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Abstract

Walking is the principal outdoor recreation activity in the UK, and a significant part of the tourism offer. However, tourism study has not previously given significant attention to match participation levels. Furthermore, the range of participation in evidence necessitates a closer investigation. Walkers vary widely in the frequency of their walks, how important walking is in their tourism activity, and their motivations and preferences in walking environments.

A combination of data collection methods involved a qualitative programme of 23 interviews with walking practitioners and an extensive survey questionnaire of walkers in the English Lake District (n=518). The study was framed by a grounded theory approach. This research design methodology reflects the exploratory nature of the study. Additionally it addresses the fact that the UK walking market is at present, supplied by a nebulous collection of sectors, which are as yet, not as congruent in their approach to management as they could be.

The study resulted in a number of important findings which add to the body of knowledge on walking in national parks and other rural tourism environments. The range of walking activity can be explained in part by individual levels of confidence in the activity. Participants are either ‘casual’ or ‘serious’ in their approach towards walking; and this distinction enables research to conceptualise an activity which spans more extreme recreational activities such as mountaineering, and the significant part of the market who will walk whilst on holiday, or on day visits, but elsewise not frequently. Route-choice was found to be related to, but not dependent on the casual-serious typology: one individual could be serious in their approach but undertake less
demanding, ‘more casual’ walks at certain times. This can be built upon by future research, to understand the motivations of individuals in more depth.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The importance of recreational walking in the present day

1.1 Introduction to the subject area

1.1.1 Walking for pleasure

Walking is a major part of the British tourism sector, with approximately 49 million visits by tourists in Great Britain featuring a walk of some description (TNS, 2015 p.74). Walking has also become a more frequent activity by residents in many local areas in the UK (Department for Transport, 2015) and is of increasing importance. However, despite this, a proper understanding of the range of motivations which affect people’s walking habits is yet to be established, perhaps because it is so commonplace and fundamental to human nature. Only in the last two centuries have other alternative forms of travel become more prominent, and in fact as recently as late Victorian times, only the aristocracy would consider walking as a viable leisure activity.

Walking has, therefore, been a somewhat simple and mundane activity often taken for granted, but conversely could be considered as something humans have used in a variety of ways to understand themselves. For many thousands of years, walking was fundamental to our survival (to seek water, food and shelter) and to gain an understanding of our surroundings. Long walks were often seen in religious terms, as part of spiritual pilgrimage. At this point, the fact that the wealthier classes paid for the poor to undertake them shows how walking was perceived in the middle ages. During the time of the Renaissance, appreciation of nature and landscapes began to emerge, although mountains were still seen as places of danger (Hale, 1977, p.41). During the period of German Romanticism, the leisure class evolved and it became desirable for them to undertake walks in natural settings. In the UK, poets such as Wordsworth used walking as a
vehicle for discovery of the landscape and inspiration behind many literary works which have shaped British and to an extent, global society.

Following the industrial revolution, the expansion of urban centres brought walking to a greater range of the population. The introduction of railways, and then the motorised car reduced the need to walk for functional purposes, but also enhanced the possibility of reaching countryside locations to walk for pleasure. More people were able to seek adventure, discovery and escape from the stresses of contemporary life, away from homes and workplaces. Relatively cheap travel heralded a growing importance for access to the countryside, not just for higher classes, but for the mass working classes of the age. However, tensions began to arise regarding the opportunities of the more privileged to explore nature freely, and the working class who had been mired in cities (Williams, 2003, p.130).

Mike Harding’s historical account of the campaign for access to the countryside, ‘The Forbidden land’ (see Stephenson et al., 1989) charts the journey of British workers increasingly using the countryside for recreation, undertaking walks in the British hills and mountains, and the first walking groups being formed in the Victorian period. There followed a lengthy struggle between the masses and landowners, through campaigning, protest, legal battling and governmental involvement, which continued throughout the 20th century and on into the 21st with the 2000 Countryside Rights of Way Act (or ‘Right to roam). A key event in this movement for access rights was the ‘Mass Trespass at Kinder Scout’, the Peak District, Derbyshire in 1932:

‘On 24 April 1932, groups of ramblers left Manchester and Sheffield for an organised trespass onto Kinder Scout, a moorland plateau in what is now the Peak District. There they clashed with gamekeepers sent by local landowners to keep people off their land. The clashes were violent and several of the ramblers were arrested and imprisoned, but over the following days and weeks much larger trespasses were held and public opinion started to sway in the trespassers’ favour.’ (Ramblers’ Association, 2012)
The event, in addition to being influential in the eventual development of access to the countryside in England, gives an indication of the importance of walking to the working person and the surroundings which are now the setting for recreational walking today.

In a society where available free time is a commodity, the leisure industry is an important component of economies around the world (see Comley and Mackintosh, 2014). Walking is central to developing recreational opportunities for UK residents and is a principal activity for both international and domestic tourists. For people who walk, there are a multitude of related industries including walking clothing, footwear and equipment. Maps, guidebooks, route leaflets and increasingly the world-wide web are significant resources for walking information.

In terms of physical locations, many elements require large-scale management: the development and maintenance of footpaths, access to walking areas, the conservation of natural areas in which people walk and the facilitation of car-parking or other transportation. In addition there are a range of other agencies involved in the supply of walking opportunities: health promotion agencies who encourage people to walk for physical conditioning; organised walking groups; educational institutions which use walking as a vehicle on field trips to understand elements of culture, society and the natural environment; and the walking holiday sector. This variation of peoples’ interests in walking means that some more than others will invest in, or use these resources. For each individual person, there is a slightly different set of wants and needs. Because there is such a diverse range of tastes and a multitude of opportunities and resources which need managing, there is also a need to understand what drives these differences in motivation, and establish where needs can be met to a greater effect.

