. First, factor
analysis uncovered the way in which recreation amenities are grouped and ranked by the
sample. Culture types of amenities were ranked highest followed by Recreation (in-
town) then Backcountry and lastly Entertain[ment]. This finding suggests that the
sample leans towards valuing in-town types of amenities which are associated with
developing or maturing high recreation amenity destinations (Glorioso & Moss, 2006)
but it is important to note that this broad leaning of the sample does not negate the
presence of distinct groups within the sample. The factor analysis results of valuing in-
town recreation amenities is also supported by data derived from all three qualitative research phases of my research project as noted earlier. Given the combined results of the qualitative and quantitative research it appears that residents (as a group) of the Bow Valley value in-town recreation amenities of culture and recreation more than the broad category of outdoor or backcountry amenities. This result offers insight as to the type of person now residing in the Bow Valley.

The second contribution of this section toward theory building emerged from the cluster and post-hoc Scheffe analysis of Table 9.10. Five distinct clusters or groups of respondents emerged, which could be related to a destination evolution model such as Plog (2004). Backcountry Lifestyle, Culture Lifestyle and Recreation Lifestyle were three clusters identified, among others. The three listed were especially important because they could be associated with a Plog (2004) model that suggests destinations mature by the type of visitor (amenity migrant in this case) from one that is nature-oriented and reliant on few amenities (venturer) who is the likely the first to arrive, through to one that seeks more established brands and comfort amenities in general (dependable). The evolution toward maturation implies a movement from natural through to built amenities, thus the Backcountry Lifestyle may relate to the venturer and the Culture and Recreation Lifestyle clusters may relate to the more built environment of the dependable. The post-hoc Scheffe results revealed significant differences among the groups in the direction expected within a Plog (2004) model of evolution, thus providing some support for the assertion that the Bow Valley evolves with the type of amenity migrant residing in the area. This result is further supported by several category level data from the Initial Focus Group and Lived Experience Interview qualitative research findings (LEI P1 Categories 1 and 2 combined) and most notably that there is considerable migration in and out of the Bow Valley, following a similar pattern of the more backcountry nature-oriented individuals leaving for other less developed communities while more dependable type residents arrive.
9.5  Segmentation Results for Q8, Perception of Change

The purpose of this section is to present the segmentation results of the Q8, Perception of Change measure. Section 9.5.1 presents the factor analysis results including tests of reliability. Section 9.5.2 presents the results of the determination of the five cluster solution. Section 9.5.3 presents the results of the cluster analysis including ANOVA and the post-hoc Scheffe test. Section 9.5.4 presents the results of the cross-tabulation analysis and chi-square analysis, and section 9.5.5 provides a brief summary.

9.5.1  Factor Analysis Results for Q8, Perception of Change

Table 9.11 presents the results of the factor analysis for the Q8 Perception of Change measure. Using SPSS Version 14, the Principle Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation procedure was carried out on the 26 items of the Perception of Change measure. Results indicate that there are six factors that explain 68.27% of the variance. Table 9.11 displays their loadings, means, standard deviations, eigen values, and percentage of variance explained. Two tests of the factorability of the data are the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. The former score ranges from 0 to 1 and a score of 0.6 is considered strong while latter should yield a significant (p<0.05) score. For Table 9.11 the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy is 0.765 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity score is .000 indicating the suitability of the data for factor analysis. In addition, reliability tests for each of the subscales yielded a Cronbach’s Alpha score of 0.853 for Crowding, 0.771 for Backcountry, 0.787 for Urbane, 0.615 for Outdoor, 0.602 for Town, and no test was conducted for Urban. Table 9.11 includes six factor groupings. Means for each factor loading are also presented in Table 9.11.

A lower mean score indicates the item was reported to have increased while a higher mean score indicates the item was reported to have decreased. Cursory analysis of mean scores indicates that ‘crowding and congestion in-town’, ‘the number of second home owners’ and ‘vehicle traffic’ are items that have increased the most. Conversely, ‘good
Table 9.11
Factor Loadings for Q8 Scale, Perception of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Eigen value</th>
<th>Percent of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crowding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tourists</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>15.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding and congestion in town</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of day recreationists - Calgary</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle traffic</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of second home owners</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding &amp; congestion in backcountry</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general cost of living</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backcountry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of canoe &amp; kayak areas</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of areas of rock climbing</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of backcountry areas for skiing</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of backcountry recreation areas</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbane</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bars and lounges</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of shopping areas</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of restaurants</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Nordic ski areas</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cafes</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Indoor fitness/sports areas</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full time residents</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good full time jobs</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of In-town parks &amp; pathways</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good quality housing</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of backcountry trails</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of informal trails</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ski/snowboard areas</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of festivals and events</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of urban recreation</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quality housing’, ‘quality of backcountry recreation’, and ‘backcountry trials’ have decreased the most. Standard deviation scores generally report a normal distribution.

The first factor grouping is Crowding which explained 15.48% of variance. This factor grouping is made up of seven items related to various aspects of crowding including: number of tourists; crowding and congestion in town; number of day recreationists from Calgary; vehicle traffic; number of second home owners; crowding and congestion; and the general cost of living. All items relate to a theme involving crowding such as congestion in town while the latter, general cost of living, is likely included in this factor grouping as being related to, or a function of, crowding. The items listed appear to possess strong convergent and discriminant validity as all items clearly relate to the general area of crowding (Cable & DeRue, 2002). The items in the Crowding factor grouping are similar to the transactional stress constructs described by Miller & McCool (2003) as including a variety of annoyances and hassles that together may create considerable stress.

The Backcountry factor grouping consisted of four items and provided 12.87% of the explained variance. The Backcountry factor grouping consisted of: the number of canoe and kayak areas; number of areas for rock climbing; number of backcountry areas for skiing; and the quality of backcountry. All items appear to possess strong convergent and discriminate validity, and even though some other backcountry items appeared in other factor groupings (e.g. backcountry trails in the Outdoor factor grouping) all items in the Backcountry factor grouping directly relate to the one-another. The Urbane factor grouping explained 12.52% of the variance and consisted of five items. The items included: number of bars and lounges; number of shopping areas; number of restaurants; number of Nordic ski areas; and the number of cafes. All items appear to possess strong convergent and discriminate validity (Cable & DeRue, 2002). However the ‘number of cafes’ which loaded at .657 appears a least likely fit with the other items. I believe that the ‘number of cafes’ is related to several factor groupings including Backcountry,
Outdoor, and Urbane given that it is likely a central to the mountain recreation lifestyle as suggested in the 'ideal day’ descriptions in previous research.

The Town factor grouping provided 11.72% of the explained variance and consists of five items. The items include: number of indoor fitness/sports areas; number of full time residents; number of good full time jobs; number of in-town parks and pathways; and access to good quality housing. The items are labelled ‘town’ because of their direct and/or indirect link to municipal government. The Town factor grouping includes items that relate to the ‘sustainability’ precinct of life rather than the recreation aspect. I coined the sustainability precinct of life earlier in Chapter Six and it refers to those aspects of daily life that support one’s ability to continue to reside in the Bow Valley, such as access to good jobs, and affordable housing.

The Outdoor factor grouping explained 10% of the variance and includes four items. The four items include: the number of backcountry trails, number of informal trails; number of ski/snowboard areas; and the number of festivals. All items within the factor grouping appear to be cohesive and thus provide strong convergent and discriminate validity except for the final item related to festivals. The festival item loaded into the Outdoor factor grouping with a load of .440 which is lower but certainly acceptable and furthermore, festivals are related to the softer aspect of the outdoor category. The final factor grouping includes the one item of quality of urban recreation and it was labelled Urban.

The data presented in Table 9.11 represent a grouping exercise to describe the way respondents perceived change (increase or decrease) of key phenomenon in the community. The factor groupings presented in Table 9.11 represent phenomenon (crowding, backcountry, urbane, town, outdoor, and urban) that is supported by Q8 results of the previous chapter (Chapter Eight).
9.5.2 Determination of Five Cluster Solution for Perception of Change Measure

Table 9.12 presents the results of the number of cases for each of the K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis for the Importance of Perception of Change measure. The number of clusters used in the cluster analysis was based on theoretical reasoning, assessment of an adequate number of cases in each cluster, and the results of the Classification of Results(a) test. Theoretical reasoning suggested that a five cluster solution would be best to parallel the number of types within the typology of amenity migrants, but it was not imperative to use five clusters in the cluster analysis. Table 9.12 suggests that an adequate number of cases were present in the each of the five clusters with a range of 18 cases in cluster three to 85 cases in cluster one. Additionally, Classification Results(a) test reported that 97.2% of the originally grouped cases were classified correctly. According to the SPSS Guidebook, a classification result of 85% or higher is considered good. The five cluster solution was therefore adopted. Furthermore, the five cluster solution yielded a significant ANOVA result and numerous significant post-hoc Scheffe results further supported its viability within the analysis.

Table 9.12
Number of Cases in Each Cluster for Q8 Scale Analysis involving Three, Four and Five Cluster Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Five Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Four Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Three Cluster Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall N for Q8, Perception of Change measure, is lower at 281 because as the scale was converted to eliminate the 6 ‘Don’t Know’ category, that data was treated as missing. A listwise analytical method was applied to the cluster analysis meaning that any case or individual who had a missing value was eliminated, and thus the lower overall N. The listwise analytical method provides a more robust analysis than the alternative of the pairwise method which allows cases to be considered despite the presence of some missing values as explained in the previous chapter.

9.5.3 Cluster Analysis Results for Q8, Perception of Change in the Community Measure

Cluster analysis for the Q8, Perception of Change measure was carried out in a similar manner to the previous Q5 result with the K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis test. Cluster analysis results for the Q8 Perception of Change are presented in two parts, the first part focuses on the presentation of the descriptive group statistics and the second part presents a summary of clusters, ANOVA result and the post-hoc Scheffe result. Table 9.13 presents the group statistics for the five cluster solution for Q8 Perception of Change. Group statistics are presented here to visually review the overall (mean, N, and standard deviation) result of the cluster analysis with factor groupings as inputs. Factor groupings generated from the factor analysis test of Crowding, Urbane, Town, Outdoor, Backcountry and Urban have been loaded into the cluster analysis test. The response scale is based on a five-point Likert scale re-coded whereby 1 is Greatly Increased, 2 is Slightly Increased, 3 is Remained about the Same, 4 is Slightly Decreased and 5 is Greatly Decreased. The group statistics presents the means for each factor grouping and cluster, with the corresponding standard deviation and the number of cases in each cluster. The means range from a low of 1.2 for the Crowding factor grouping of Cluster 2, through to a high of 4.44 for the Urban factor grouping of Cluster 3. Standard deviations from .338 to .636 and indicate little deviation surrounding the mean. The Ns range from 18 for Cluster 3, through to 85 for Cluster 1, with a total N of 281.
Table 9.13
Group Statistics for Q8 Scale, Perception of Change, Cluster Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Factor Components (Subscales)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid N Listwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>crowding</td>
<td>2.0010</td>
<td>.60380</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backcountry</td>
<td>2.9755</td>
<td>.49415</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urbane</td>
<td>2.2837</td>
<td>.43661</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>3.0614</td>
<td>.44859</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor</td>
<td>2.9151</td>
<td>.45462</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>2.6824</td>
<td>.49309</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>crowding</td>
<td>1.2304</td>
<td>.27166</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backcountry</td>
<td>2.3167</td>
<td>.63622</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urbane</td>
<td>1.3656</td>
<td>.33801</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>1.7592</td>
<td>.51845</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor</td>
<td>2.0926</td>
<td>.49161</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
<td>.53619</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>crowding</td>
<td>1.6024</td>
<td>.62787</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backcountry</td>
<td>3.2361</td>
<td>.43088</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urbane</td>
<td>2.0769</td>
<td>.59095</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>3.8389</td>
<td>.44410</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor</td>
<td>2.8685</td>
<td>.43453</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>4.4444</td>
<td>.51131</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>crowding</td>
<td>1.3875</td>
<td>.37764</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backcountry</td>
<td>3.1009</td>
<td>.38857</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urbane</td>
<td>1.7632</td>
<td>.33847</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>2.2340</td>
<td>.45221</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor</td>
<td>2.8011</td>
<td>.44282</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>2.4342</td>
<td>.54980</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>crowding</td>
<td>1.4181</td>
<td>.47855</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backcountry</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.48829</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urbane</td>
<td>1.8108</td>
<td>.47187</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>2.4793</td>
<td>.47723</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor</td>
<td>2.8689</td>
<td>.59625</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>4.2162</td>
<td>.41734</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>crowding</td>
<td>1.5545</td>
<td>.55936</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backcountry</td>
<td>2.9098</td>
<td>.60264</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urbane</td>
<td>1.8550</td>
<td>.53002</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>2.5095</td>
<td>.75849</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor</td>
<td>2.6849</td>
<td>.57861</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>2.7260</td>
<td>.98180</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.14 presents the summary of the cluster analysis results based on the K-
means non-hierarchical five cluster solution analysis. Each of the five clusters is presented from the left beginning with cluster 1 and columns 1 through 5. The sixth column presents the mean for each of the six factor groupings, Crowding, Urbane, Town, Outdoor, Backcountry, and Urban. The sixth column provides insight on the importance ranking of each of the factor groupings by means. The table presents the sub-measure means for each of the clusters, a cluster label and the results of the Scheffe test. The scale for Q8 was a six point scale with the final scale item of Don’t Know recoded as missing, therefore it is based on a five point scale whereby 1 is Increased Greatly 3 is Has Not Changed and 5 is Decreased Greatly. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences among the means of the clusters which yielded a p-value of .000 indicating significant differences exist within the five clusters. A post-hoc analysis of a Scheffe Test was conducted to determine which clusters are significantly different from which and in what direction. Numerous significant tests (p=.05) were reported with the direction of difference indicated by the arrow.
### Table 9.14
Summary of Cluster Analysis for Q8, Perception of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clu 1 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 2 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 3 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 4 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 5 and Mean</th>
<th>Total and Mean</th>
<th>Scheffe Test Results (p=.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crowding 2.00</td>
<td>Crowding 1.23</td>
<td>Crowding 1.60</td>
<td>Crowding 1.38</td>
<td>Crowding 1.41</td>
<td>Crowding 1.55</td>
<td>(1,2,1,3,1&gt;4,1&gt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1) (3&lt;1) (4&lt;1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5&lt;1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbane 2.28</td>
<td>Urbane 1.36</td>
<td>Urbane 2.07</td>
<td>Urbane 1.76</td>
<td>Urbane 1.81</td>
<td>Urbane 1.85</td>
<td>(1&gt;2,1&gt;4,1&gt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;1) (4&lt;1,4&lt;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5&lt;1,2&gt;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 3.06</td>
<td>Town 1.75</td>
<td>Town 3.83</td>
<td>Town 2.23</td>
<td>Town 2.47</td>
<td>Town 2.50</td>
<td>(1&gt;2,1&lt;3,1&gt;4,1&gt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;1,3&gt;2,3&gt;4,3&gt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4&lt;1,4&lt;2,4&lt;3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5&lt;1,5&gt;2,5&lt;3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor 2.91</td>
<td>Outdoor 2.09</td>
<td>Outdoor 2.86</td>
<td>Outdoor 2.80</td>
<td>Outdoor 2.86</td>
<td>Outdoor 2.68</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;3) (4&gt;2) (5&gt;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry 2.97</td>
<td>Backcountry 2.31</td>
<td>Backcountry 3.23</td>
<td>Backcountry 3.10</td>
<td>Backcountry 3.25</td>
<td>Backcountry 2.90</td>
<td>(1&gt;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&gt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;2) (4&gt;2) (5&gt;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 2.68</td>
<td>Urban 1.80</td>
<td>Urban 4.44</td>
<td>Urban 2.43</td>
<td>Urban 4.21</td>
<td>Urban 2.72</td>
<td>(1&gt;2,1&lt;3,1&gt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;1,3&gt;2,3&gt;4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4&gt;2,4&lt;3,4&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing is Different</td>
<td>Crowded Out</td>
<td>Everything is Different</td>
<td>Mountain Lights</td>
<td>Mountain Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three important points of interpretation to be garnered from Table 9.14. The first is that five clusters exist based on the six factor groupings and significant differences exist among the clusters as noted by the significant ANOVA test.