‘There is no limit to the way you can embellish the idea that you can see how important is having good information about their characteristics. It’s going to be fundamental to the way the whole structure is funded in the future.’ (Walking guide writer, during an interview for this PhD study)
1.1.2 Walking locations: National parks, and the Lake District

Although urban walking is of increasing importance to the recreational walking sector, natural areas are the focus of a significant proportion of leisure trips in the UK. Visits to natural environments increased between March 2014 and February 2015 by 9.4%, from the same time period in the previous year and number 3.1 billion visits in total (Natural England, 2015). National parks make up a significant proportion of natural spaces, and there are fifteen in total in England, Scotland and Wales. They are important spaces for natural heritage, and a significant part of the tourism sector, supporting millions of day visits and holidays. The first national parks originated in the United States in the late 19th century with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park. There are now similar areas worldwide, which share a fundamental purpose: to conserve natural landscapes, ecosystems, flora and fauna; and provide recreational opportunities for people.

The Lake District National Park is situated in the North-West of England, and is the most visited national park in the country (National Parks UK, 2015a). The mountains are the highest in England, and the area contains the largest natural lakes in the country. Its popularity as a tourist destination stems in part from the poetry and literature which it has inspired historically, and now the area is considered by many as the principal location in the country for outdoor recreation. Such is the importance of the visitor economy in the area that the management of the national park constantly works to balance the movements of visitors and the conservation of the natural spaces which attract them. Walking is of particular importance as it is the widest ranging and most frequent activity of visitors in the park area. There is great value to obtaining insight into walking tourism to understand where people choose to walk, and why.

‘In terms of the research that we’ve done, it has been based on open access and needs and preferences. It hasn’t really been based on psychology. We haven’t drilled down to that level of why people do certain things. It would be interesting to know that. Why we’ve decided to do a certain amount of work – why we’ve focused on certain improvement work – is kind of based on this and that. People tend to want short routes
and better information. We’re trying to keep up on the ground with signposts. We probably haven’t managed that on our website. But that’s been the level – this kind of evidence base is our drive to talk about what we do. But anything else that we can pick up on might help in the future, it will be useful.’ (Lake District Recreation Manager, extract from an interview from this PhD study)

The Lake District, as an area for walking tourism, features walks for people of all abilities, ranging from long mountain-based walks to short low level walks. There are a range of extremely busy ‘honey-pot’ sites and other sites which are more difficult to access. The more remote areas of the national park are sought out by walkers who are looking for locations which are more quiet and wild. It is of interest to the organisations involved in managing the Lake District as a tourism resource to understand more about the walks people choose, and what they are looking for when they make a decision. There is also a wider need to explore route-choice in natural areas: by knowing more about the locations people seek out and the types of walks they are engaging in, national parks and other designated areas can manage their resources more effectively.

1.1.3 Tourism research, the tourist typology and the rationale for this study

Tourism Studies is a research area which has evolved from the social sciences and is now of increasing importance in the globalised world. A relevant thread of tourism research involves understanding the movements of tourists. Walking is an integral part of tourism and recreation. Whether it is the central activity of a holiday or day trip, or a means of connecting tourism activities at a destination, most tourists will walk at least a little way during every trip. Despite the obvious nature of this statement, tourism studies rarely concentrate on walking as either the focal point of research, or as the linking mechanism of tourist activities. A research study into walking in a national park area with high levels of tourism, is at this moment, very timely.

One of the more significant tools of tourism research is the tourist typology. It is a procedure used within the field to categorise tourists into different groups for a range of different research
purposes including: marketing different messages to different people, managing visitors, understanding participation in tourist activities and knowing more about the tourism experience. A typology can separate people meaningfully so that those involved in research and management can understand the tourist more, and the differences that define them.

This study posits that the people who undertake recreational walks are inherently different to one another. From the historic differences between classes in terms of their outdoor visits, to the different preferences in evidence today for quieter or busier locations, it is clear that the types of walk being undertaken vary, and that the range of people who engage in them is at least as broad as any other recreational activity one can think of. If walkers can be grouped based on their needs and preferences, in the same way tourists at large are in tourism studies, it stands to reason that the tourism offer for walkers can be improved.

The outdoor recreation market is of increasing relevance to the economy in the UK, and recently political emphasis has been placed on this sector in the House of Commons (Outdoor Recreation Network, 2015). At the end of October 2015, shortly before the submission of this doctoral thesis, a debate was held in the house on the economic potential of outdoor recreation. A recent report by the Sport and Recreational Alliance (2015), ‘Reconomics’ was discussed, valuing the sector at approximately £21 billion annually, and taking into account additionally the health and environmental benefits, the recommendation following the debate was that as a country, the UK should be bringing greater strategic prominence to outdoor recreation. This development lends weight to the need for a deeper understanding of the participants of recreational activities, in order to manage demand more effectively.

My own personal research journey in the production of this thesis stretches back to late 2008, when the research was initially designed. In that time the importance of walking continued to increase, the tourism field further developed, with an emergent strand of ‘adventure tourism’
becoming more visible in the literature, and a handful of walking studies began to be published in the more traditional tourism journals. I chose the subject area from a personal interest in walking, and as a researcher of transport and tourism, from the knowledge that the mode of travel least represented in the literature is actually the oldest and most frequently undertaken. I have published research on walking in organised groups (Davies and Weston, 2015), the health motivations associated with walking (Davies, Lumsdon and Weston, 2011) and walking trail development (Davies, Lumsdon and Weston, 2012) in that time, in addition to working on many consultancy and tourism policy research projects on walking. Although they are separate studies in their own right with separate datasets, these endeavours have supported my own understanding of the walking world.

Understanding the decision making process which underpins recreational walking has become an increasingly complex objective. During the production of the thesis, I have had numerous interactions with people in the industry. Building a typology of walkers based on empirical study, is a task which is of value to the sector, and something which has become more topical in the duration of the study.

‘I separate them, and it is very interesting because there’s a lot of debate going around that kind of thing.’ (Interview extract with an equipment marketing executive for a walking boot manufacturer)

However, the process has been revealing in the sense that walking is an activity which covers such a broad range of motivations and levels of interest, which is an added reason why it must be understood in more depth.