The second involves a more in-depth examination of the differences between the five clusters which based on the post-hoc Scheffe results. The *Crowding* factor grouping presents only a marginal number of significant post-hoc Scheffe results among the five clusters. Only clusters 1, 2, and 5 report any significant results indicating that at the
Crowding factor grouping level, the five clusters are more homogenous than different. This result may have come about simply because the Crowding factor grouping is strong among clusters - that is, most people who live in the Bow Valley would perhaps agree that it is getting crowded. However, given the presence of distinct groups (post-hoc Scheffe results) it is also important to note that some groups find it less crowded than others. This latter point underscores the potential for an evolutionary type of change whereby groups of residents more amenable to new conditions (e.g. crowding) are also present.

The Urbane factor grouping yields considerably more significant post-hoc Scheffe results with some significant tests among all five clusters and Cluster 2 is different from all four others. This result indicates that, different from the Crowding result, there is less agreement as to the direction of change or increase of the items housed within the Urbane factor grouping. The Urbane factor grouping includes several items pertaining to the urban types of amenities such as cafes, bars, and restaurants which tend to be a part of variety of recreation lifestyles.

The Town factor grouping yielded numerous significant post-hoc Scheffe tests in a fairly even manner across all clusters indicating that the sample has varying perceptions of the increase and/or decrease of this set of items. The Town factor grouping includes various items pertaining to municipal recreation, and variation of use of municipal recreation services such as the recreation centre tend to vary more with lifecycle (such as young families and older adults subscribe more than other groups) than any other variable.

The Outdoor factor grouping produced at least one significant post-hoc Scheffe test for each of the five clusters but overall there are few significant results. Cluster 2, Crowded Out is different from all four other clusters with respect to the Outdoor factor grouping but it appears the majority of the population perceives a relatively similar decrease in various outdoor amenities. The Backcountry factor grouping result across the five clusters is relatively similar to the Outdoor factor grouping. Again Cluster 2,
Crowded Out is significantly different from the other four clusters by the extent to which it reported that backcountry recreation amenities have decreased over time. However, at least one significant result emerged for every cluster. I suggest that this result implies there is greater agreement of perception among the sample that backcountry amenities have decreased.

The _Urban_ factor grouping produced multiple significant post-hoc Scheffe results involving all five clusters, indicating that there is greater variation of perception among the sample as to the extent that quality of urban recreation has increased. Overall the _Crowding_, _Outdoor_, and _Backcountry_ factor groupings showed considerably less variation within the clusters relative to other factor groupings and even relative to other cluster results for other measures in this chapter (e.g. Q2, Q5 and Q9 measures).

Thirdly, the general results of Table 9.14 indicate that some factor components are perceived to be increasing and others are perceived to be decreasing. For example, if a mid-point of 2.5 within the (5 point) scale is adopted, whereby that which is less than 2.5 is perceived to be increasing and that which is over 2.5 is perceived to be decreasing, then respondents report that _Crowding_ and _Urbane_ components are perceived to be increasing while _Town_ has generally remained the same and _Outdoor_, _Backcountry_ and _Urban_ (only one item) have all decreased. Also, the five clusters are different however some basic patterns emerge. With respect to the _Crowding_ factor grouping, Cluster 1 ‘Nothing is Different’ is different from the others. Cluster 2 ‘Crowded Out’ generally differs from the others with respect to the _Urbane_, _Outdoor_, _Backcountry_ and _Urban_ measures. Overall, Cluster 2 ‘Crowded Out’, N=65 are different from others with respect to perception of change in the Bow Valley.

The results of the cluster analysis for the Q8 Perception of Change measure have produced important insights to support theory building. The first is that change in the community from a resident perception perspective is such that there is strong agreement that aspects of crowding have increased, that urbane types of recreation amenities have also increased while outdoor and backcountry types of recreation amenities have
decreased generally. To the first point regarding crowding, there is considerable literature to support the assertion that resident populations perceive aspects of crowding to increase with increased tourism and tourism related development (Easterling, 2005; Andereck & Vogt, 2000). I have found no specific studies to assess whether residents perceive a concurrent loss of outdoor or nature-based recreation amenities. In fact, some resident support for tourism studies report that residents believe that many recreation amenities increase (Getz, 1994). However, there is support within amenity migration literature that nature-based recreational lands are lost due to residential development (Robertson & Stark, 2006) and to golf course development (Buckley, 2009). A variety of qualitative findings from all three previous phases of my research that relate to recreation coping and inter-personal level constraints further support this point of change in the community. This implies a direction of change from a more nature-oriented destination to a more urbane (urban) oriented destination. The perceived direction of change from a more nature-oriented destination to a more urban-oriented destination is in keeping with results from Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities measure and in keeping with the Plog (2004) model of change within destinations.

9.5.4 Baseline Characteristics by Cross Tabulations for Q8 Perception of Change in the Community

The final step in the segmentation analysis for the Q8 Perception measure is the cross-tabulation with the chi-square test. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 9.15, the first column including each of the five clusters and Ns, the next to last column from the right includes the Pearson value from the chi-square analysis and the final column to the right includes the p-value for that particular variable.

The frequency and percent (in brackets) is given for each variable for each cluster. The first column in Table 9.15 includes each of the demographic or descriptive variables from residence (community), tenure of residency, household structure, home ownership, education, income, gender and age. Chi-square results indicate that four variables produced significant results: community (Banff or Canmore) (p=0.007); tenure of
residency (p=0.000); home ownership (p=0.004); and age (p=0.000). The relevance of these results is that each item relates to an aspect of connection to place such as community, tenure of residency, home ownership and age more loosely connected to how long one has lived in the area, versus non-place attachment variables such as gender, income, education and household structure. Perhaps there is a link between the level of connection one feels with place and types of change that is perceived in the community. Another way to present this finding is to state that individuals will perceive what is important or relevant to them in daily life. Kyle et al. (2004) segment the broader concept of place attachment into place dependence and place identity, implying that individuals will connect to a place because of their dependence on the place to carry out desired activities (e.g. mountains required for skiing) or by how the sum of the characteristics of the place represent the desired identity that one aspires to (Williams & McIntyre, 2001). It is probable that one is more likely to perceive changes in amenities or other phenomenon that relates to one of the two dimensions of place attachment. Similar to my previous qualitative findings whereby men were more likely to comment (unaided) on backcountry crowding and main street changes while women were more likely (unaided) to comment on temporal changes and those related to safety and security. In this case it would appear that aspects of place attachment may present some predictors of the way one perceives changes in the community.
Table 9.15 Baseline Characteristics by Cross Tabulations for Q8 Perception of Change in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
<th>Cluster 5</th>
<th>(df) Pearson</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.158</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Canmore N=203 (100)</td>
<td>49 (24.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Banff N=78 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (26.6)</td>
<td>13 (6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 (14.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of Residency N=277</td>
<td>36 (46.2)</td>
<td>11 (14.1)</td>
<td>5 (6.4)</td>
<td>18 (23.1)</td>
<td>8 (10.3)</td>
<td>56.893</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 yrs N=64 (100)</td>
<td>34 (53.1)</td>
<td>9 (14.1)</td>
<td>5 (7.8)</td>
<td>12 (18.8)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 yrs N=71 (100)</td>
<td>24 (38.8)</td>
<td>8 (11.3)</td>
<td>9 (12.7)</td>
<td>21 (29.6)</td>
<td>9 (12.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20 yrs N=63 (100)</td>
<td>13 (20.6)</td>
<td>12 (19)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
<td>24 (38.1)</td>
<td>11 (17.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and longer N=79 (100)</td>
<td>12 (15.2)</td>
<td>34 (43)</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
<td>19 (24.1)</td>
<td>13 (16.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Structure N=275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.894</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple w/kids N=100 (100)</td>
<td>30 (30)</td>
<td>20 (20)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>29 (29)</td>
<td>14 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple no kids N=112 (100)</td>
<td>32 (28.6)</td>
<td>31 (27.7)</td>
<td>7 (6.3)</td>
<td>29 (25.9)</td>
<td>13 (11.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent N=10 (100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone N=26 (100)</td>
<td>7 (26.9)</td>
<td>9 (34.6)</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/R-mates N=18 (100)</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5.6)</td>
<td>3 (16.7)</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Extended N=4 (100)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.869</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own N=232 (100)</td>
<td>62 (26.7)</td>
<td>59 (25.4)</td>
<td>10 (4.3)</td>
<td>68 (29.3)</td>
<td>33 (14.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent N=48 (100)</td>
<td>22 (45.8)</td>
<td>6 (12.5)</td>
<td>8 (16.7)</td>
<td>8 (16.7)</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.476</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some School N=2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School N=23</td>
<td>6 (26.1)</td>
<td>4 (17.4)</td>
<td>2 (8.7)</td>
<td>7 (30.4)</td>
<td>4 (17.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Secondary N=41</td>
<td>13 (31.7)</td>
<td>10 (24.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (34.1)</td>
<td>4 (9.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Diploma N=36</td>
<td>11 (30.6)</td>
<td>7 (19.4)</td>
<td>4 (11.1)</td>
<td>8 (22.2)</td>
<td>6 (16.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree N=122</td>
<td>39 (32)</td>
<td>30 (24.5)</td>
<td>6 (4.9)</td>
<td>30 (24.6)</td>
<td>17 (13.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School N=55</td>
<td>16 (29.1)</td>
<td>13 (23.6)</td>
<td>5 (9.1)</td>
<td>15 (27.3)</td>
<td>6 (10.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.279</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000 N=10</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $30,000 N=22</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $40,000 N=35</td>
<td>13 (39.4)</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
<td>3 (9.1)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $50,000 N=67</td>
<td>18 (21.6)</td>
<td>12 (22.8)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>15 (26.3)</td>
<td>7 (12.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$80,000 N=49</td>
<td>14 (28.6)</td>
<td>10 (20.4)</td>
<td>2 (4.1)</td>
<td>15 (30.6)</td>
<td>8 (16.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000 N25</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and higher N=50</td>
<td>11 (22)</td>
<td>14 (28)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
<td>7 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused N=33</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender N=279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female N=164 (100)</td>
<td>47 (28.7)</td>
<td>38 (23.2)</td>
<td>13 (7.9)</td>
<td>44 (26.8)</td>
<td>22 (13.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male N=115 (100)</td>
<td>38 (23)</td>
<td>27 (25.5)</td>
<td>5 (4.3)</td>
<td>30 (26.1)</td>
<td>15 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.263</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 N=7</td>
<td>5 (71.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (14.3)</td>
<td>1 (14.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 N=42</td>
<td>20 (47.6)</td>
<td>2 (4.8)</td>
<td>6 (14.3)</td>
<td>9 (21.4)</td>
<td>5 (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 N=67</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
<td>8 (11.9)</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
<td>8 (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 N=75</td>
<td>15 (20)</td>
<td>21 (28)</td>
<td>5 (6.7)</td>
<td>20 (26.7)</td>
<td>14 (18.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 N=64</td>
<td>18 (30.5)</td>
<td>20 (33.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>12 (20.3)</td>
<td>7 (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older N=31</td>
<td>4 (12.9)</td>
<td>14 (45.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (35.2)</td>
<td>2 (6.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.5.5 Section Summary

The purpose of the previous section was to apply a variety of segmentation analysis to the Q8 Perception of Change in the Community measure toward theory building within a grounded theory approach. The results of the factor analysis yielded six factor groupings of Crowding, Urbane, Town, Outdoor, Backcountry and Urban. The factor groupings were then input to the PCA cluster analysis test with the post-hoc Scheffe test which uncovered five clusters that were generally distinct.

Several implications for theory building emerged from the overall findings of this section and I will summarize them here. The first is that the cluster analysis and post-hoc Scheffe analysis results indicate that residents generally perceive changes in the community such that crowding and urban or comfort types of recreation amenities have increased while outdoor (mostly mechanized) and backcountry (mostly self-propelled) have generally decreased. This result presents is important because it suggests residents perceive the community is becoming more urban. A similar finding was reported for Whistler, British Columbia (Moore & Gill, 2006). It implies a physical, social and structural evolution of the community from nature-based, towards a more urban, and built, destination with a change in resident. If these results are considered in light of the previous measure (Q5) further definition of an emerging theory can be discerned. The Q5 results indicate that residents favour more urban or built types of recreation amenities while residents also perceive (Q8) an increase in such amenities coupled with a decrease in nature-based amenities. It appears that the recreation amenities deemed more important by residents also represent the direction of change in the community.

9.6 Segmentation Analysis Results for Q9 Quality of Life

The purpose of this section is to present the segmentation results of the Q9, Quality of Life measure. Section 9.6.1 presents the factor analysis results including tests of reliability. Section 9.6.2 presents the results of the determination of the five cluster
solution. Section 9.6.3 presents the results of the cluster analysis including ANOVA and the post-hoc Scheffe tests. Section 9.6.4 presents the results of the cross-tabulation analysis and chi-square analysis, and section 9.6.5 provides a brief section summary.

9.6.1 Summary of Factor Analysis for Q9, Quality of Life

Table 9.16 presents the results of the factor analysis for the Q9 Quality of Life measure. Using SPSS Version 14, the Principle Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation procedure was carried out on the ten items of the Quality of Life measure. One item “quality of backcountry amenities” loaded below the 0.4 cut off and was thus eliminated, resulting in nine items as presented in Table 9.16. Results indicate that there are three factors that explain 50.73% of the variance. Table 9.16 displays their loadings, eigen values, and percentage of variance explained. Two tests of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Percent of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of development</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sense of community</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make friends</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living (housing and daily life)</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality health care</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality education</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of in-town recreation</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of regulations with backcountry recreation</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of career/work opportunities</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

factorability of the data are the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. The former score ranges from 0 to 1 and a score of .6 is
considered strong while the latter should yield a significant (p<0.05) score. For Table 9.16 the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy is 0.670 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity score is 0.000 indicating the suitability of the data for factor analysis. Additionally, reliability tests were conducted for each of the three subscales yielding a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.628 for Community, 0.576 for Services and 0.387 for Negatives. The Cronbach Alpha scores are relatively low which may be a result of the smaller N for the measure, the relatively small number of items within each sub-scale, or that the items possess lower overall reliability.

The response format for the question was based on a five point scale where 1 was Very Bad, 2 was Somewhat Bad 3 was Unsure, 4 was Somewhat Good, and 5 was Very Good. A cursory examination of the mean scores reveals that ‘access to health care’, and ability to make friends’ contribute most to a good quality of life while ‘general cost of living’ and ‘amount of development’ contribute most to a bad quality of life. Standard deviation scores appear to present a relatively normal distribution. One item, ‘Quality of Backcountry Recreation Opportunities’ was eliminated because it loaded below the .4 cut off.

The first factor grouping of Community explains 18.94% of the variance and includes four items that relate to community life and thus labelled Community. The four items include: amount of development; the sense of ‘community’; ability to make friends; and cost of living (housing to daily life). The Community factor grouping reflects the ‘sustainability’ precinct of daily life that was presented earlier in Chapter Six. The sustainability precinct of daily life exists alongside the recreation precinct but reflects the aspects of daily life that one tends to struggle with to either maintain a good quality of life in the Bow Valley or to simply remain at all. One could argue, based on the qualitative research results, that if any or all of the four items within the Community factor grouping were to erode substantially one would be likely leave the Bow Valley.