‘……which makes it an extreme research challenge, trying to build up a profile, and understanding people’s motivations, because, you can’t just say this person is a woman of this socio economic group, therefore they will do this activity. It seems to be very, very complex’ (Interview extract with a tourism researcher)
It is important for outdoor recreation planners and managers, and those involved in making policy relating to walking to understand further the differences between types of walking, the multi-dimensional nature of the differences of walking motivations and preferences and perhaps most importantly the people who are participant. At the outset of this PhD study, I explored existing typologies of walkers used by organisations in England. The most prominent at the time was that used by Natural England, who fund and maintain the English National Trails. They categorised users of the trails as either dedicated users (completing the trail in one go, or in different sections over time) who accounted for 33% of all users (Edwards, 2007). The remaining 67% were split into three categories:

- Amblers (people on trips of one hour or less): 6% of users
- Ramblers (typically walk between one and four hours): 44%
- Scramblers (full day walkers and anyone walking over four hours): 50%

These categories were aimed at understanding the market for the trails to ensure suitable provision of resources, information and marketing. Whilst they suffice to gain a broader understanding of the proportions of trail users based on the time they spend on the trail, it could be inferred that other characteristics place individuals into these groups. Is the likelihood of an individual belonging to one of these groups increased because of their fitness levels, their ambition to complete walks of a certain length, a desire to reach a place far away from civilisation or perhaps simply because that was the amount of time they had spare?

The effects of this study therefore are to provide a much needed starting point to understand the differences between recreational walkers, and the routes they choose; to unpick some of the complexity which currently is not well understood, either in academia or the industry. The value of walking in economic, environmental and social terms is significant to the UK and the wider context, and this is not limited to the tourism sector. The next section will detail the thesis aims and structure.
1.2 Introduction to the research and thesis

1.2.1 Aims of the thesis

This PhD study examines recreational walkers in the context of tourism. It gives particular attention to the influence of variations between walkers’ characteristics, their preferences and motivations. It also investigates which factors influence the decisions made by tourists regarding their choices of walk.

Overall research idea

There are a range of factors which influence the motivations and walking behaviour of recreational walkers and that their interaction determines choices of walking route.

Aims

There were three main aims to this PhD study:

1. **To develop a typology for recreational walkers:** In order to investigate the research idea, an in-depth exploration was conducted of the characteristics of individual recreational walkers. It encompassed their motivations to walk, and their general walking preferences. This process was intended to establish groups of individual walkers. It was posited that individuals within each group which resulted from the typology would share similarities with other individuals within the group, and differences to individuals in other groups.

2. **To understand the choice sets of recreational walking with regards to route preference:** Factors which influence walkers’ preferences for certain characteristics of walking routes locations will be investigated. This will include preferences for certain physical characteristics of routes and locations, and other factors which affect their route choices.
3. **To then develop a model which explains route choice**: The resulting typology from the first aim and the findings of the analysis of route-choice factors from the second aim, will then be interrogated further to develop a model to explain route-choice.

Figure 1.1 below shows how the fulfilment of the first two aims flow into the development of the route-choice model, the third and final aim of the thesis. Whilst each aim is a discrete goal of the thesis in itself, the work undertaken often addressed the first two aims concurrently.

**Figure 1.1: The relationship between the aims of the thesis**
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**1.2.2 Scale and scope of the research**

The research focused on the English Lake District as a case-study area. As a tourist area the Lake District attracts a wide range of walkers; from day walkers to those walking on holiday, to serious fell-walkers who undertake challenging walks on a regular basis. This range of people provided a detailed picture of the differences in characteristics between different types of walkers, who all walk in the same general location, but undertake very different routes. It was surmised that the English Lake District provided a robust sample from which to draw valid inferences on recreational walking. The research involved interviews with walking experts in the UK, and a survey questionnaire of both domestic and international tourists; therefore the research can be
considered as a valid picture of the UK walking tourism market. The results and outcomes of this study can also be applied to tourism locations for walking in other areas of the world, particularly those where a similar national park structure to the Lake District exists, and locations in which the physical dimensions are similar.

1.2.3 Value of the research

This research is valuable to both: academics, providing an understanding of recreational walking as an activity; and to practitioners who are involved in developing resources and infrastructure for walking tourism. There are several key areas where this study makes a contribution to knowledge:

1. **To bridge a research gap on motivation for walking and rural recreation:** Park and Yoon (2009) noted a paucity of studies which provide insight into motivation for rural tourism and relevant segmentation approaches. This study fills a research gap by understanding recreational walking using the English Lake District, largely rural or semi-rural, as a study area. Whilst the tourism literature has an increasingly well-developed understanding of the motivations and experiences of tourists in general, there is a lack of research that has focused specifically on walking.

2. **To help the tourism and recreation sectors to plan better for walkers.** Walking is a prominent element of both the tourism and recreation sectors. Den Breejen (2007) recommended that those involved in managing walking destinations should develop a greater understanding of the ‘wants’ and ‘needs’ of walkers, arguing that there are as yet unexplained complexities relating to the relationship between walkers and their environment, which are relevant to the continuing improvement of provision for walkers.

3. **To provide a more theoretically driven typology of walkers than that which currently exists.** At present the majority of typologies exist at practitioner level; there are few substantiated and theoretically deep studies, where the data have been derived from
the perspective of the walkers themselves. Wickens (2002) acknowledges the deficiencies of many typology studies to understand the tourist from a tourist-centric viewpoint, asserting that different tourist types experience the same destination in different ways.