Services are the second of three factor groupings, it explains 18.45% of the variance and it is made up of three items that directly relate to various government-provided
services including: access to health care; access to quality education; and quality of in-town recreation. The Services factor grouping is representative of an individual who is intent on living in the Bow Valley, and perhaps with a family, as they represent a family oriented infrastructure. This particular grouping of items is supported by Glorioso & Moss (2006) who report the increase of comfort amenities including public services, in amenity migrant destinations. In the case of the Bow Valley it also points to the presence of a full-time resident population, as education opportunities are likely less relevant to the second home owner group.

The final factor grouping of Negatives explains 13.32% of the variance and consists of two items: level of regulation in the backcountry; and availability of work/career opportunities. The two items were grouped together and represent what is considered an annoyance for many in the former and what is a challenge for many in the latter. Results of the three qualitative research phases suggest that the level of regulation in the backcountry is considered negative by some who would like more freedom to pursue various activities at will, and considered almost a safeguard by others to ensure that only certain activities, and thus people, will use the area. The suggestion can be made that those who dislike the presence of backcountry regulations tend to be the earlier arrivals to the area or more of the Venturer type, while those who view higher levels of backcountry as a way to limit the types of use and users can be said to be more the Dependable (Plog, 2004). Results of previous qualitative research phases suggested that securing a good full time position was a critical part of ensuring one has the option to remain in the Bow Valley. Thus, it may be considered to be positive or negative depending on one’s goals and position in the Bow Valley.

Two of the three factor groupings appear to offer strong convergent and discriminant validity, as the constructs that should theoretically be related are related within factor groupings and those that theoretically should not be related are not related (Cable & DeRue, 2002). However, the Negatives factor grouping appears to possess considerably less validity by the same measures, which may be the result of a lack of clarity of the
item within the questionnaire, or simply its representation of a distinct construct which did not fit well with other items.

9.6.2 Determination of the Five Cluster Solution for Q9, Quality of Life

Table 9.17 presents the number of cases for each of the K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis for the Q9 Quality of Life measure. The number of clusters to be used in the cluster analysis was determined by theoretical reasoning, assessment of an adequate number of cases in each cluster, and the results of the Classification of Results(a) test. Theoretical reasoning suggested that a five cluster solution would be best to parallel the number of types within the typology of amenity migrants, but it was not imperative to use five clusters in the cluster analysis. Table 9.17 suggests that an adequate number of cases were present in each of the five clusters with a range of 53 cases in cluster five to a high of 91 cases in cluster four. Additionally, the Classification Results(a) test reported that 96.6% of the originally grouped cases were classified correctly. According to Pallant (2001) a classification result of 85% or higher is considered good. The five cluster solution was therefore adopted. Furthermore, the five cluster solution yielded a significant ANOVA result, and numerous significant post-hoc Scheffe results further supported its viability within the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Five Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Four Cluster Solution</th>
<th>Three Cluster Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6.3 Summary of Cluster Analysis and Post-Hoc Scheffe Test for Q9, Quality of Life

Cluster analysis results for the Q9 Quality of Life measure is presented in two parts, the first focuses on the presentation of the descriptive group statistics and the second part presents a summary of clusters, ANOVA result and the post-hoc Scheffe result.

Table 9.18 presents the group statistics for the five cluster solution for Q9 Quality of Life. Factor groupings generated from the factor analysis, Community, Services, and Negatives, were used as inputs for the cluster analysis test. The response format for the question was based on a five point scale where 1 was Very Bad, 2 was Somewhat Bad, 3 was Unsure, 4 was Somewhat Good, and 5 was Very Good. The higher the mean the more of a positive effect it was deemed to have on quality of life. The group statistics in Table 9.18 present the means, standard deviations, and number of cases within each cluster for each of the five clusters by the factor groupings. The means range from a low of 2.0 for the Negatives factor grouping of Cluster 2, through to a high of 4.3 for the Negatives factor grouping of Cluster 5. Standard deviations from .413 to .851 and indicate little deviation surrounding the mean. The Ns range from 53 for Cluster 5, through to a high of 91 in Cluster 4, with a total N of 357.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Factor Components (Subscales)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid N Listwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>3.1444</td>
<td>.45838</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>3.0845</td>
<td>.41392</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negatives</td>
<td>3.1620</td>
<td>.49117</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>2.3871</td>
<td>.59717</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>3.2939</td>
<td>.56478</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negatives</td>
<td>2.0461</td>
<td>.47734</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>2.3434</td>
<td>.48183</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>3.6692</td>
<td>.44745</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negatives</td>
<td>3.5985</td>
<td>.51306</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>3.7381</td>
<td>.44246</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>4.1575</td>
<td>.43981</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negatives</td>
<td>2.9945</td>
<td>.43776</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>3.6274</td>
<td>.48690</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>4.1132</td>
<td>.47930</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negatives</td>
<td>4.3208</td>
<td>.41711</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>3.0581</td>
<td>.77569</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>3.6634</td>
<td>.63908</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negatives</td>
<td>3.1345</td>
<td>.85138</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.19 presents the summary of the cluster analysis results based on the K-means non-hierarchical five cluster solution analysis. Each of the five clusters is presented from the left beginning with cluster 1 and columns 1 through 5. The sixth column presents the mean for each of the three factor groupings: Community, Services, and Negatives. Column six provides some insight as to the importance ranking of each of the factor groupings by means. The table presents the sub-measure means for each of the clusters, the composite mean for each cluster, a cluster label, and the results of the post-hoc Scheffé test. The scale for Q9 is a five point scale whereby 1 indicates a very bad effect on quality of life and 5 indicates a very good effect on quality of life. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences among the means of the clusters which yielded a p-value of 0.000 indicating significant differences among the five clusters. A post hoc Scheffé test was conducted to determine which clusters are significantly different from which, and in what direction. Numerous significant tests (p=0.05) were reported with the direction of difference indicated by the arrow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clu 1 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 2 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 3 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 4 and Mean</th>
<th>Clu 5 and Mean</th>
<th>Total and Mean</th>
<th>Scheffe Test Results (p=.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community 3.14</td>
<td>Community 2.38</td>
<td>Community 2.34</td>
<td>Community 3.73</td>
<td>Community 3.05</td>
<td>Community 3.05</td>
<td>(1&gt;2,1&gt;3,1&lt;4,1&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&lt;1,3&lt;4,3&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4&gt;1,4&gt;2,4&gt;3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives 3.16</td>
<td>Negatives 2.84</td>
<td>Negatives 3.59</td>
<td>Negatives 2.99</td>
<td>Negatives 3.66</td>
<td>Negatives 3.13</td>
<td>(1&gt;2,1&lt;3,1&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;1,2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;1,3&gt;2,3&gt;4,3&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4&gt;2,4&lt;3,4&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5&gt;1,5&gt;2,5&gt;3, 5&gt;4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services 3.08</td>
<td>Services 3.29</td>
<td>Services 3.66</td>
<td>Services 4.15</td>
<td>Services 3.13</td>
<td>Services 3.66</td>
<td>(1&lt;3,1&lt;4,1&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2&lt;3,2&lt;4,2&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3&gt;1,3&gt;2,3&lt;4,3&lt;5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4&gt;1,4&gt;2,4&gt;3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Transients</td>
<td>Older Comforts</td>
<td>Long-timers</td>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.19 reports five distinct clusters with respect to the three factor groupings; the associated ANOVA test yielded a p value of .000. Post-hoc Scheffe results offer further insights into the extent to which each of the clusters of factor groupings are distinct. The Community factor grouping yielded numerous significant post-hoc Scheffe results indicating that the five clusters are significantly different based on aspects of community, or as previously stated the ‘sustainability’ aspects of daily life. Cluster 1 is significantly different from the four other clusters while clusters 2, 3, 4, and 5 are significantly different from three of four other clusters. The cluster means for the Community factor grouping range from 2.34 in Cluster 3 to 3.73 in Cluster 4, with a mean for the factor grouping of 3.05 based on a 5-point scale.

The Negatives factor grouping yielded an equally high number of significant post-hoc Scheffe results. Clusters 1, 4 and 5 are significantly different from three of four other clusters, while Clusters 2 and 3 are significantly different from all four other clusters. It is a safe assertion that the clusters differ based on the Negatives factor grouping. The means for the Negatives factor grouping range from a low of 2.84 for Cluster 2 to a high of 3.66 for Cluster 5 with a mean score across all five clusters of 3.13.

The Services factor grouping yielded a similarly high number of significant post-hoc Scheffe results. Clusters 1, 2 and 4 are significantly different from three of four other clusters while Clusters 3 and 5 are significantly different from all four other clusters. The means for the Services factor grouping range from a low of 3.08 for Cluster 1 to a high of 4.15 for Cluster 4.

Upon examination of the five clusters one can begin to discern some patterns. For example, Cluster 2, the Transients, score low on all three factor groupings and it is generally significantly different from other clusters. Their score implies a cluster that requires fewer services, community connection, and regard for regulation and career which in turn implies a group that is less connected. Cluster 1, Friends (from the television show ‘Friends’), scored high on Community but lower than the mean for the other two factor groupings, indicating a group with strong need for community
connection but as yet requires less reliance on *Services* and are less concerned about career and regulation not so different from the characters of the similarly labelled television program. Clusters 3 and 4 generally score high on all three factor groupings but differ slightly in that Cluster 3 places emphasis on the *Negatives* factor grouping while Cluster 4 places greater emphasis on *Community* and *Services* factor groupings. Thus Cluster 3 is purported to represent an older, more comfort amenity seeking resident, while Cluster 4 appears to be more of a long-time, less comfort seeking type of resident. Finally, Cluster 5 distinguishes itself from other clusters primarily on its emphasis on the *Negatives* factor grouping.

An important finding pertaining to theory building is the rank order of the factor groupings. *Services* are ranked most important, *Negatives* are ranked second and *Community* is ranked last in terms of its positive effect on quality of life. The implication is that most residents believe municipal/provincial services in the form of health, education and recreation have the greatest impact on quality of life. This finding can be supported by the Q2, Motivation to Reside data which indicates that the overwhelming majority of residents are motivated *To Live* in the Bow Valley and the majority within that factor grouping are those who wish to balance work with a mountain recreation lifestyle, but live in the area. The high ranking of the *Services* factor grouping would compliment this finding. Further, there appears to be a slight contradiction, yet an understandable one, whereby it is commonly cited that amenity migrants seek places of extra-ordinary physical and cultural amenities (Price, Williams & Moss, 1997) yet it is equally well understood that once a place is identified, the result is a build up of comfort amenities including services (Glorioso & Moss, 2006) and urbanization (MacMillan & Gill, 2006). The same process appears to be occurring in the Bow Valley, whereby those who come to seek out its extraordinary amenities are also seeking to make it more liveable in a conventional manner.
9.6.4 Baseline Characteristics by Cross Tabulations for Q9 Quality of Life

The final step in the segmentation analysis for the Q9 Quality of Life measure was the cross-tabulation with the chi-square test. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 9.20 with the first column including each of the five clusters and Ns, the next to last column from the right includes the Pearson (df) value from the chi-square analysis and the final column to the right includes the p-value for that particular variable.

Table 9.20 results indicate that two of the eight descriptive variables yielded significant findings, home ownership ($p=.004$) and age ($p=.000$). The significant results do not offer any unique insights into the nature of the community but that the clusters are not so different based on Quality of Life factor groupings, and perhaps that Bow Valley residents are largely in agreement as to what inputs support a good quality of life.
Table 9.20 Baseline Characteristics by Cross Tabulations for Q9 Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cluster 1 Cluster 2 Cluster 3 Cluster 4 Cluster 5</th>
<th>Pearson P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence N=356</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.308 .508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Canmore N=258</td>
<td>43 (16.7) 43 (16.7) 76 (29.5)</td>
<td>8.298 .761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Banff N=98</td>
<td>15 (15.3) 21 (21.4) 19 (19.4) 22 (22.4) 21 (21.4)</td>
<td>27.894 .265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of Residency N=351</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.869 .004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 yrs N=85</td>
<td>10 (11.8) 18 (18.8) 19 (22.4) 27 (31.8)</td>
<td>18.476 .779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 yrs N=93</td>
<td>17 (18.3) 25 (26.9) 18 (19.4) 13 (14) 20 (21.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20 yrs N=79</td>
<td>14 (17.7) 15 (19) 13 (16.5) 15 (19) 22 (27.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and longer N=79</td>
<td>12 (15.2) 34 (43) 1 (1.3) 19 (24.1) 13 (16.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Structure N=275</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.279 .900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple w/kids N=100</td>
<td>30 (30) 20 (20) 7 (7) 29 (29) 14 (14)</td>
<td>22.869 .004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple no kids N=112</td>
<td>32 (28.6) 31 (27.7) 7 (6.3) 29 (25.9) 13 (11.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent N=10</td>
<td>0 3 (30) 5 (50) 2 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone N=26</td>
<td>7 (26.9) 9 (34.6) 2 (7.7) 6 (23.1) 2 (7.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/ R- mates N=18</td>
<td>10 (55.6) 0 1 (5.6) 3 (16.7) 4 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Extended N=4</td>
<td>1 (25) 0 1 (25) 1 (25) 1 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.279 .900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own N=232 (100)</td>
<td>62 (26.7) 59 (25.4) 10 (4.3) 68 (29.3) 33 (14.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent N=48 (100)</td>
<td>22 (45.8) 6 (12.5) 8 (16.7) 8 (16.7) 4 (8.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.476 .779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some School N=2</td>
<td>0 1 (50) 0 1 (50) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School N=23</td>
<td>6 (26.1) 4 (17.4) 2 (8.7) 7 (30.4) 4 (17.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Secondary N=41</td>
<td>13 (31.7) 10 (24.4) 0 14 (34.1) 9 (23.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Diploma N=56</td>
<td>11 (30.6) 7 (19.4) 4 (11.1) 8 (22.2) 6 (16.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree N=122</td>
<td>39 (32) 30 (24.5) 6 (4.9) 30 (24.6) 17 (13.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School N=55</td>
<td>16 (29.1) 13 (23.6) 5 (9.1) 15 (27.3) 6 (10.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.279 .900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000 N=10</td>
<td>5 (50) 1 (10) 0 4 (40) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $30,000 N=22</td>
<td>5 (22.7) 8 (36.4) 2 (9.1) 5 (22.7) 2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $40,000 N=33</td>
<td>13 (39.4) 6 (18.2) 3 (9.1) 9 (27.3) 2 (6.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $50,000 N=57</td>
<td>18 (31.6) 13 (22.8) 4 (7) 15 (26.3) 7 (12.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$80,000 N49</td>
<td>14 (28.6) 10 (20.4) 2 (4.1) 15 (30.6) 8 (16.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000 N25</td>
<td>8 (32) 3 (12) 3 (12) 6 (24) 5 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and higher</td>
<td>11 (22) 14 (29) 3 (6) 15 (30) 7 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused N=33</td>
<td>10 (30.3) 10 (30.3) 1 (3) 7 (21.2) 5 (15.2)</td>
<td>1.793 .774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender N=279</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.263 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female N=164 (100)</td>
<td>47 (28.7) 38 (23.2) 13 (7.9) 44 (26.8) 22 (13.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male N=115 (100)</td>
<td>38 (33) 27 (23.5) 5 (4.3) 30 (26.1) 15 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.263 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 N=7</td>
<td>5 (71.4) 0 0 1 (14.3) 1 (14.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 N=42</td>
<td>20 (47.6) 2 (4.8) 6 (14.3) 9 (21.4) 5 (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 N=67</td>
<td>23 (34.3) 8 (11.9) 5 (7.5) 23 (34.3) 8 (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 N=75</td>
<td>15 (20) 21 (28) 5 (6.7) 20 (26.7) 14 (18.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 N=59</td>
<td>18 (30.5) 20 (33.9) 2 (3.4) 12 (20.3) 7 (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older N=31</td>
<td>4 (12.9) 14 (45.2) 0 11 (35.2) 2 (6.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6.5 Section Summary

The segmentation results of the Quality of Life measure was carried out using factor analysis, cluster analysis and cross-tabulation and chi-square tests. The factor analysis yielded three factor groupings of Community, Services and Negatives and each was then used as an input for the cluster analysis. The cluster analysis revealed that the Services factor grouping was highest ranked, followed by the Negatives and Community. Numerous significant post-hoc Scheffe tests were reported indicating that the clusters substantially varied based on the factor groupings.

Findings further supported the development of theory in two important ways. Firstly, the clear indication of five distinct groups or clusters further supports the typology of amenity migrants presented earlier in the report. Secondly, the ranking of factor groupings indicates the importance of residential services (medical, recreation and education) and reinforces the Bow Valley as a place of residence, beyond a tourist or resort enclave. It also suggests that the Bow Valley has, and continues to evolve from a frontier tourism destination to a more established community able to sustain families in all lifecycle phases.

9.7 Chapter Summary

The purpose of the chapter was to present segmentation analysis results in keeping with the objectives of the BVRS within the broader objectives of the research project. Each of the measures has been thoroughly reviewed within this chapter thus the summary will highlight the ways in which results add to theory development.

Analysis of the Motivation to Reside measure offered a variety of insights but emphasized that people come to the Bow Valley to live as full-time resident amenity migrants. The mountain recreation lifestyle, however manifested, is a primary draw but the potential to realize a work/life balance is important to many. This finding is supported by a variety of qualitative findings that emphasize reinvention, mountain recreation, and escape (LEI P1 Category1; SHO Concept:2). Thus, it can be said that:
people move to the area to live in the mountains in a mountain community; and...

Analysis of the Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities measure offered several clear insights about the character of the residents. Most insightful was the rank order of recreation amenities whereby cultural and recreation amenities ranked higher than backcountry and entertain[ment] amenities. It suggested a resident population that favours built recreation amenities more than natural amenities and further suggests that the Bow Valley may be an evolving destination towards the direction of dependables (Plog, 2004). Thus, it can be said that:

*Bow Valley residents want to live in the mountains in a community and favour recreating in built environments over natural; and...*

Analysis of the Q8 Perception of Change measure revealed numerous important results and findings. These can be summarized as Bow Valley residents recognize change occurring in the Bow Valley toward the direction of urbanization, even to the point of a perceived loss of backcountry and outdoor recreation amenities. Despite the recognition (respondent perception) of change as increased crowding and urban amenities, and decreased natural amenities, other descriptive findings would suggest that quality of life is reported to be high most residents feel they generally achieve the lifestyle they expected and despite any recognition of change they generally do not intend to move on in the next five years. Thus, it can be said that:

*...Bow Valley residents want to live in the mountains in a mountain community. They generally favour built recreation amenities over natural amenities, residential-based infra-structure add mostly to quality of life, they generally perceive that the community has changed to become more crowded and urban with less outdoor and*
backcountry amenities but they are also generally satisfied, and do not intend to leave; 
and ...

Analysis of the Q9 Quality of Life measure revealed one important finding relative to theory building which was the recognition of residential types of services as having the strongest impact on a quality of life, even over aspects of community. Thus, it can be said that...

...Bow Valley residents want to live in the mountains in a mountain community. They generally favour built recreation amenities over natural amenities, residential infrastructure-based adds mostly to quality of life, they generally perceive that the community has changed to become more crowded and urban with less outdoor and backcountry amenities but they are also generally satisfied and do not intend to leave.

The preceding statement summarizes the results of Chapter Nine.
10. Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration

10.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the final results of my research. The results are presented in accordance with grounded theory in the form of my theoretical model, *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration*. My research began with the aim of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley. Through four phases of research and within the grounded theory framework, the research project evolved towards an investigation of leisure negotiation within amenity migration. It is common for grounded theory research to evolve over the course of the investigation in accordance with emergent data, analysis, and associated theoretical frameworks (Charmaz, 2008). This chapter draws upon the sum of qualitative results (Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7), descriptive and segmentation statistical results (Chapters 8 and 9), the working theory of the Typology of Amenity Migrants (Chapter 7) and relevant theoretical frameworks to support specific components of the theoretical model.

Following the introduction to the chapter, a brief section is included to describe the way in which grounded theory findings are presented within the literature. Next, my theoretical model, Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration, is presented and lastly, a chapter summary will be presented to offer further context to the theoretical model.

10.2 Presentation of Grounded Theory Findings

The goal of grounded theory research is to produce a theoretical model that is grounded in the emergent data and organized through inductive analytical procedures (Corbin & Strauss; 1990, Charmaz, 2008). Hoss & Brunson (2000) carried out a qualitative investigation of acceptability judgement within wilderness settings. They employed semi-structured interviews, a convenience sample and a grounded theory approach. Their findings were presented in the form of a typology based on varying levels of acceptance of impact on the wilderness. Decrop & Snelders (2005) carried out a
grounded theory investigation of decision-making of vacationers in Belgium based on 25 households. Their findings were also presented in the form of a typology of six distinct types.

Little (2002) carried out a grounded theory investigation of leisure constraints of women rock climbers within a grounded theory framework. Her findings were presented in the form of a theory-based model depicting the interconnectivity of different model components. Text was exclusively used to present her model. Hardy (2005) used grounded theory research to explore stakeholder perceptions of tourism in the Daintree area north of Queensland, Australia. Her findings were presented within a complex theory-based model. Similar to Little (2002), Hardy (2005) used text to explain each component of the model. The theoretical model for this research project, Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration, is presented as a theoretical model.

10.3 Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration

Figure 10 presents my model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration. The intent of my model is to explain the observed phenomenon of the research within a cohesive manner and situated within existing theoretical frameworks and literature. Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration, explains the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography within a recreation context. Whereby the human component is predominantly amenity migrants: the environment is predominantly a high recreation amenity and tourism-based community; and the relationship is characterized by various forms of leisure and recreation negotiation. An overview of the entire model is presented first, followed by a detailed explanation of each component, including the role of each component within the model and supporting research and literature.

Firstly, the model includes two different but related parts. The first is individual negotiation and includes the components of Motivation to Reside, Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure, Environment, Negotiation and Coping Strategies, Amenity Migrant Typology, and Place Attachment (Dependence and Identity). Individual negotiation
forms the human impact on the environment part of the relationship, which is then followed by the related part which is the environment's impact on the individual. The latter part includes the Affect of Destination and Recreation Supply and the associated loops demonstrate aspects of the connectivity. The two parts function in a manner similar to early Behavioural Geography models such as Kirks' The Behavioural Environment of the Decision-Maker Representation of the Society and Environment Interface presented earlier in Chapter Two (presented in Anderson, 1989) and Golladge & Stimson's (1987, from Johnston, 1991).

The model is explained beginning at the far left end of the model with 'Motivation to Migrate. Individual motivations to move and reside in the Bow Valley are varied. I posit that motivation to reside influences recreation behaviours and broader lifestyles that are manifested in everyday life. The Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure exists as a point of convergence for motivation, desired behaviours with the
effects of the environment, and negotiation and coping strategies. The Environment is suggested to be made up of physical, social, and structural components and each offers opportunities and constraints for the individuals’ negotiation efforts. A counter point to the Environment is the individual’s selection of negotiation and coping strategies.

Resulting from the negotiation process are patterned behaviours that eventually form groups or types of individuals who share similar motivations, recreation choices, negotiation strategies, and to some extent personal resources. The grouping of these individuals is captured in the Amenity Migrant Typology component. Over time these types form attachments with the environment which can be explained as Place Attachment (including place dependence and place identity). Depending on the strength of a person’s place attachment to the place (Bow Valley), that person will remain and continue to negotiate, or leave to find a place better suited to personal needs.

Regardless of whether one remains or leaves, one leaves an imprint on the place by their expression of recreation behaviour or choices. The Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply then becomes the point in the model whereby the human influence on the environment is noted. Recreation expression affects demand, that in turn affects supply of recreation opportunities. Two broken lines emanate from The Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply to suggest that as the supply of recreation opportunities are affected, the environment is altered and subsequently attracts those who are more amenable to current conditions. The lower broken line serves to suggest that as similar changes occur within the environment its effects loop back to influence the motivation, negotiation process and even attachment to place of existing residents. For example, a person whose initial motivation was to live cheaply in a quiet mountain town may have their attachment to place weakened by rapid urban type growth and thus the loop continues. Next, a detailed explanation of each component will be presented.

**Motivation.** It is appropriate to begin with motivation to reside or why people chose to live in the Bow Valley because it is what forms the initial connection to the
place for the individual. I suggest that there are numerous ways to explain why people are motivated to reside in the Bow Valley as amenity migrants, but the desire to live a mountain recreation lifestyle appears to be most prominent.

Leisure and recreation are important motives for amenity migrants (Moss, 2006). Findings from my research offer several specific reasons for why people chose to reside in the area. Quantitative results of the research project based on the Motivation to Reside measure suggest that the pursuit of a mountain recreation lifestyle is most important, to be with a partner is next most important, followed by ‘to get away and escape from where I was’, ‘to pursue a career in tourism, parks or hospitality’, ‘to start a business’ and ‘to own a second home’, respectively. Descriptive results of Q2 strongly suggest that the pursuit of the mountain recreation lifestyle dominates. For example, the item received 175 frequency responses for the ‘extremely important’ category response, while the next highest frequency was 78 for ‘just to be with a friend or partner’.

Qualitative findings of my research suggest that people arrive with a mental perception of the area, and an expectation of lifestyle. The majority chose to live in the area to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle whereby recreation pursuits are paramount and even define the individual more so than one’s career or work. The mountain recreation lifestyle is broadly defined. It may be just as easily focussed on arts, or entertainment or family as it may be on the pursuit of mountain sports. Motivation to live in the Bow Valley was also seen to involve an important connection to the pursuit of a desired lifestyle. A lifestyle that is self-described as out-of-the-ordinary, and almost counter-culture, as recreation goal achievement is given higher priority than wealth creation or career advancement. Some reported to have been drawn by the pursuit of one activity (usually skiing) but stayed for the lifestyle. The Second Home Owner group reported motivations more in line with escape and the pursuit of solitude and family time.

Another qualitative finding that was seldom directly stated but consistently implied was that of reinvention. Both full-time and part-time residents of the Bow Valley appear to be motivated at some level towards reinvention. Reinvention as an underlying
motivation is similar to the 'to escape' variable that was a part of the quantitative component (Q2). To 'get away and escape from where I was' yielded the third highest mean but did not produce a value in the subsequent factor analysis test, suggesting that the item was widely subscribed. The motivation variables of 'to get away and escape from where I was' and the idea of 'reinvention', I suggest are important underlying motivations for residency in the Bow Valley.

The most relevant theoretical framework that supports the Motivation to Reside component of the model are the push and pull models of leisure and travel motivation and the amenity migration literature related to motivation. Individuals are attracted to a particular destination based on a variety of factors such as one’s personal traits, and leisure and travel motivation, which can be grounded within a broad conceptual push-pull scenario (Suvantola, 2002). For example, the push of 'to get away and escape from where I was' and the pull of the possibility of a mountain recreation lifestyle can fit well within the push and pull framework. Cohen (1979) suggests that the push and pull is related to alienation in one’s home place and the search for authenticity in the other. Cohen’s (1979) appears relevant to the findings of my research.

The search for a personally meaningful identity and lifestyle has been linked to the mobility of amenity migration (Williams & McIntyre, 2001). I posit here that the unique and extra-ordinary mountain recreation amenities found within areas such as the Bow Valley act to attract those whose identity is supported by a mountain recreation lifestyle. Of the many motivations that drive people to choose to live in the Bow Valley, the pursuit of a mountain recreation lifestyle appears most relevant.

**Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure.** The leisure negotiation process is a central point of convergence of all that is everyday negotiation. It is framed by the human-environment relationship and remains dynamic due to constant evaluations of one’s ability to negotiate aspects of a changing environment with one’s personal resources. The lived experience component of the model includes the element of leisure
and recreation behaviour. Behaviour is important as it is postulated here that leisure/recreation behaviour imprints the destination through the expression of demand. For example, the emergence of downhill skiers side stepping up snowy hills in 1940s Banff resulted in the eventual development of the mechanized lift and ski areas. Likewise, the presence of families in Canmore keen to participate in swimming and fitness has resulted in the proposed development of a new and larger recreation centre. Recreation behaviour is an expression of demand which I suggest impacts supply, thereby altering the environment.

**Environment.** I posit that the environment of the Bow Valley is a high recreation amenity and tourism environment, and one that is different from most residential settings. The environment of a high recreation amenity destination can be characterized as having significant natural and cultural resources (Moss, 2006). The environment here includes physical, social and structural elements. The physical element includes natural and built features. It involves a strong social component of community and reference groups (Brehn, Eisenhaur, & Krannich, 2004). The social element can include detractions such as crowding, congestion, and other forms of conflict such as that with recent and long time residents (Moss, 2006). The environment also includes structural components such as the economy, housing, roads and health and educational infrastructure which all contribute to the negotiation process (Robertson & Stark, 2006). Physical, social and structural aspects of the environment are assumed to act both as a facilitator to one’s leisure goals, and a constraint or stressor at different times. I also suggest that over time the nature and character of the Environment evolves (dotted line) as the physical, social and structural aspects of the community evolve.

Findings from my research revealed much about the Bow Valley environment that support the assertion that it is a high recreation amenity and tourism destination and that it is different from other typical residential settings. Qualitative research findings report the Bow Valley to be:
• A unique place to live in relation to most other places. Its emphasis on the supply of physical and built recreation amenities, and culture of recreation activity, make it different from other typical residential centres.

• A place that people migrate to largely for a broadly defined mountain recreation lifestyle. It includes setting affordances skewed to a recreation lifestyle.

• A place that is self-described by residents to facilitate a lifestyle that is not for everyone, and that values attributes of recreation and social connection over career and wealth generation. It is widely acknowledged that one does not move to the Bow Valley for career or wealth, which separates it from traditional notions of economic migration.

• A place where social connectivity is made more challenging due to the itinerant nature of life in a tourism setting. Mobility is a part of daily life whether directly on the part of the individual or as a witness to the mobility of others.

• Related to mobility, the tourism and recreation focus and the presence of crowds are such that its rhythms are noticed on a temporal level, whereby Banff changes seasonally and Canmore changes from week to weekend.

• A place that is contested from a recreation perspective. That is, different groups defined by their motivation to reside and subsequent lifestyles (us and the ‘others’) vie for control of structural and physical changes. Social inclusion is based on how well one fits with the values of the broader community.

• From a leisure negotiation perspective, it is a place where the bulk of negotiation is focussed on the sustainability precinct of life more so than the recreation precinct.

Quantitative results further describe the Bow Valley environment as:

• A place where urban or front country recreation amenities are generally reported to be more important than backcountry amenities.

• A place where changes with recreation amenities and in the community are noted by residents, and quality of life remains high.
A place that considers its structural elements important as quality of life variables such as health care, education, and recreation services are ranked highest.