The popularity of walking does not stop efforts of policy makers to increase the overall numbers of people choosing it as a regular activity. There are many reasons why walking is important in the present day. Increasing the participation levels of recreational walking is a universal goal for transport and health practitioners, in addition to politicians and decision-makers, sustainable tourism organisations and destination management agencies. This research therefore, provides a greater level of definition into the actions and preferences of recreational walkers, which can aid those involved in stimulating increases in walking.
1.2.4 Breakdown of thesis chapters

Figure 1.2: Structure of the thesis

Figure 1.2 shows in pictorial form the structure of the thesis by chapters. The next part of the thesis includes two chapters which provide the background context and reasoning behind the design of the research. Chapter 2, the academic literature review, provides a much deeper exploration of the existing research which frames this study: by mapping out the relevant bodies of literature, as, in addition to tourism studies, other subject areas are relevant; understanding the theory behind tourist typologies with a view to ascertain ways of categorising walkers in spaces for tourism; examining previous work on route-choice, location preference theories and environmental influences on non-motorised leisure travel. An initial conceptual framework of route-choice for recreational walkers will then be introduced.
Chapter 3, the Methodology, will take into account the academic context and provide the framework for approaching the research problem in the ‘real world’. It will first explore the philosophical positioning of the research study, giving consideration to ontologies and epistemologies which shape the grounded research approach. The methodology chapter will appraise the use of both quantitative and qualitative approaches in this study to give a detailed analysis and justification of the research design. It will also justify the grounded theory approach used, and relate it to the research framework. The sampling methods and data collection will be detailed and the process of conducting the research will be outlined.

In Chapter 4, the Research Context, a more in-depth investigation of the current UK walking market will be undertaken. The demand for walking in the UK will be analysed in detail, historically, and in the present day: participation and motivations for recreational walking and walking tourism. The development of recreational walking as a leisure activity in the UK will be explored: taking into consideration the nature of the supply sector for walking; whilst detailing the relevant organisations and structures, and summarising the grey literature and the mechanisms managers use to provide resources for walking. The Lake District will be introduced in more detail as a study area, and the tourism context there will be outlined. The outcome of this chapter is to place the academic problem and method of enquiry into the ‘real world’. This will then lead into the next section of the thesis, the results chapters.

The results of this study are covered by three chapters, each dealing with a particular element of the process. Chapter 5 will contain the findings of the first stage of primary data collection, a program of expert interviews with practitioners involved in providing resources for recreational walking. The emergent themes which resulted from the interviews are discussed, and the differentiating characteristics of walkers are explored. The experts' observations on the walking behaviour of recreational walkers will be considered, and their views on the factors which determine route-choice synthesised. Chapter 6 will then begin by explaining how these
elements were used to design the second stage of data collection, a survey questionnaire of recreational walkers.

The remainder of Chapter 6 will detail the survey questionnaire, and how the sample captured by the data collection process was characterised. It will primarily examine the characteristics of recreational walkers, and the segmentation analysis which aimed to explore the existence of a typology. Chapter 7 covers the second part of the analysis of the survey of recreational walkers. This part of the results section focuses on the factors which influence the route-choices recreational walkers make. It will also detail an analysis of whether the segments identified in chapter 6 differ in terms of their route-choice decisions.

The outcomes of the three results chapters will be discussed in conjunction with the literature in the discussion and conclusion (Chapter 8). This section will draw together the findings of both stages of research. This will be framed by, and compared to, the earlier review of the literature from chapter 2, and the analysis of supply and demand in the sector from chapter 4. The outcome from this chapter is the theoretical model of route-choice. Finally the chapter will draw the study to a close and explain the limitations of the research, reflecting on the process and the implications of the results.

1.3 Summary of the chapter
In this introductory chapter, the research problem has been outlined. There is a need for tourism study to theorise walking as an activity. Walking is extremely important in the policy context for personal health and sustainability. In terms of tourist participation in natural spaces, recreational walking is highly important. However the current knowledge base is somewhat lacking in depth in terms of understanding the individual needs, preferences and motivation of the participants. Therefore this study bridges a gap by developing an understanding of recreational walkers, their characteristics and their walking choices.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The academic context for recreational walking research

2.1 Introduction to the chapter

The introduction chapter presented the recreational walking focus of the study, and the main areas of enquiry. The tourism management area of study is an emergent academic field and there is still no clear consensus that tourism studies are a discipline in their own right. They still draw principally from social science; business studies, economics, anthropology and geography. Nevertheless, the overall aim of this chapter is to make a thorough analysis of the relevant literature in order to place its theoretical contribution into the most appropriate prism of understanding.

An initial problem is the fact that tourism journal articles rarely focus directly upon walking. Elsewhere, walking studies have been somewhat more prevalent in transportation studies, geography, built environment and health studies. There are also elements of relevant material in leisure and recreation studies, although the concepts of leisure, recreation and tourism often overlap. It will be apparent to the reader that the terms ‘recreational walking’ and ‘walking tourism’ have at times been used interchangeably in the first chapter. That is because walking for pleasure can be viewed under common definitions of tourism and recreation as both a form of recreation and an activity undertaken as part of tourism. Thus, an issue arises over the ‘multi-disciplinary’ or ‘interdisciplinary’ nature of this investigation. The first aim of this chapter will be to critically assess the relevant areas of study from which to draw theory on a research project which focuses on recreational walking.
A key element of this study is to understand characteristics of recreational walkers: their similarities and differences; their preferences, motivations and attitudes toward walking choices; and the potential for clustering them into meaningful groups, so that tourism managers and academics can understand more closely where and why they walk. One theoretical focus of tourism study in which there are some significant underpinnings is that of the tourist typology. This strand of the literature is of direct relevance to this study, and its analysis is the second aim of this chapter.

Route-choice is an emergent area of tourism study, and one which is addressed in its wider context by previous research which has focused on the preferences of tourists for locations; their physical characteristics, and other considerations of travel which affect their choices. This thesis is directly interested in the route-choice decisions of recreational walkers. There are a number of relevant tourism areas which underpin this aim but do not generally concentrate on walking. There are also route-choice theories for walking which are more developed in other disciplines such as public health and built environment. These areas form the basis of fulfilling the third aim of this chapter.
Therefore the directional flow of this chapter must follow an iterative process (see figure 2.1). In order to access the subject material on characteristics and route-choice and thus fulfil the last two aims, an initial overview of the literature map of relevant subject areas is vital. Section 2.2 will deal with the mosaic of literature areas at the outset, and place this study into a relevant academic context. This will enable the next two aims to then be addressed.