Raymore (2002) describes leisure facilitators in contrast to leisure constraints. She claims an important leisure facilitator is the environment (physical, social and structural) and if it includes elements conducive to one’s recreation goals, then it will aid in one’s leisure goal achievement. Similarly, Walker & Virden (2005) present a model of leisure constraints that includes the element of setting affordances that acts in a manner similar to that suggested by Raymore (2002). I suggest that the Bow Valley environment includes a variety of recreation setting affordances thought to be conducive to a mountain recreation lifestyle. Conversely, the recreation coping research suggests that proximity to a high traffic recreation setting such as Acadia National Park can result in recreation based stress and engagement in a variety of coping strategies (Manning & Valliere, 2001). Daily life as a resident in a tourism community can include a variety of stresses unique to the setting (Andereck & Vogt, 2000). Doxey (1976) reported the phenomenon of the stresses and irritations experienced by residents within a tourism setting within his well known theoretical model Doxey’s Irritation Index. It is clear that the high amenity recreation and tourism environment of the Bow Valley offers the potential for opportunities and constraints to a resident’s recreation aspirations. At this point, it is one’s negotiation and coping strategies that become important.

**Negotiation and Coping Strategies.** Negotiation and coping strategies form an important part of the model. I posit that both the Leisure Constraints Theory and the Recreation Coping model are relevant as general negotiation strategies but each has its own role within the short and long term negotiation process. Figure 10.1 presents my version of the negotiation process involving Leisure Constraints Theory and the Recreation Coping model. Leisure Constraints theory is suggested to guide earlier (upon one’s arrival to the destination) negotiation and provides guidance to the individual as to their ‘fit’ in the community. Recreation Coping is generally (not always) learned. One
learns about the resource such that they can more easily manipulate aspects of substitution (i.e. they learn of the hidden trails or of the times that it is best to go skiing through to grocery shopping). The Recreation Coping model is suggested here to guide many aspects of daily life later in one’s tenure at the destination. It is acknowledged here that both are relevant throughout one’s stay and it is matter of emphasis. The particular relationship between Leisure Constraints Theory and the Recreation Coping model is presented here in association with the unique setting of a high amenity recreation and tourism setting. It is likely that this particular relationship is relevant for any new resident to a particular site - urban, rural, or otherwise. As previously noted in Figure 2.7 in Chapter Two, there does appear to be a strong conceptual link between leisure constraints theory concepts and those of recreation coping research.

From a leisure and recreation perspective, negotiation with a person’s internal and external constraints is widely understood within the Leisure Constraints model. Intrapersonal level constraints or facilitators suggest a strong value-based fit with the place (Raymore, 2002). Interpersonal level constraints or facilitators suggest direction in the selection of reference groups and the general formation of the behavioural communities (Raymore, 2002; Johnston, 1989; Walker & Virden, 2005). Structural level constrains or facilitators suggest one’s parameters of lifestyle - what one can afford to do or not, where one can live, and the number of jobs one requires to maintain ability to reside in the area. This application of leisure constraints represents an alternate understanding of the construct and one that extends it to behavioural geographies’ human-environment relationship framework. If leisure constraints act in a manner to guide the understanding of one’s fit within the community, then recreation coping research serves to guide one’s daily life through adherence to temporal and spatial displacement and substitution, rationalization of negative stress, product shift[ing] the community towards enhancing one’s place attachment and connection with place or detracting attachment and connection to place, and direct action of attempting to make change. The notion that recreation coping strategies can affect one’s daily life is
supported directly and indirectly in studies of construct that involve resident populations (Manning & Valliere, 2001; Robertson & Regula, 1994).

**Figure 10.1**
Negotiation and Coping Process

Leisure Constraints Theory

Recreation Coping Model

Time at the Destination

Qualitative findings from my research also support this assertion. First, the leisure constraints material did not easily emerge as most participants did not understand the concept very well. However, it emerged clearly in a post-hoc manner through the trade-off question. The trade-offs of living in the Bow Valley “what do you get and what do you give up by living in the Bow Valley” produced numerous responses of leisure constraints from easy access to recreation and great lifestyle, to high cost of living, poor housing conditions, no good career, etc. Over time it became apparent that these responses were about the individual’s understanding of their fit in the community. Each response points to a choice the individual has made and each choice offers definition of who the person is and where he/she fits in the community. For example, the selection of the Bow Valley as a place to live was at the intra-personal level a strong fit with their values (usually); the selection of activities from hard mountain sports to hard urban nightlife suggested they had chosen a lifestyle and a reference group (inter-personal level); their financial resources dictated where he/she would be able to live, whether she/he could afford to work only one job or more, whether he/she could afford a ski pass for the winter or not (structural). Furthermore, Walker & Virden (2005) suggest that four types of structural leisure constraints exist including environmental, social, territorial, and institutional structural. Social, territorial and institutional structural suggest the
individual is formally and informally guided by what she/he believes can and cannot be
done in a manner similar to what is being suggested here.

Qualitative research related to recreation coping research yielded highly saturated
categories, and concept and category-level findings. For example, Phase 1 Category-
level findings for the Initial Focus Group research included that recreation coping is real
and engaged in by most participants, and noted that displacement is most prominently
noted. A key aspect of being a local means learning recreation displacement and
substitution strategies, and social inclusion is related to how well one fits into the values
of the broader community. Similar findings emerged from the other two qualitative
research phases. What became apparent to me in the course of recreation coping
questioning was that knowledge of the resource base and the associated ability to flexibly
substitute was an important way for ‘locals’ to distinguish themselves from ‘others’.
Knowledge of the resource was reported by some participants to reduce the stress of
overcrowding and that it was learned over time. Despite the fact that some types of
coping, such as crowd avoidance in a busy street, may be engaged in with little or no
resource knowledge of the site, there are some aspects of displacement and substitution
that require resource knowledge, such as finding the best fishing spot, that is developed
over time (or an accurate guide book).

The negotiation process here is based on the ability for one to negotiate through
leisure constraints and for one to respond to stresses in the environment with choice. I
posit that the Leisure Constraints Theory and the Recreation Coping Model work together
in a complimentary manner.

Amenity Migrant Typology. Resulting from Motivation to Reside, the dynamic
convergence within the Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure, of the Environment, and
Negotiation, is a patterned response resulting in several notable types of amenity
migrants. The Amenity Migrant Typology includes five distinct types including: those
who wish to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle in the Bow Valley and rely on it for
their livelihood but cannot negotiate the costs over the benefits and decide to leave; those who wish to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle in the Bow Valley and rely on it for their livelihood but negotiate to overcome the costs for the benefit; those who live in the Bow Valley to pursue more urban recreation and hospitality & tourism careers within the area; those who wish to pursue a mountain recreation lifestyle but do not rely on the Bow Valley for their livelihood directly (commute or remote work situations); and those who wish to escape to the Bow Valley part-time (second home) and do not rely on the valley for their livelihood. The typology is a result of different types (what is being negotiated) and levels (intensity) of negotiation within the human-environment.

I developed the typology from the emergent qualitative findings, however later quantitative research also demonstrates strong support for the typology. Segmentation statistical analysis of the Bow Valley Recreation Study reported that generally five distinct groups exist in the Bow Valley relative to one's motivation to reside, the importance placed on different recreation amenities, the way change in the Bow Valley is perceived, and quality of life variables. The segmentation results strongly support the presence of distinct groups based on broad variables similar to those employed in the development of the Typology of Amenity Migrants.

Figure 7.2 in Chapter Seven presents a clear link between the findings of the research project and the development of the typology. Several amenity migrant typologies appear in the literature, and each has taken a unique approach. For example, one is based on motorized versus self-propelled recreation activity (McMillan, 2006). Another is based on real estate purchases (Robinson & Stark, 2006). Another, more informal typology, is based on who they are (Purdue, 2004) and another is based on whether they are new arrivals or newly arrived (Easterling 2005). The Typology of Amenity Migrants is based on motivation/negotiation framework and therefore appropriate to the model.

**Place Attachment, Dependence, and Identity.** The relationship the individual recreationist develops with the place over time can be understood using the concept of
place attachment, including underlying concepts of place dependence and identity (Kyle, Bricker, & Wickham, 2004). Together, as place attachment, it is used to characterize the continuous manifestation of the human-environment negotiation as a relationship with the place (Johnston, 1989). Place dependence refers to the connection one makes with a place in order to carry out a specific recreation activity (or activities) (e.g. in Banff it may be the unique combination of mountain sports and high calibre arts in one location). Place identity refers to the attachment one makes with a place because of its ability to reinforce or support one’s desired idea of their own identity. For example, I witnessed this with participants who worked with Parks Canada and felt a visceral stewardship-like connection to the Bow Valley and their role in the area. Place identity as described by Kyle, Bricker, & Wickham (2004) is similar to the motivation to reside concept of searching for a place that reflects one’s identity put forth by Williams & McIntyre (2001). The model contends that over time residents will develop various forms and levels of place attachment. It is placed later in the model because it is suggested that the attachment takes time to form.

Emergent findings from the research project suggest that place attachment is experienced within the Bow Valley. Qualitative findings from the Lived Experience Interview phase reported that place attachment appear to be linked more to place identity than to place dependence. That is, most activities in the Bow Valley can be found in other similar mountain communities, thus place dependence appears less prominent, except when associated with the one feature of the area that is generally different form other mountain towns and that is the presence of Banff National Park. Other emergent qualitative findings support the notion of place attachment, for example the manner in which people reported that the Bow Valley reflected a part of who he/she was, or how participants had tried to leave the Bow Valley before only to return. Some could not explain their connection to the place other than to describe the great sense of pleasure they receive from walking to work in the morning under the shadows of the towering mountains. Others stated that leaving would not be difficult because their activities and
lifestyle could be found elsewhere in Golden, BC or Revelstoke, BC, etc. Quantitative research did not focus specifically on aspects of places attachment but descriptive statistical findings suggest that residents report experiencing high quality of life satisfaction and little propensity to leave to the Bow Valley.

I suggest that residents’ place attachment is a function of the connection they have managed to create through on-going negotiations and that some will leave and others will remain. Those who leave may be seeking other destinations more supportive of their identity, goals and personal resources. Those who remain impact the destination through their behaviour, and in other ways such as policy development, and through on-going shared discourse that creates a collective understanding of place. However, even those who eventually leave imprint the destination by their recreation activities to some degree. Thus Place Attachment feeds into the Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply.

**Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply.** The final component of the model seeks to explain how the leisure-based human-environment relationship physically affects a high recreation amenity destination. I posit that as population increases, urban-type recreation supply increases, and backcountry (outside of the town site) generally remains stagnant or decreases. This general pattern has been previously observed. For example, Glorioso & Moss (2006) discuss the rapid increase of urban amenities in the Santa Fe region during the 1980s to present in association with amenity migration. Moore, Williams & Gill (2006) report loss of recreation land adjacent to Whistler, BC town site as a result of residential and golf course development coupled with increased urbanization.

As the destination evolves, including the quantity and quality of urban and recreation supply, this will result in an equally evolving image of the destination that will serve to attract different types of individuals. This is a simple displacement process similar to Plog’s (2002) model whereby a destination evolves and as it does it attracts ‘venturers’ at first then ‘dependables’ later on. Similarly, early, density-crowding-satisfaction models
realized that within any one site varying conditions would attract different groups of people more or less comfortable with crowding conditions (Tarrant & English, 1996).

Emergent findings from the qualitative and quantitative research strongly support the phenomenon suggested here. Qualitative findings in both the Initial Focus Group research and the Lived Experience interview research included concept and category-level data that reported on a perceptible loss of recreation land due to golf course and residential development. Other concept level findings noted that it was the 'others' with different recreation tastes and habits that were changing the community. Furthermore, some noted that they were unsure of who the town was developing for - the locals/full-time residents, or the new second home owners.

Quantitative findings provide considerable support for a perceived loss of outdoor recreation lands. Perhaps the most relevant are those related to the Q8 Perception of Change measure. Results indicate that residents perceive that, since he/she has arrived, Crowding components (number of tourists, crowding in town, number of day use Calgarians, vehicle traffic, number of second home owners, and cost of living) and Urbane components (bars, lounges, cafes, restaurants, Nordic centre, and shopping) have increased. Components of the Town (fitness centre, full time residents, good full time jobs, in town pathways and parks, quality housing) have generally remained the same. Outdoor components (number of backcountry trails, informal trails, ski/snowboard areas, festivals and events) and Backcountry components (Number of canoe/kayak areas, rock climbing, and areas for backcountry skiing and quality of backcountry areas) have decreased.

Furthermore, a general pattern in the quantitative results suggests that the Bow Valley is maturing as a destination or in the process of change. That is, residents tend to move to the area to experience a broadly defined mountain recreation lifestyle (Q2 measure); they tend to favour urban types of recreation amenities over backcountry amenities (Q5 measure); they notice changes to the area whereby urban elements have increased and backcountry elements have decreased (Q8 measure); they favour quality of life services
such as education, health, and recreation over others (Q9 measure); yet they report high
good quality of life and most are not interested in leaving the area. All combined, it suggests a
departure even from early 1980s when Canmore was vying for the Olympic Games, and
emerging from its mining reliance, homeless climbers lived in Banff on a couple of
dollars-a-day, and Banff’s image and desirability clearly overshadowed that of Canmore.

There are dotted line loops from Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply, first
upwards to the Evolving Character of the Destination is Altered to Suit New Residents
box, and further back to Evolving Character also Influence Those Who are Motivated to
Visit or Migrate, and the Motivation of Residents to Remain or Leave box. The dotted
lines here suggest that as the environment of the Bow Valley (as per the results of Q8
measure) changes its character to attract those more amenable to urban type amenities
and it may cause existing residents to re-think their attachment to the place. The dotted
line downwards presents a similar effect but solely focussed on existing residents and
may cause a re-thinking of the relevance of their motivation to reside in the area. The
dotted lines indicate the evolutionary nature of the model.

10.4 Chapter Summary

The theoretical model, *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration*, is an
inductively generated and empirically based model. Data supporting the model is
grounded within four different but related research phases blended together within the
parameters of the grounded theory methodological approach. Each component of the
model is supported by the emergent data of the research and other relevant theoretical
frameworks and literature. The model explains the lived experience of leisure
negotiation for amenity migrants within a high amenity and tourism destination. It
further explains how the negotiation loops back to change the destination, and as such it
is firmly situated within the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography.

The model includes three features that require further elaboration. Firstly, that it
presents activity on two temporal planes. Secondly, that it is an evolutionary model, and
thirdly that occupies a unique position within the literature. *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration* captures observed phenomenon on two temporal planes, that of the individual within the destination and that of destination change itself. The first temporal plane is to the negotiation process of an individual whether the person decides to leave shortly after or remains indefinitely. This process marks the individual within the destination, for example, the tenure of that individual may be from 1990 to 1994 and in that time she/he has left some imprint on the Bow Valley. The second temporal plane is that of destination change over time. An important part of the model is the back loops that signify the destination changes with changes in recreation supply based on demand. Over time the destination will change to perhaps take on a more urban character, or not. The destination likely requires considerable more time than the individual process of change. Regardless, it marks time on two levels, that of the individual and that of the destination itself with no set points, or stages of alteration.

There are no set stages of marked change within the model, *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration*. This suggests that unlike other destination change models such as the Tourism Area Lifecycle model (Butler, 1980) or the Boom Town Tourism model (Perdue, Long & Kang, 1999) the *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration* is an evolutionary model. One of the criticisms of the Tourism Area Lifecycle model has been that its marked stages of change do not accurately reflect real-life change. An evolution-based perspective could better reflect real life change (McKercher, 2005). The *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration* model further reflects real life phenomenon through its evolution-based perspective.