To unlock and understand the third aim of route-choice, tourist theory which underpins applying a typology to walkers must first be addressed. Section 2.3 will explore the literature of tourism typologies by analysing the use of segmentation in previous tourism research. The section will also give attention to tourist characteristics, motivation theories and ‘push and pull’ factors and assess how these elements of tourism study can be applied to recreational walkers.

Section 2.4 will concentrate on providing theory to underpin preferences for walking location and route-choice. It will look at how tourists prioritise elements of destinations in making their choice to visit them, and the stimuli which cause their movements to, from and within tourist environments.
areas. The literature pertaining to movements to, from and within natural areas will be an important focus of this section. Findings from this section of the literature review will, where necessary, be critically assessed for their relevance to the context of national parks. In order to provide a more complete understanding of decisions which recreational walkers make in terms of their choice of route and location, subject areas other than tourism will also be considered.

To complete the academic literature review, section 2.5 will draw together these analyses and offer an initial conceptual framework of route-choice, based on the findings of this stage of the thesis, to carry forward into the research design stage.

2.2 The academic niche: Appropriate literature areas for studying walking in tourist locations

2.2.1 Introduction: walking as a tourist activity and a form of travel

To frame the area of study, an initial exploration of walking within the context of tourism studies is now made. Tourism is a human phenomenon undertaken frequently and conceptualised with increasing complexity. Essentially it can be characterised by a few simple fundamental elements. At a very basic level, the vital components for tourism to occur number four elements: people; places; the interaction between people and the places they visit, and the physical movement of people within and between places. Walking is very often a significant part of these movements and interactions in tourism settings.

Walking can be considered as a form of tourist travel in itself, or perhaps less obviously but more frequently, as a function to move tourists around spaces to engage in tourist activity. Walking offers a unique means of experiencing social and cultural dimensions of places (Lumsdon and Spence, 2002). As a recreational activity, walking is discussed within the tourism literature in the context of the fulfilment of numerous tourism-related motivations and needs including: health, physical rehabilitation and mental wellbeing (Connell, 2006), adventure (Beedie and
Hudson, 2003), access to locations for wildlife and nature based tourism (Reynolds and Braithwaite, 2001), as a vehicle for the discovery and interpretation of heritage (Moscardo, 1996), a key component of route-based tourism packages and pilgrimage (Murray and Graham, 1997) and a means of attaining feelings of spirituality (Sharpley and Jepson, 2011).

The relatively small number of published articles in tourism journals which directly analyse walking often seek to understand an aspect of tourism, using the activity as a focal point to investigate that aspect. For example there is a branch of tourism study which analyses tourist ‘performance’. In a study undertaken at the Taj Mahal, India, Edensor (2000a) theorises that walking is part of a performance on a ‘stage’ (the destination), characterised by interactions such as encounters with other tourists, objects or other obstacles occurring during the walk. Another example focuses on walking tours undertaken by Western tourists in the slums of India to ascertain the nature of tourist mobilities (Diekmann and Hannam, 2012). The walking element is incorporated as a vehicle to assess theories of tourist experience.

Other authors who use walking as a study phenomena to explore tourist mobilities include Cutler et al. (2014). In a study on the Inca Trail, they offer for debate the notion that the journey itself is in some cases more important to the tourist than the destination. The concept of trails and route based tourism is a branch of study which concentrates on the movement of tourists as a key element of tourism, with the walking tourist in this case providing the means to explore the experience of the journey. A further relevant piece of research concerns a heritage trail in Hong Kong, used as a basis to explore the way in which meanings and interpretations of historical culture can vary depending on the relationship of groups of stakeholders associated with the trail (Cheung, 1999). The varied meanings perceived by different groups affected their personal tourist experience. In each of the aforementioned studies, the tourism-related experience itself is the principal focus, and walking the vehicle to understand the experience in more depth. The authors collectively each acknowledge the walking experience in their writing,
but fall short of turning their full focus onto the activity of walking, instead drawing wider tourism theory.

The tourism experience is an important element when considering recreational walking research. Previous studies have also demonstrated that it is meaningful to the field of tourism to explore walking as an integral part of the tourism experience. It is of significant interest to tourism academics to develop a clearer theoretical understanding of the role which travel plays in tourism. A seminal point in this line of thinking occurred when Leiper (1979) identified the transportation element in the tourism system as a crucial interlinking component which interfaces the ‘tourism generating region’ (origin) and ‘tourism destination region’ (destination). Lumsdon and Page (2004) assert the fundamental importance of transport to the existence of tourism. They also differentiate the dual role of transportation as a means to an end to move tourists to and from destinations (Lumsdon and Page, 2004) and as the tourist activity itself, offering a higher intrinsic value to the tourist.

Tourism studies have often focused on individual modes of transport to provide a theoretical underpinning to transport as a form of tourism, and the role the act of travel plays in the overall experience. For example, Lumsdon (2006) developed a model of tourist bus services in the UK, highlighting the propensity of service design to facilitate the needs of utilitarian travellers rather than tourists, and the necessity for planning to adopt a sustainable tourism development approach when considering passenger transport. Guiver et al. (2007) appraise the importance of scheduled tourist bus services, specifically in rural areas, to reduce visitor pressure, congestion and encourage economic, environmental and social benefits. These studies put bus travel at the centre of the tourist experience.

Rail travel has also featured in tourism literature. Generally studies explore experiences, travel choices and motivations from a tourist perspective, or the role both high speed and local passenger rail services play in sustainable tourism development (Charlton, 1998; Prideaux, 1999;
Most rail-based studies have a common underlying theme: the issues associated with promoting and increasing rail patronage. The operation of services to facilitate tourism and the customer satisfaction elements are also prominent, as are the reduction of the negative environmental effects of car travel. The tourist experience and travel choices made by tourists are an important element.

Few studies have focused on the car as the tourist mode of travel. They have sought to chart the rise of the private car in tourism and debate the need for provision of suitable infrastructure (Ward, 1987), to assess tourist choices using ‘car tourists’ from West Australia as the focus of study (Taplin and McGinley, 2000); and to understand travel patterns in national parks, using Loch Lomond and the Trossachs as a study area (Connell and Page, 2008). Although the intrinsic benefits of car travel are taken into account, the car as a travel experience is not significantly addressed within the academic literature thus far.

However, given the emphasis on sustainability in tourism over the last two decades or so, it is also unsurprising that non-motorised modes of transport have now come into significance. The low-carbon impact of walking and cycling, coupled with the active travel paradigm which most often resides in the transportation study area (Rissel and Garrard, 2006; Shannon et al., 2006; Mulley et al., 2013), suggest that non-motorised modes should now be a significant focus for sustainable tourism travel studies. Cycle tourism has steadily been integrated as a branch of tourism study over the last 15-20 years. In the literature, cycling has been examined in terms of its role for increasing sustainable tourism (Lumsdon, 2000), to ascertain impacts of tourism on long-distance cycle trails such as economic effects (Cope et al., 1998; Downward et al., 2009), and its role in diversifying the tourism product to benefit smaller regional areas and rural tourism (Ritchie and Hall, 1999). There is now clear scope for the development of a comparable branch of literature for walking.
Although studies looking solely at walking are scarce, it is sometimes discussed in conjunction with other activities to examine aspects of tourism. McNamara and Prideaux (2011) assessed visitor attitudes and behaviour in rainforest environments, exploring experiences of natural environments. Walks, scenery and wildlife were key motivations. Visitor management is an important element of tourism research as is the movement of tourists, particularly in sensitive areas in which managers and academics benefit from a greater understanding of the routes which tourists use, many of them walking routes. A study by Orellana et al. (2012) modelled visitor movement patterns in natural recreation area. They were able to identify the locations in the park which were visited most, plus the most frequently used routes between locations. The findings were important for the development of resources, management and the monitoring of sites or destinations. However, where people go is only one dimension. Davies et al. (2012) investigated motivations for recreational walking using a series of focus groups with residents in an area where a long distance multi-use trail was being developed. The study findings highlighted the diverse nature of walkers’ needs when promoting trails for recreation, which stem from individual preferences and motivations. Den Breejen (2007), studied the West Highland Way to better understand the long distance walk as a form of tourism, and noted the lack of research which concentrates on long distance walking.

Therefore, it can be surmised that walking has so far played a limited role in tourism studies to explore experience, meaning and the nature of tourist mobilities. As a form of travel activity in its own right, it has not had the same weight of attention as other travel modes have in the past. It has come under focus to researchers interested in monitoring visitor movement patterns, and to understand the challenges of visitor management. It has been shown that travel is a vital element of tourism and therefore an important component of tourism study. There are various research strands which analyse travel-based tourism, mainly to underpin greater understanding of the sustainability movement of the last few decades in tourism development. However, there now needs to be a clearer focus on walking both as a form of tourist travel and as an activity.
The three main objectives of this first substantive section of the literature review are to:

1. firstly, explore the areas of literature in which a study of this nature on walking can sit;
2. secondly, to draw from those subject areas the necessary concepts and theories which underpin this research;
3. and thirdly to arrive at a point at which it is then possible to frame the research questions and provide a suitable theoretical background to build upon in the later sections of this literature review chapter.

Essentially this first section is a scoping exercise to examine the relevant fields and disciplines available to provide theoretical examples of use to a research study on walking, and to establish the key concepts on which to base the research design.

A study of walking tourism faces an obvious immediate hurdle, in the shape of the newness surrounding the status of tourism study as an accepted academic discipline. This will be the starting point in the discussion (section 2.2.2). The three overlapping areas of leisure, recreation and tourism are then examined, because the walking context explored in this study spans all three (section 2.2.3). A relevant and developing body of literature will then be discussed: adventure tourism, which is found to hold a number of relevant theoretical aspects (2.2.4). Finally, three other areas of study, which each have strands of research on walkers, their choices and relationship with walking environments are assessed: transport studies, geography and health studies (2.2.5). The concepts which underpin the research objectives are then summarised in section 2.2.6. The next section will further explore the field of tourism studies and appraise the suitability of an inter-disciplinary approach.
2.2.2 Tourism Studies and their inter-disciplinary nature

A debate on whether tourism is a discipline or a multi-disciplinary field has built within the academic community over recent decades. Tribe (1997) discusses the lack of agreement as to where the boundaries of the subject area lie, and undertakes a philosophical investigation which ultimately results in the rejection of the notion that tourism can be considered a discipline. He bases his viewpoint on earlier work by Hirst (1974, p74) which stipulates the key characteristics of a discipline. They include the presence of central interrelated concepts, which are unique to the discipline. Tribe provides the example of the tourism multiplier as one of a number of concepts which are integral to the study area but are used in other disciplines. He bases his rejection of the disciplinary status of tourism on this lack of concepts, and several other key reasons relating to Hirst’s criteria: the fact that tourism concepts are present but nebulous and not interconnected, and that they are not irreducible within the discipline, nor do they contain answers that can only be found within tourism studies rather than elsewhere.

Tribe (1997) suggests an alternative description: a field of tourism studies which is underpinned by business studies and marketing which draws otherwise from Economic, Sociology, Psychology and Law; and a second field which at times overlaps, but contains more intangible concepts such as environmental and social impacts and carrying capacity. Based on Tribe’s assessment of tourism studies as two fields, the first of these is more suited to a study of the characteristics of walkers and their decisions. Furthermore, the element of concepts taken from other disciplines is relevant to this study. In the words of Moscardo et al. (1996, p.112): ‘As is often the case in tourism, it is valuable to look to other disciplines for theories and concepts that can be used in a tourism context’. To give an example, Tribe also notes the process of assessing tourism visitor satisfaction as actually being, in intrinsic terms, an assessment of satisfaction. This is an argument which is pertinent to this thesis. A tourism study of walkers’ behaviour and decision making draws from concepts such as motivation, place attachment and preference and is based to a degree on their satisfaction with the ‘product’ (in this case the walking environment). Thus,
a justification for basing the literature review partially on concepts from other disciplines is raised.