Finally, numerous theoretical models have been cited throughout this document. Many share similar general goals to the *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration* model in explaining leisure and tourism phenomenon at the individual or broader environmental level. Yet the model that I present occupies a unique position within the literature in that it has attempted to provide an inter-disciplinary explanation of leisure and tourism within the human-environment relationship of behavioural geography. Coles
et al. (2005, p.31) argue for a post-disciplinary reconsideration of tourism research "...of tourism as a subject to embrace the complexities, ambiguities, and overlaps among different types of human movements, among which tourism is but one distinctive dimension". The inductive research approach adopted by this research project has allowed for the integration of a diverse array of phenomenon to be cohesively explained within the *Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration* model.
11. Summary and Conclusions

11.1 Introduction

In recent decades, the ability of the amenity migration phenomenon to alter rural landscapes throughout the world and especially within the North American west has caught the attention of community residents, planners and policy makers alike (Buckley, 2009). Despite recognition of the growing importance of amenity migration, not much is known about the inner workings of this phenomenon that brings about change to the landscape (Price, Williams, & Moss, 1997). My research has begun to provide some insights into this area by providing some theory in the form of the Typology of Amenity Migrants (Chapter Seven) and the model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration (Chapter Ten). The research project began with the aim of exploring the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley. My research has project evolved through the inductive grounded theory methodological approach to narrow the investigation on leisure negotiation within amenity migration.

The project examined several areas of research in an interdisciplinary manner towards its end of examining the human—environment relationship of behavioural geography within a recreation context. Areas of research included: behavioural geography; leisure constraints; recreation coping research; destination change research; place attachment research; and amenity migration research.

11.2 Summary and Research Conclusions

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley. This brief section will highlight the contributions of each chapter towards the final aim.

Chapter One presented the research aims, research context, its findings, and challenges for the research and researcher. The first chapter provided the necessary
research parameters which are especially important within the sometimes 'messy' processes of a grounded theory approach.

Chapter Two presented the initial research aims within the context of related literature and theoretical frameworks (see Figure 2.1). It further demonstrated conceptual links between some key areas of research such as links between behavioural geography and recreation and tourism literature, between leisure constraints and recreation coping research (forming the basis of the negotiation literature) and a lesser link between recreation coping research and place attachment literature.

Chapter Three presented the methodological approach and specific methodologies employed throughout (See Figure 3.1). The rationale for the research project was provided. All aspects of the methodology were discussed in the context of theoretical and other relevant literature.

Chapters Four, Five and Six represent the three qualitative results chapters. Chapter Four presented the results of the Initial Focus Group research phase. Results were presented by question groupings, at the concept and category levels and in context of relevant theoretical frameworks and literature. Chapter Four was the first of three qualitative results chapters and six data results chapters in total. Chapter Five followed, by presenting the results of the Second Home Owner interview phase of research. Chapter Five results represented the cross or extreme comparison aspect of grounded theory theoretical sampling. It completed the initial research investigation and provided a general picture of the overall phenomenon of leisure negotiation for residents of the Bow Valley. Results were presented by question groupings, at the concept and category levels and in light of relevant theoretical frameworks and literature. Chapter Six presented the results of the twenty-two Lived Experience Interview results. This third phase of qualitative research provided a deeper view of leisure negotiation within the Bow Valley. It represented a subtle but important shift in the direction of the research from recognition of 'residents of the Bow Valley' solely as residents of a tourism-based community to that of 'amenity migrants' and the Bow Valley as a 'high recreation amenity' and tourism
destination. This subtle shift was critical to contextualizing the majority of observed phenomenon.

Chapter Seven presented a summary of the qualitative results of the previous three chapters. It focussed the results into a cohesive working model of a typology of amenity migrants. The typology provided a bridge between qualitative and quantitative research phases by summarizing the qualitative work and guiding the quantitative research. The qualitative results, including the typology of amenity migrants working theory, provided essential guidance to the development of the quantitative research phase. The intent of the quantitative research was to verify the presence of distinct groups within the Bow Valley by key variables, and to further explore aspects of perception of the change by residents.

Chapter Eight provided the first of two chapters of quantitative results of the Bow Valley Recreation Survey. Chapter Eight presented descriptive results for each question on the questionnaire, more in-depth results for the four measures. Chapter Nine provided the results of the segmentation statistical analysis of the Bow Valley Recreation survey. The focus of the chapter was the presentation and interpretation of the four major measures of the questionnaire: Q2 Motivation to Reside; Q5 Importance of Recreation Amenities; Q8 Perception of Change; and Q9 Quality of Life.

Throughout the presentation of the results (Chapters Four to Nine), analysis was presented in light of other emergent research or themes and other relevant theoretical frameworks and literature towards the development of a grounded theory. The grounded theory of this research project emerged in the form of the Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration theoretical model, and was also the focus of Chapter Ten. The model represents a cohesive interpretation of the sum of the observed phenomenon of my research in accordance with the project's aims, and parameters. The model presents unique and meaningful insights into the areas of leisure negotiation and amenity migration research, and connects important aspects of behavioural geography and leisure and tourism research. This final chapter, Chapter Eleven, presents the summaries and
conclusions of the research project including its limitations and directions for future research.

11.3 Main Conclusions of the Research Project

There are five major conclusions of the research. The five will be presented in accordance with the chronological order of their emergence within the research project. The first focuses on the negotiation of leisure constraints within the unique environment of a high amenity recreation and tourism based destination. The second major conclusion is centred on the underlying dynamic of recreation demand that fuels growth and change in high amenity destinations. The third is closely related to growth and focuses on the contested nature of these spaces, with leisure and recreation expression acting as the central point of contention. The fourth major conclusion is the typology of amenity migrants which is based on the variables of recreation motivation, expression and negotiation, and within a contested place may also act as the basis of community stakeholder formation that furthers the different directions of growth and change. The final conclusion is the theoretical model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration organizes the emergent data into a cohesive and explanatory form.

Negotiation of leisure constraints for residents of a high amenity recreation and tourism environment appears to be different from that of other, non-touristic, places based on available literature. Jackson (2000) provides a strong summary of what is known and not known about leisure constraints literature, and based on his account (explained in detail in Chapter 2) leisure constraints results of this research project are compared. There are three types of constraints: intra-personal, inter-personal and structural level constraints (Jackson, 2000). Intra-personal leisure constraints in the Bow Valley are not an issue for most. There is generally a strong connection between one’s values and being in the Bow Valley because they migrate to the Bow Valley for personal recreation reasons, thus the presence of intra-personal constraints is likely less prominent. Inter-personal level constraints are conceptually similar to that of Jackson’s (2000)
description. However, the general focus of inter-personal conflict is not the typical coach, piano teacher, or simply lack of partners (although the latter is reported), it is more focussed on the presence of ‘other’ groups and whether they possess a threat to one’s recreation lifestyle. Structural level constraints are similar but different to Jackson’s (2000) explanation. They are similar because similar types of constraints are raised such as a lack of money and time, but different because a lack of money or time (holding too many jobs) means not being able to achieve an expected lifestyle or even not being able to remain in the Bow Valley. The latter point is different from the range of leisure constraints reported in the literature largely because of another difference which is that residents of the Bow Valley consider recreation and leisure as a lifestyle pursuit largely integrated into daily life unlike much of the previous literature that focuses on the pursuit of one activity. In essence, what differentiates leisure negotiation in the Bow Valley from that reported in most other literature is that people arrive to the Bow Valley with considerable and specific expectations of experiencing recreation and leisure, and that it will be experienced as a lifestyle more than an activity.

The recreation and leisure demand of residents of the Bow Valley alters the physical environment. This second major conclusion is basic but important. It separates the Bow Valley and other similar communities from typical residential communities such as Calgary, Edmonton, or Fort McMurray. Most communities grow as a result of economic activity, or the availability of employment, career advancement or other opportunities such as education, while the recreation component is viewed as a secondary attraction for the region. Tourism, and in this case amenity migration, is an export industry whereby the inbound traveler is considered the export product to the region (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2006). The revenue that arrives with tourism and amenity migration development is a recognized economic development strategy for many communities. From a community and resident perspective, I will argue that it is easier to accommodate short stay tourists (Banff) within recognised tourism zones (Banff Avenue, Lake Louise, Johnston’s Canyon, etc.) than it is to accommodate long term amenity
migrants who choose to reside in the region. For example, subdivisions or multi-unit dwellings are constructed to accommodate those who wish to stay, leaving a more-or-less permanent imprint. Those who stay also require services - schools, medical, recreation, shopping - more so than a short stay tourism infrastructure would require. The lingering aspect of amenity migration growth reinforces that the presence of 'other' groups will result in an altered community, and thus fuels contention within the community from those who are part of the change, to those who oppose the change.

The third major conclusion is that the influx of 'other' groups results in a contested space based on recreation. The influx of different groups, motivated largely by recreation lifestyles, brings a variety of 'other' groups together and fuels the behavioural communities as described by Johnston (1989). It is further argued here that the 'other' groups contest the space (community) by the measure of 'recreation lifestyle' because it is understood consciously or otherwise that recreation expression is a form of demand that eventually alters the physical environment. This conclusion underscores the recreation centered human—environment relationship and lays the ground for a typology of amenity migrants that captures different groups within the area.

The fourth major conclusion of the research project is the typology of amenity migrants. The typology brings together the variables of motivation to migrate, recreation lifestyle (what they do, value, and amenities they value) and negotiation strategies, to form a cohesive representation of the basic range of 'others' residing in the Bow Valley for recreation reasons. It represents a theoretical framework of groups within the region from a recreation basis. The latter point provides a basis for assertion that the Bow Valley represents a contested recreation space. More importantly, it underscores the theme running throughout the findings of the interpretation of the behavioural geography human—relationship from a recreation perspective.

The fifth major finding is the theoretical model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration. The model further interprets the human-environment relationship from a recreation perspective. Furthermore, it is widely accepted that high amenity
destinations change as a result of the phenomenon as previously demonstrated. The model extends our understanding in this area by providing an explanatory basis for the evolution (physical, social and structural) of high recreation amenity destinations.

There is an applied conclusion resulting from the research as well. It is apparent that amenity lead migration is market driven and without specific attention and controls it may quickly and significantly alter destinations and landscapes for good or bad, depending on one’s view point. It is increasingly apparent to this researcher that amenity migration can be managed. It is not an inevitable process beyond the purview of residents, planners and political leaders. The obvious case of the Town of Banff presents a nearby example of controls that has managed amenity migration growth (arguably to displace it to Canmore). The obvious rebuttal is that the Town of Banff rests within a national park with extra-ordinary management control capability, even legislative controls such as that associated with the ecological integrity (EI) planning principle. Such controls and management are not necessarily limited to a park or protected area. For example, the Sustainable Recreation and Tourism on Victoria’s Public Lands report provides considerable detail on how recreation and tourism will be addressed on public lands. It includes reference to the Ecologically Sustainable Development Plan which guides outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism on public lands. The Ecologically Sustainable Development Plan emphasizes:

- Individual and community well being and welfare by following a path of economic development that safeguards the welfare of future generations;
- Provide equity between and within generations; and
- Protect biological diversity and maintain ecological processes and life support systems.

It is applied to all public lands and holds some similarities with the EI planning principle. Ucluelet, a small high recreation amenity community 30 minutes from Tofino, British Columbia, has also began considering measures to manage amenity migration while Golden, British Columbia is presently seeking ways to make sure amenity
migration growth does not displace its local residents. Communities are beginning to understand — such as many did decades earlier with tourism — that measures are required to ensure a balanced approach to amenity migration growth, and it does appear possible.

Perhaps one of the more revealing practical insights has been that in absence of a specific amenity migration strategy amenity migration has been treated as tourism and amenity migrants as tourists. Yet the fundamental footprint difference between a tourist corridor (tourism) and the residence (amenity migrant) is fundamentally different in the context of environmental change. It appears that high amenity communities such as Canmore require a specific to address the specific and unique challenges and opportunities of amenity migration.

11.4 Research Limitations

The purpose of this section is to provide a broad perspective on limitations to the research. Specific limitations to the quantitative research portion were presented earlier in Chapter Three (Section 3.7) and in Chapter Eight (Section 8.2.5) with respect to response bias related to the quantitative sample. This section will present three limitations to the overall research of this project. The first involves sampling both qualitative, quantitative and statistical weighting, the second involves a lack of statistical analysis of Banff and Canmore as two distinct groups, and the third involves a lack of triangulation related to the perception of change in the community. Limitations to research are defined as the boundaries, exceptions and qualifications of a particular method or approach (Creswell, 2003).

**Sampling.** Sampling associated with grounded theory should be theoretical or purposeful with no regard to achieve a representative sample. However, grounded theory sampling should explore all possible categories (Charmaz, 2008). The qualitative research phases were successful in exploring numerous categories, and the researcher is generally satisfied. For example, once the mountain recreation lifestyle was determined to be the dominant group, other groups were sought out such as the second home owners,
established families, and several more. Those who had exited the Bow Valley were also a part of sampling, but the three participants interviewed had all decided to move to larger centres (usually Calgary). No one was interviewed that had chosen to leave the Bow Valley for a smaller centre such as Fernie or Golden, British Columbia. This group was referred to on numerous occasions by others but no one from that group was specifically interviewed as study participant. This point is a limitation to the inductive grounded theory process.

As discussed in Chapter Eight (Section 8.2.5), the data set is slightly overrepresentative of Canmore residents over Banff residents; it is slightly over-representative of older people over younger people; and it is slightly over-representative of female residents over male residents. Non-response bias was addressed (Section 8.2.5) but it is important to understand that the sample is over represented in the three areas noted.

There are a variety of ways to address response bias and this study chose to address non-response bias using an adapted approach of comparison with known values (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). A more widely supported method appears to be a weighting procedure for adjusting survey results to correct for non-response bias (Ley, 1997). The weighting method is considered to be generally effective for correcting non-response bias in univariate distributions. My research did not apply the weighting method to the quantitative sample because given the amount of qualitative data acquired from the three previous research phases, it was determined that the comparisons with known values were feasible and allowed for adequate rigour.

Banff and Canmore distinction. The objective of the research project was to treat the Bow Valley as one community, recognizing that the two communities of Banff and Canmore are different in many ways as noted in earlier qualitative results chapters. Over the course of the research it became even more apparent that the two communities are different in their environmental (physical, social and structural) characteristics affecting a general sense of culture between the two. The general theme of place as described throughout by Johnston’s (1989) behavioural communities, Kyle et al., (2004) revelations
of place attachment, Stokowski’s (2002) notions of place creation, and Walker & Virden’s (2005) structural leisure constraints associated with place, suggest that a particular place’s (community) culture holds significant implications for the dynamic occurring within. There is no doubt that a distinct treatment of Banff and Canmore residents would have added to the interpretive depth of the research. The results in most individual points of comparison may have been subtle, but likely meaningful in a broader sense. I did not choose to proceed with a detailed distinct treatment of the two communities for two reasons. The first is that it would have added considerably to the scope of the research project, making it too unwieldy and difficult to form cohesive theory. The second is that most focus group and interview participants reported a strong connection with both communities. For example, some live in one and work in the other, while others have lived in both communities throughout their tenure in the Bow Valley. It is clear that most participants held a strong understanding, if not connection, to both communities although they were generally biased towards one or the other. This still represents a limitation to the research project.

A lack of triangulation related to the perception of change in the community. An important component of the final theoretical model is that the environment changes over time in the direction that urban types of recreation opportunity increase while backcountry types of recreation opportunities remain the same or decrease. While the results of Bow Valley Recreation Survey support this position, it is on the basis of the perceptions of residents. Northcote & MacBeth (2005) investigated limitations of resident perception surveys and determined that in many cases residents do not always accurately report changes in the community within a quantitative survey format alone. They further suggest that any resident perception research use a triangulated approach or one employing a variety of methods. In the case of this research project, qualitative results also support the theoretical direction but another method may have been employed. The most appropriate method in this case may have been a simple historical accounting of key recreation assets such as trails (of different types), climbing areas,
commercial outdoor recreation opportunities (amount of skiable terrain within commercial ski areas) and urban opportunities such as cafes, bars and lounges, restaurants, etc. It would have likely included an extensive list of recreation opportunities but it would have added to the validity of the assertion that real change in the stated directions has occurred. Informal triangulation with the researcher’s reference group on the subject yielded no debate as to whether urban recreation opportunities have increased over time, but consensus was not reached as to whether backcountry recreation opportunities have remained the same or decreased. Regardless, due to the lack of a historical accounting of actual increases or decreases in recreation opportunities means that the results of this research project are limited to statements of the perception of respondents.