Echtner and Jamal (1997), suggest that the lack of a unique theory is a fundamental issue in the construction of knowledge for the tourism subject area, and propose that Kuhn’s (1962) call for a dominant paradigm may be the solution. They note that previously, different disciplines including anthropology, geography and sociology had each considered tourism from a different perspective, and that there is a need for the tourism subject area to take a more holistic theoretical approach. Given the emergent nature of tourism as a potential ‘discipline’, they advocate an interdisciplinary approach, based on the work of Leiper (1981, 1990) which distinguishes the merits of considering tourism study as either multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary. This interdisciplinary approach, they argue, must come with the caveat that ‘different research problems may require different philosophical approaches’ and additionally that ‘considering the high behavioural content and diverse nature of tourism, both qualitative and quantitative methodologies must be tolerated (Echtner and Jamal, 1997, p.879).’

Unavoidably, it must therefore be considered that a study on recreational walkers based in a tourism context, cannot lodge itself into any one established discipline readily. The underpinning theories of tourism find their roots from a number of older, more established areas of study. Given these considerations, it must then be accepted that this PhD study is interdisciplinary. Its contribution of knowledge is in the emergent area of tourism studies. This leads us to the first step in framing the research question. Walking in this context should be thought of as an activity, which can be conceptualised using tourism as its main body of theory, but which draws from other related disciplines. As tourism is intrinsically linked to leisure and recreation, the next subsection will address the presence of walking within those areas of study.
2.2.3 Leisure, recreation and tourism

It must be remembered that whilst tourism and recreation share similar properties in outdoor settings (Pomfret, 2006), consensus over definitions and the relationship between subject areas in an academic context are not universal. Leisure studies, a more established field of investigation than tourism, traditionally covered sociology-based concepts; whilst recreation and park management emerged in North America in the 19th century as a reactive line of thinking following the increase of urbanisation (Godbey et al., 2005). Boniface et al. (2001, p.20) presented a conceptual map (figure 2.2, below) of activities which occur in recreation and tourism terms. A recreational continuum included recreation as an element of leisure time, with tourism activities part of the recreational spectrum. They include day visits, but not daily leisure activities such as sports or socialising, or home-based leisure.

Figure 2.2: The relationship between leisure, recreation and tourism
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Adapted from Boniface et al. (2001)

It is useful to consider leisure as the broadest area, with recreation and tourism as types of activities which can be incorporated within. The definition of leisure is closely related to working
life. In the past it has been distinguished as anything not related to work, although the borders between both activities are subject to some overlap (Voss, 1967). In Gershuny and Fisher’s (1999) working paper on the development of leisure in the UK, they note a definitional debate surrounding leisure as being one of three things: (a) not work, but activities undertaken at all other times, (b) an element of consumption, or (c) a composite of all categories of recreation. Leisure studies is a broad field which covers a number of aspects including the exploration of the leisure experience, its function in society, as consumption and to understand cultural theory (Best, 2009). The area of study is grounded in sociology, in particular the role of free time in society and, like studies of recreation and park management, has a multi-disciplinary nature encompassing geography, sociology, anthropology and other human sciences (Godbey et al., 2005).

A significant strand of leisure studies in this context is Stebbins’ work on casual and serious leisure. Originally, Stebbins (1982) produced a conceptual statement on serious leisure, noting at the time the trend towards people working less and a growing minority of people spending more time indulging in leisure activities deemed as ‘serious’. Walking for recreation or tourism only fulfils this definition if one considers people participating in long-distance walking, ‘peak-bagging’ or walking holiday tours. Stebbins outlined a number or sub-divisions of serious leisure. These forms of walking are most closely aligned to ‘hobbyist pursuits’. Hobbyists have ‘definite and lasting purposes’ but will pursue their hobby ‘regardless of...financial loss or gain’ and are often entirely unrelated to an individual’s work role (Stebbins, 1982, p.259, 260). An individual who approaches an activity in this way will look to their leisure time as an opportunity to engage in the hobby as often as possible. From the perspective of walking, this approach to the activity reflects recreational walkers who intend to spend a significant part of their spare time walking. Time is particularly relevant in this definition given the pace of walking as an activity and the potential to spend a great deal of time actually engaging in the activity, in comparison to some other ‘quicker’ hobbies, such as bungee-jumping.
Stebbins (1997) later devised a further classification of activity: casual leisure. Casual leisure is often discussed as a foil for describing or illuminating serious leisure and requires ‘virtually no skill and only minimal knowledge’ (Stebbins, 1997, p.21). Stebbins initially outlined six ‘types’ of casual leisure. Three are relevant to the derived experience and motivations for a more ‘casual form of walking’: active entertainment, sociable stimulation and sensory stimulation. If more casual forms of walking are considered, they may be subject to these motivations: a ‘gentle stroll’, or a short walk, perhaps including a meal or drink on the way, or another focal activity such as an attraction. The individual might be described as someone who has a casual interest in walking. A more recently defined sub-category of casual leisure (Stebbins, 2004), pleasurable aerobic activity, includes ‘nature trails at the weekend’, where enjoyment is a key factor in order to participate frequently.