11.5 Future Directions

It is the nature of grounded theory study to offer numerous considerations for future research because of the amount of interesting information that must be discarded in the inductive–reduction process along the way. In some cases, reference has been made about links between emergent data and various theoretical frameworks that have not been elaborated with any detail, within my dissertation. These types of references often signal considerations for future research. This section will highlight some of the more apparent directions for future research emerging from my work thus far. There are three basic categories for future research consideration: the environment, the people and negotiation.

The Environment

With respect to the environment the more obvious and accessible question is about the differences (and similarities) between the Banff and Canmore communities. This question is of special importance because as noted in Chapter One, the types of controls placed on the Town of Banff and position within a national park, makes it a unique community. The Town of Banff exists almost as a control group type of experiment
among the many other amenity migration destinations in the west and especially neighbouring Canmore and that is, controlling for open market conditions. My research revealed several important differences between the cultures of the two communities. For example, Banff residents appear to be more aware of their role as stewards of the land, they appear less concerned about future growth knowing they live in a national park, and tend to appreciate the full range of recreation opportunities including the arts. Canmore residents are more diverse in their personal resources, more oriented to the mountain recreation lifestyle, and appear to have decided to be a ‘resident’ while many in Banff arrive simply contemplating the thought. The theoretical frameworks related to place attachment from Kyle et al. (2004) and place creation from Stokowski (2002), offer a strong basis from which to approach the unique situation of adjacent but different communities.

A further consideration for future research related to place is to carry out an empirical accounting of increase or decrease in recreation amenities/opportunity in conjunction with resident perceptions of the same. This form of triangulation would offer insights into actual change and just as importantly, the residents’ ability to perceive and report change in their community in relation to another benchmark (Northcote & MacBeth, 2005). This research may hold important implications for future community stakeholder analysis and insights into the future planning dynamic.

Related to residents’ ability to perceive and report change is that of the contested space that Stokowski (2002) writes about in relation to place creation. The Bow Valley is no doubt a contested place along the lines that Stokowski (2002) describes, whereby leisure is form of political expression. Which group gains and which group loses recreation resources (trails, approvals, closures, and so on) is a political process at the individual and community levels. Central to this dynamic is the role of local government (other levels as well) in the allocation of resources, approvals and the like. It may be valuable to further explore the notion of the Bow Valley as a contested place from the perspective of local government and related stakeholder groups that relate directly to
local government decision-making. Much could be gained by merging theoretical frameworks of the leisure-political/self-place-creation to the practical frameworks of leisure/recreation resource allocation within a high amenity recreation destination.

The People

There are three areas of future research consideration as it directly relates to the people. Firstly, despite the emphasis placed on motives (motivation to reside) in this research project, another related area emerged that received little attention: expectations of arrivals to the Bow Valley. Lee & Graefe (2003) present a strong argument that one’s expectation, in light of expectation theory, holds significant implications for how they will respond to environmental stressors such as crowding and congestion within recreation environments. Further investigation of one’s expectation of daily life and lifestyle in the Bow Valley may yield important insights into the changing social dynamic of the Bow Valley and offer practical insights into quality of life planning.

Secondly, there is the opportunity to relate other theoretical frameworks to the findings of this research project. Some have been alluded to throughout the interpretation of results. For example, there appears to be a strong link between aspects of the Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration theoretical model, and specifically, the Affect on Destination and Recreation Supply component and Plog’s (2002) work related to venturesomeness. The link being that as the destination evolves from the newly discovered, to one with a more urban theme, the types of people attracted to reside in the destination would move along the continuum from the Venturers to the Dependables.

Another theoretical framework that can be related to the findings of this research project is that of Cohen’s (1979) tourist typology. His tourist typology was briefly raised in Chapters Four and Five to assist in the interpretation of qualitative results. It offers a further and unique lens from which to examine the amenity migrant, as well as other arrivals to the Bow Valley. Cohen’s (1979) three latter types of the exploratory, experimental, and existential traveler arguably share numerous similarities with the
amenity migrant yet there it is not a completely clear fit. The ability to link amenity migrants and tourists within a typology such as Cohen's (1979) typology may offer important insights into the broader conceptual link between tourism and amenity migration.

Thirdly, another direction for future research is to further explore those individuals who choose to leave the Bow Valley. Some investigation on this matter was carried out here, but more focussed research on 'exit motives' perhaps even in light of 'expectations' of life and lifestyle in the Bow Valley would offer strong insights into the mobility and negotiation aspects of the dynamic from a theoretical and applied perspective.

Negotiation

From the perspective of negotiation, one important conceptual relationship continues to emerge as practically relevant and theoretically important: the relationship between what is understood as leisure constraints theory (Jackson, 2000) and what is understood as recreation coping research (Miller & McCool, 2003). The two have been thoroughly reviewed in this dissertation and appear to address different aspects of the negotiation process. Leisure constraints research focuses on the broader negotiation process from contemplation to response, while recreation coping research addresses a more specific response to stress within recreation decision making. The two have been conceptually linked in Chapter Two. Further quantitative research could be carried out to examine the link. One way could be to develop a comprehensive questionnaire measure incorporating items of both leisure constraints and recreation coping followed by factor analysis, to determine the level of overlap of constructs. This is perhaps rudimentary but it could further explore the relationship between the two towards a better understanding of leisure negotiation.

A variety of opportunities for future research have been presented in this section. Each direction presented has held a clear link to the work of this research project and to other theoretical frameworks or relevant literature. It is hoped that the findings of this
research project may ignite future research towards knowledge creation and a better understanding of the world in which we live.

11.6 Future Recommendations

The purpose of this section is to offer recommendations for future research that are somewhat broader than the specific scope of the research presented in this dissertation. Four recommendations for research are presented related to leisure negotiation, spatial analysis of recreation coping, tourism, amenity migration and the evolution of a community, and a broader recommendation related to motives around amenity migration. Recommendations are presented in chronological order of emergence within the grounded theory process.

Throughout this research project a considerable amount of attention has been devoted to understanding the underlying aspects of leisure negotiation. At times I focussed attention on the questions at hand and other times attention was given to contemplation of the possibility of a single, more comprehensive model of leisure negotiation. It is suggested here that there is enough conceptual evidence to warrant further investigation into a blended model of leisure negotiation incorporating aspects of leisure constraints research, recreation coping research, and other models such as Transactional Stress Theory (Miller & McCool, 2003). It is widely held that leisure constraints theory possesses various short-comings (Jackson, 2000). A short-coming of leisure constraints theory that was discovered in the course of this dissertation is its lack of application to a leisure lifestyle (collection of associated activities including psychographic dimensions) versus its application to specific activity/activities). It is also understood that recreation coping research is limited to responses to stressors within the recreation environment (Manning & Valliere, 2001). Walker & Virden (2005) presented a modified model of leisure constraints for outdoor recreation that extended beyond the traditional boundaries of leisure constraints theory and included aspects of coping as
demonstrated by this researcher in Figure 2.7. Further research is needed to explore the development of a comprehensive model of leisure negotiation.

Much has been written about the recreation coping model (Peden & Schuster, 2004). Likewise, much is hypothesized about where people go and what they do once they make a behavioural coping adjustment. Little is reported about the broader impacts of displacement and spatial and temporal shift. From a human-environment relationship perspective, what does it mean if people are displaced from a particular amenity? Where do they go? Or the people who choose to avoid a particular amenity in the first place, where do they go and what are they doing instead? These questions have been raised in works cited such as Robertson & Regula (2004) who explored displacement of boaters. In the case of this research project it is clear that some people leave the Bow Valley for other smaller (less expensive) communities such as Golden or Revelstoke, BC. Does this phenomenon signal a wave of venturer-types (Plog, 2002) sweeping across the landscape, discovering new destinations as they are displaced from the previous? On a more local level, does the same phenomenon occur when the experienced rider is tired of encountering other mountain bikers and seeks other more distant areas in which to build new trails? What is the impact on the environment? Why is the role of technology included in this process? Is it that technological advances in mountain bikes allow for a day use range of 30km to 50km and thus make it possible to avoid of other riders? There are two interesting and important areas of investigation recommended from the basics of spatial and temporal displacement research.

Firstly, what is the role of technology in facilitating spatial and temporal displacement? That areas are perceived to have become more crowded and congested in the first place may be a function of technology (the sport of climbing is a good example of advances in technology facilitating large numbers of new entries). That the more experienced appear to feel compelled to seek out other areas, and that they can do so is likely a function of advances in technology. For example, it is now common to see boaters on the Kananaskis River (Alberta) during the winter months that are there to
avoid the crowds of summer, and because advances in paddling gear now allow one to paddle in cold winter months. The latter is an example of temporal shift facilitated by technology. The role of technology must be seen as an intervening variable in the traditional human-environment relationship of behavioural geography.

Secondly, what do we know about the physical distribution of people resulting from recreation displacement? From the perspective of amenity migration, what are the patterns of migration? In the west it would appear that people often come from the east of Canada (Newfoundland to Saskatchewan) and stop in the Bow Valley, assess its viability as a place to live, and stay or leave. If they leave, they appear to keep moving west or now even north (Whitehorse, YK and Smithers, BC are quickly becoming the destinations of choice for young venturers). More locally, the same patterns of spatial and temporal displacement and shift can be found in recreation choices of residents. A tracking investigation perhaps involving longitudinal research for migrants, and for local patterns GIS techniques, would afford some insights into the broader impact of this phenomenon. My model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration only captures the dynamic of change in one location and does not make direct statements about the impact of others who leave the site or of the specific impact (i.e. new trails in the distant backcountry) of those who stay. Further research is needed to better understand the dynamic of spatial and temporal displacement and shift, from a recreation perspective, on the land.

Over the past several decades numerous models have demonstrated that tourism alters communities (Butler, 1980; Perdue, Long & Kang, 1999; Johnston & Tyrell, 2005). What is seldom if ever stated is what specific aspects of tourism result in change and what type of change. It is suggested here that the change attributed to tourism (short stay tourism) requires further examination as a force of change within communities. Qualitative findings from my research would suggest that there are clear tourism corridors within the Bow Valley leaving other areas of the community relatively untouched. Maria Varga, a pioneer of tourism and ecotourism in Belize, once told me
that "it is not the tourists that change Belize it is the people who come here to live as a result of the tourism that changes the character of the place" (personal communication, May 2007). It is suggested here that the specific effects of short stay tourists and tourism should be examined distinct from the effects of long term arrivals or amenity migrants to the area. It is understood that economic migrants also converge upon new tourism destinations in search of employment, but the focus should remain on amenity migrants. And amenity migrants should be broadly defined to include full-time residents seeking a lifestyle, through to second home owners. The deconstruction of the notion of tourism impacts from the basic distinction of short stay tourism and amenity migration may add considerably to the understanding tourism impacts in general. The model of Leisure Negotiation within Amenity Migration may contribute to a better understanding of the specific effects of amenity migration on the place, separate from that of tourism activity, by providing basic insights into the specific effects of amenity migration on place.

Underscoring the broad ideas of leisure (at home), travel and amenity migration is the question of motives for such. This topic has been thoroughly examined over the decades but seldom have links been afforded to connect the three to a singular discretionary or expressive precinct of life. That they are all related is well accepted, yet a model of motivation for all is not. It may be wise to begin at the broadest level of society. What is it about the society (largely urban) that we live in that results in motivations to seek out other places to live so distinct from most daily urban lifestyles? Cohen (1979) approached it from a tourism typology perspective and posited that alienation from 'home place' and the search for authenticity was the basis of this motivation. Strong as it may be, it does not house the phenomenon of amenity migration well due to the tourism orientation of its first few types of 'recreational' and 'diversionary' tourists. Williams & McIntyre (2000) approached the question specifically from the perspective of amenity migration and posited that the search for an identity in an otherwise unanchored and changing society was the primary reason for amenity migration. Push-pull models such as Cohen's (1979) and other propositions
such as that of Williams & McIntyre (2000) appear to suggest that the idea of individual 'reinvention' is at the centre of this broad area of motivation. Qualitative findings from my research suggest that participants sought out the Bow Valley as a way of reinventing oneself - that is, to allow the forces of place to affect personal change. It is not assumed here that a single model of leisure-travel-amenity migration motivation may be achievable, and it may not even be desired given the long tradition of remaining within specific academic disciplines (Coles, Hall & Duval, 2005). My experience would suggest there appears to be enough evidence to support further investigation of an overarching model of motivation that is inclusive of at home leisure or daily leisure, travel, and amenity migration.

The four areas of future recommendations that I suggest relate directly and indirectly to the aims and findings of my dissertation. Each addresses a different aspect of the path of the grounded theory inquiry taken throughout the research project. The recommended areas of future research also strongly suggest that a broad inter-disciplinary approach is required to fully address leisure/recreation, travel and amenity migration. Coles, Hall & Duval (2005) argue for a post-disciplinary approach to tourism research that effectively means a seamless integration of theoretical frameworks towards the development of theory that is specific to the most basic elements of travel and mobility. What they may actually be suggesting is a return to the human-environment relationship within a leisure (discretionary and expressive) framework. It is hoped that the findings, interpretations and conclusions of this dissertation will add to thought and theory building in this area.
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Sincerely,
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Initial Focus Group Consent Notification
Attachment D – Informed Consent Notice – Focus Groups.

Name of Researcher, Faculty, Department, Telephone & Email:
Joe Pavelka
Department of Geography
403.241.9215
jpavelka@ucalgary.ca

Supervisor:
Dr. Dianne Draper

Title of Project:
The Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure for Residents of the Bow Valley

Sponsor:

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

The University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board has approved this research study.

Purpose of the Study:

The central question is “what is the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley?” This question expressed as a purpose statement is: The intent of this research proposal is to explore the lived experience of negotiated leisure of Bow Valley residents by converging both broad numeric trends from quantitative research and the detail of qualitative research.

Research Objectives:

1. Determine whether Bow Valley residents experience leisure constraints specific to tourism.
2. Explore the relationships among other key variables such as gender, income, motivation for residency, age, tenure of residency, lifecycle, and household structure in relation to perceptions of leisure constraints and coping.
3. Explore the range and dynamic of factors considered by residents in the process of negotiating daily leisure.
4. Explore the range of recreation coping strategies employed by residents.
5. Offer insights for long term social sustainability of tourism communities in relation to resident recreation integration with a tourism economy.

Questions specific to focus group research will include items pertaining to:

- Motivation for residency in the Bow Valley and associated leisure goals
- Everyday experience of coping strategies – presence and types
• Perception of everyday leisure constraints and corresponding negotiation – presence and types
• Broad patterns of coping strategies employed on a seasonal basis and within the context of lifecycle
• Response to specific measures of crowd management (*Parks Canada items)
• Insights and suggestions to strengthen the leisure experience of residents of a tourism-based community and specifically within the Bow Valley

What Will I Be Asked To Do?

You will be asked to attend a two-hour maximum focus group session – specific time and location will be communicated to you. Within the focus group session you will be asked to take part in the discussion to your level of comfort – all sessions will be audio-taped to make the analysis more accurate. There is no additional follow-up unless you request it – see check boxes. Participation in the focus group session is voluntary and you may stop participation anytime you wish.

What Type of Personal Information Will Be Collected?

Should you agree to participate, you will be asked to provide your gender, age, length of residency in the Bow Valley and occupation in so much as whether you work directly in tourism or not.

There are several options for you to consider if you decide to take part in this research. You can choose all, some or none of them. Please put a check mark on the corresponding line(s) that grants me your permission to:

I wish to remain anonymous: Yes: ___ No: ___
I wish to remain anonymous, but you may refer to me by a pseudonym: Yes: ___ No: ___
The pseudonym I choose for myself is: ____________________________
You may quote me and use my name: Yes: ___ No: ___

Are there Risks or Benefits if I Participate?

Participation in this focus group research does not present any enhanced physical, psychological, financial, political or legal risk than would otherwise exist in everyday life.

What Happens to the Information I Provide?

"Participation is completely voluntary and confidential. You are free to discontinue participation at any time during the study. No one except the researcher and his supervisor will be allowed to see or hear any of the answers to the interview guide or the interview tape. Your name will never be used in association with any comments unless you specifically indicate above. Additionally, comments that do not include your name but could reveal your identity through an important detail unique to yourself will not used. For example, no one will be identified by their specific job such as "the assistant to the mayor
indicated that...” You have choices with respect to how your identity is or is not integrated into the results (see above section). Keep in mind that while your comments will remain anonymous within the report and the data will be securely stored but the focus group setting with up to ten people together discussing a topic, may impose limits to anonymity and confidentiality. Focus group data is kept in a locked cabinet only accessible by the researcher and his supervisor and transcribed data is kept within a secure computer. If you so choose to withdraw from the focus group session your data to that point will be used in the analysis. The data will be stored for ten years on a computer disk, at which time, it will be permanently erased.

Signatures (written consent)

Your signature on this form indicates that you 1) understand to your satisfaction the information provided to you about your participation in this research project, and 2) agree to participate as a research subject.

In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from this research project at any time. You should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Participant’s Name: (please print) ______________________________

Participant’s Signature __________________________________________ Date: __________

Researcher’s Name: (please print) ______________________________

Researcher’s Signature: ________________________________________ Date: __________

Questions/Concerns

If you have any further questions or want clarification regarding this research and/or your participation, please contact:

 Mr. Joe Pavelka
 Department of Geography
 403.440.6512 jtpavelka@ucalgary.ca
 And Dr. Dianne Draper, Department of Geography
 403.220.5584 ddraper@ucalgary.ca

If you have any concerns about the way you’ve been treated as a participant, please contact Patricia Evans, Associate Director, Research Services Office, University of Calgary at (403) 220-3782; email plevans@ucalgary.ca

A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference. The investigator has kept a copy of the consent form.
APPENDIX D

Focus Group Recruitment Poster
Leisure and Recreation in the Bow Valley

Seeking Bow Valley residents to participate in a 2 hour focus group session on the general topic of leisure, lifestyle, tourism and life in the Bow Valley.

This research is being conducted by Joe Pavelka, PhD student in the Department of Geography at the University of Calgary. This research has been approved the Conjoint Faculties Ethics Board at the University of Calgary and any questions pertaining to its ethics may be directed to plevans@ucalgary.ca

The focus groups will be held in the evenings of Tuesday October 25th and Thursday October 27th at the TBD location.

If you have lived in the Banff or Canmore for a year or more, you are 18 years or older, and you have an interest in the leisure and recreation life of the Bow Valley please contact

Joe Pavelka
jpavelka@ucalgary.ca
or Phone 403.660.7862
Leisure and Recreation in the Bow Valley

Seeking seasonal workers in Banff and Canmore to participate in a 2 hour focus group session on the general topic of leisure, lifestyle, tourism and life in the Bow Valley.

This research is being conducted by Joe Pavelka, PhD student in the Department of Geography at the University of Calgary. This research has been approved the Conjoint Faculties Ethics Board at the University of Calgary and any questions pertaining to its ethics may be directed to plevans@ucalgary.ca

The focus group will be held in the evening of Monday October at the TBD location.

If you have lived in the Banff or Canmore for at least 4 months, you are 18 years or older, and you have an interest in the leisure and recreation life of the Bow Valley please contact

Joe Pavelka
jpavelka@ucalgary.ca
or Phone 403.660.7862
APPENDIX E

Lived Experience Interview Consent Form
Attachment E – Interview Informed Consent Notice.

Name of Researcher, Faculty, Department, Telephone & Email:

Joe Pavelka
Department of Geography
403.241.9215
jpavelka@ucalgary.ca

Supervisor:
Dr. Dianne Draper

Title of Project:
The Lived Experience of Negotiated Leisure for Residents of the Bow Valley

Sponsor:
This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information. The University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board has approved this research study.

Purpose of the Study:
The central question is “what is the lived experience of negotiated leisure for residents of the Bow Valley?” This question expressed as a purpose statement is: The intent of this research proposal is to explore the lived experience of negotiated leisure of Bow Valley residents by converging both broad numeric trends from quantitative research and the detail of qualitative research.

Research Objectives:
1. Determine whether Bow Valley residents experience leisure constraints specific to tourism.
2. Explore the relationships among other key variables such as gender, income, motivation for residency, age, tenure of residency, lifecycle, and household structure in relation to perceptions of leisure constraints and coping.
3. Explore the range and dynamic of factors considered by residents in the process of negotiating daily leisure.
4. Explore the range of recreation coping strategies employed by residents.
5. Offer insights for long term social sustainability of tourism communities in relation to resident recreation integration with a tourism economy.

Questioning specific to the interview will include items pertaining to:
- Daily patterns of activity and formation of leisure goals
- Relationship between leisure goals and affordances
- Perception of everyday leisure constraints and corresponding negotiation
Relative importance of the role of leisure in daily life

What Will I Be Asked To Do?

You will be asked to take part in a 45 to 60 minute face-to-face interview. At that time you will be asked a series of questions pertaining to the study as indicated earlier. Participation in the interview is voluntary and you may stop participation anytime you wish.

What Type of Personal Information Will Be Collected?

Should you agree to participate, you will be asked to provide your gender, age, length of residency in the Bow Valley and occupation to the extent that you indicate whether you work directly in tourism or not. There are several options for you to consider if you decide to take part in this research. You can choose all, some or none of them. Please put a check mark on the corresponding line(s) that grants me your permission to:

I wish to remain anonymous: Yes: ___ No: ___
I wish to remain anonymous, but you may refer to me by a pseudonym: Yes: ___ No: ___
The pseudonym I choose for myself is:

You may quote me and use my name: Yes: ___ No: ___

Are there Risks or Benefits if I Participate?

Participation in this diary research does not present any enhanced physical, psychological, financial, political or legal risk than would otherwise exist in everyday life.

What Happens to the Information I Provide?

"Participation is completely voluntary and confidential. You are free to discontinue participation at any time during the study. No one except the researcher and his supervisor will be allowed to see any of the diary submission. Your name will never be used in association with any comments. Additionally, comments that do not include your name but could reveal your identity through an important detail unique to yourself will not used. For example, no one will be identified by their specific job such as “the assistant to the mayor indicated that…” You have choices with respect to how your identity is or is not integrated into the results (see above section) Interview data will be kept in a locked cabinet only accessible by the researcher and her supervisor and transcribed data is kept within a secure computer. The data will be stored for ten years on a computer disk, at which time, it will be permanently erased.”
Signatures (written consent)

Your signature on this form indicates that you 1) understand to your satisfaction the information provided to you about your participation in this research project, and 2) agree to participate as a research subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from this research project at any time. You should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Participant’s Name: (please print) ____________________________________________
Participant’s Signature ____________________________________________ Date:

Researcher’s Name: (please print)

Researcher’s Signature: ____________________________________________ Date:

Questions/Concerns
If you have any further questions or want clarification regarding this research and/or your participation, please contact:

Mr. Joe Pavelka
Department of Geography
403.440.6512 jpavelka@ucalgary.ca
And Dr. Dianne Draper, Department of Geography
403.220.5584 ddraper@ucalgary.ca

If you have any concerns about the way you’ve been treated as a participant, please contact Patricia Evans, Associate Director, Research Services Office, University of Calgary at (403) 220-3782; email plevans@ucalgary.ca

A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference. The investigator has kept a copy of the consent form.
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Lived Experience Recruitment Poster
University of Calgary

Recreation in the Bow Valley

Seeking residents Banff and Canmore to participate in a 45 minute in-person interview on the general topic of leisure, lifestyle, tourism and life in the Bow Valley.

This research directly benefits those who live in Canmore and Banff in the following ways:

1. Develop a better understanding of the community features that add to your quality of life
2. Better understand the way in which community amenities evolve with you and your lifecycle and over time as tourism changes
3. Mostly, to gain insights into how to ensure the long term social sustainability of your community

If you have lived in the Banff or Canmore for a year or more, you are 18 years or older, and you have an interest in the leisure and recreation life of the Bow Valley please contact

This research is being conducted by Joe Pavelka, PhD student in the Department of Geography at the University of Calgary. This research has been approved the Conjoint Faculties Ethics Board at the University of Calgary and any questions pertaining to its ethics may be directed to plevans@ucalgary.ca

Joe Pavelka
jpavelka@ucalgary.ca
or Phone 403.660.7862
APPENDIX J
Bow Valley Recreation Survey Cover Pages
Bow Valley Recreation and You

The purpose of this survey is to better understand changes in recreation opportunity in the Bow Valley, and the way that residents, like you, adapt to some of these changes. I would like to ask you questions about why you decided to live here, your recreation patterns, your perception of how some of your recreation areas have changed over time and a little about yourself. It is important for us all to better understand the community in which we live and how it is evolving over time so that we can protect the things that matter to us. It is also important that the person completing this survey be 18 years of age or older and have lived in the Bow Valley (Banff or Canmore) for at least one year.

The survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. Once you are finished please FOLD the survey, place it in the smaller postage-paid envelope and mail it back. If you would like to enter your name in a draw to win a weekend gateway at the Jasper Park Lodge for the fall of 2007, or if you would like to receive your own copy of the summary results fill out the correct boxes on the smaller card provided and include it too in the return envelope. The card will be separated from your survey upon receipt.

By completing and returning the survey you provide consent to participate in this project. If you have any questions about this survey please contact Joe Pavelka at 403.440.6512jpavelka@ucalgary.ca or if you have any questions about the way in which it is being carried out contact plevans@ucalgary.ca. Just a reminder, please only complete this survey if you are 18 years of age or older and if you have lived in the Bow Valley for one year or longer. If not, please have someone else in your household who is complete the survey. The survey results will remain confidential. There is a code on the questionnaire it is not associated to your name it is used to monitor responses. Your name will never be associated with your responses.

The results of this survey will be communicated back to the community and if you are personally interested you can receive your own copy of the summary results. This survey is being conducted by Joe Pavelka, a PhD student in the Department of Geography at the University of Calgary. It is not sponsored by any organization and it is independently funded. Your speedy response if greatly appreciated!

Thanks for participating in this survey.
APPENDIX K

Bow Valley Recreation Survey
WHY DID YOU DECIDE TO LIVE IN THE BOW VALLEY?

1. Please indicate how long you have lived in the Bow Valley? ________ (in actual years)

2. Please indicate how important each of the following statements are with respect to your decision to live in the Bow Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) To pursue a career in tourism, hospitality or parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) To balance work (work in general) with a mountain recreation lifestyle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) To start a business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) Just to be with a friend or partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.) To get away and escape where I was</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.) To own a second home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.) I have lived here all my life — it was not my choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Are there any other reasons to explain why you moved to the Bow Valley? (please state)

4. Do you think you are living the lifestyle you thought you would be living here in the Bow Valley?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Some of the Time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW IMPORTANT ARE THE FOLLOWING FACILITIES TO YOUR RECREATION?

5. Please indicate how important the following recreation areas are for you at present in your life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) Backcountry trails for mountain biking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) Town fitness centre and/or pool (municipal or hotel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) Rivers and lakes for canoeing and/or kayaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) In-town trails for walks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.) Backcountry climbing areas (rock and ice climbing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.) In-town restaurants and cafes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.) Backcountry trails for more remote hikes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.) The roadways for leisure driving trips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.) In-town bars and nightlife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.) Performance arts venues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.) Museums and galleries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.) Backcountry trails for running</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.) In-town trails for dog walking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.) Recreation centre for children’s activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Are there any other facilities important to your recreation? Please state.

Sometimes your recreation activity changes over time. Please indicate if you have experienced changes in your recreation over time in the following ways.

7. Since I have started living in the Bow Valley...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) I now participate in backcountry activities...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) I now participate in in-town recreation activities...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) I now participate in recreation in general...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE IN RECREATION AND RELATED OPPORTUNITIES

In this section I would like to know whether you have noticed changes, as increases or decreases, over time to any of the following. Please answer in relation to where you now live – Canmore or Banff.

8. In the time I have lived in the Bow Valley...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Increased Slightly</th>
<th>Has not Changed</th>
<th>Decreased Slightly</th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) The number of backcountry trails have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) The number of restaurants have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) The number of areas for rock climbing have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) The number of bars and lounges in town have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.) The number of backcountry skiing areas have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.) The number of areas for rock climbing have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.) The number of tourists have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.) The number of shopping areas have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.) The number of second home owners have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.) The number of canoe and kayaking areas have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.) The number of indoor fitness and sports areas has</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.) The number of festivals and special events have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.) The number of good full time jobs have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.) The number of full time residents have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.) The number of in-town parks and pathways have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.) The number of Nordic ski areas have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.) Access to good quality housing has</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.) The number of day-use recreationists from Calgary has</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.) The number of cafes have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.) The number of areas for back country skiing has</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.) The number of in-formal trails has</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of ski/snowboard areas have

Vehicle traffic has

The general cost of living has

Crowding and congestion in the backcountry has

Crowding and congestion in town has

The quality of backcountry recreation opportunities has

The quality of our urban recreation opportunities has

**QUALITY OF LIFE AND YOUR INTENTIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

Please consider your overall quality of life in the Bow Valley. Consider whether the following items have a good to bad impact on your quality life here.

9. Please rate the impact of the following items on your overall quality of life in Bow Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Somewhat Bad</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) Cost of living (housing, and daily life in general)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) Quality of backcountry recreation opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) Availability of career work and/or job of my liking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) Level of regulations regarding backcountry recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.) The sense of community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.) Ability to make friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.) Level of town development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.) Quality of in-town recreation opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.) Access to quality education opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.) Access to quality health care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I would rate my overall quality of life in the Bow Valley as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Your future intentions...**

11. Over the next Five Years... *Please check only one*

- [ ] I will stay here in the Bow Valley
- [ ] I am not sure if I will stay or leave
- [ ] I will probably leave
- [ ] I will definitely leave
- [ ] I will likely leave (travel, education, etc.) and return

**A LITTLE ABOUT YOU**

12. Please indicate your age – check one of the categories listed below.

- [ ] 18 to 19
- [ ] 20 to 24
13. Which of the following household most closely describes your personal situation?

___ Couple with children living at home
___ Couple without children living at home
___ Single Parent household
___ Living alone
___ Living with roommate(s)
___ Other: ____________________________

14. Do you own or rent your home?

___ Own
___ Rent
___ Other (please state) ____________________________

15. Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed.

___ some school
___ high school
___ some college or university
___ college diploma
___ university degree
___ graduate school (master's or phd or professional degree)
___ other (please state) ____________________________

16. Which of the following categories most closely represents your personal income from all sources during 2006?

___ $20,000 or less
___ $20,001 to $30,000
___ $30,001 to $40,000
___ $40,001 to $60,000
___ $60,001 to $80,000
___ $80,001 to $100,000
___ $100,001
___ Don't know
___ Refused

17. Your gender is:
Thank you for participating in this study. When you have completed the survey please:

1. Fold the survey and place it in the smaller postage-paid envelope; but

2. Think about whether you want to enter your name for the Jasper Park Lodge getaway weekend, and if you want to receive your own copy of the summary results when completed; then

3. Mail the entire package through Canada Post

Thanks again!