Recreation differs from leisure (but is part of the leisure spectrum) as it refers to a more active attempt to relax, escape, refresh oneself and to generally derive pleasure (Moore et al., 1995). Godbey et al. (2005) analyse the two fields of leisure studies and recreation and park management with particular reference to the active living agenda. Both fields predate tourism study, but have influenced the development of tourism study as a field in its own right. Godbey et al. (2005) describe a particular branch of leisure studies which is concerned with understanding underpinning influences on active living, contrasting this with the recreation and park management field which often seeks to focus on environmental impacts and policy of recreation. As the latter area of study has evolved, there has been increasing focus on non-work activities to improve the health and wellbeing of less privileged classes. Studies of outdoor recreation principally focus on management issues including natural resources, impacts, conflicts, social inclusion and crowding (Pigram and Jenkins, 2006; Jacob and Schreyer, 1980; Manning et al., 2000; Van der zande et al., 1984; Carr and Williams, 1993). These areas are of relevance to recreational walking as they relate to the behaviour, experiences and motivations of the walker and their relationship with other walkers and the walking environment.
Recreation studies which concentrate solely on walking are rare. They generally observe more specialist activities such as hiking, back-packing and mountaineering, which are associated with more ‘serious’ forms of walking. Differentiation is problematic: the terms walking and hiking are often used interchangeably in recreation studies, an example being a study of trail users which substitutes the category of walkers for the term ‘day-hikers’ (Lieber and Fesenmaier, 1984). Whether this is a reflection of linguistics in certain subject fields or geographical areas is a matter for debate.

In attempting to draw conceptual material from the field of recreation and park management studies for a study on walking, it is evident that locations are of relevance. Recreation and tourism activities often occur in the same physical spaces, for example national parks (McKercher, 1996). The prevalence of the countryside, or green spaces within urban areas, as a preferred location for recreational walking is a significant element of the recreation branch of study.

Thus far, the exploration of literature of fields which are close to the tourism area of study: leisure studies, and recreation and park management; has highlighted a number of relevant theoretical elements to take forward into the later sections of the literature review. Distinguishing casual and serious approaches to leisure reflects different uses of leisure time and a basis to differentiating approaches by tourists to walking as an activity. Management issues such as the use of recreation resources, visitor patterns and behaviour, categorisation of the users of recreation areas such as trails, user conflicts and the crowding of sites for recreation are all applicable areas of recreation study when considering the decision making of walkers. These research objectives of the recreation field are directly linked to the walking environment and the management of walking locations. Figure 2.3 (below) summarises the interfaces between the three areas of study and the aspects which are significant to walking.
Whilst the subject boundaries are not always completely defined, it is reasonable to argue that walking, when not solely for transport, can be defined as both: a recreational or a tourist activity undertaken in leisure time, and therefore reflects the focus of studies of active outdoor recreation and tourism. It can also be viewed in terms of its closeness to hobbyism and ‘pleasurable aerobic activity’ as a form of leisure. To some degree, the concepts all filter into tourism study, and are congruous with a tourism-based study of walkers. For instance, Beeton’s (1999, p.211) study on conflicts between walkers and horse-riders provided insight into the visitor management strategies for national parks and the need for ‘planning and operational staff to have an improved understanding of the psychological needs and motivations of visitors’.

The overriding theme of this section on leisure, recreation and tourism is that the three areas are intertwined and that their conceptual spheres are part of the theoretical basis for this study. The next section will explore a strand of tourism study which draws many of them together.
2.2.4 Adventure Tourism Studies

There is increasing interest in the field of ‘adventure tourism’ or ‘outdoor adventure recreation’ with a number of specialised journals evolving. Tourism activity based in natural areas is increasing, according to a review of sustainable tourism research (Lu and Nepal, 2009). The study area of outdoor adventure recreation is described by Pomfret and Bramwell (2014) as a complex sub-sector of tourist to research due to the broad range of activity encompassed in the classification, from adrenaline seekers such as bungee jumping, to longer activities which include mountaineering, and overlap with ecotourism and activity tourism.

Outdoor adventure tourism research dates back to more than 30 years ago. Ewert (1987) published an overview of the research in the field up to that point. It included a definition for outdoor adventure recreation: ‘a self-initiated, non-consumptive recreational activity engaged in a natural outdoor setting, that contains real or perceived elements of risk in which the outcome is uncertain but influenced by the participant and/or circumstance’ (Ewert, 1987, p.15, 16). Although the inclusion of ‘risk’ in this definition may indicate that it only covers more adventurous forms of walking such as mountaineering, the definition still holds as applicable. Ewert provides a history of research charting the 1960s which focused principally on social benefits, through the 1970s in which focus shifted to benefits to individuals, and finally the 1980s where the importance of the wilderness experience became more significant. Ewert goes on to suggest four distinct perspectives of research: psychological (behaviour of the individual), sociological (the recreational group context), economic (available resources and economic impacts), and interaction with the natural environment (which includes impacts on environments).

More recently, Weber’s (2001) work on outdoor adventure tourism aimed to address the tendency of papers on adventure based outdoor recreation to neglect the tourism element. This discussion drew from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1943), a principal theory used in tourism
study, which states that certain basic needs such as biological and physical needs and personal safety have to be fulfilled before an individual can seek out more experiential fulfilments such as social needs and personal growth. Weber identifies risk as an important factor, which demonstrates that adventure tourists sometimes bypass the safety element. Maslows’ theory originates from the psychology discipline, and can be drawn upon when identifying the variations between characteristics, motivation and decisions of recreational walkers. Given the differences walkers have in interest levels of the activity, it is applicable in most circumstances (except perhaps where risk becomes a factor).

Mountaineering is one of the primary activities focused on by adventure tourism study. Previous research in the field is useful in providing theory to consider when exploring different forms of walking and their underlying motivations. Pomfret (2011), classed mountaineering as a form of ‘adventure recreation’ in tourism studies. Interestingly, given the earlier discussion on casual and serious forms of leisure, she references Stebbins (1992), reinforcing that mountains are a place for ‘serious leisure’. Beedie and Hudson (2003) state that mountaineering as a specialist activity now overlaps more with tourism (in terms of adventure tourism). They suggest that hillwalking in exotic places has been ‘redefined as trekking’ (Beedie and Hudson, 2003, p.626) and that the increase in classifications is a result of the broadening of activities over time. The authors describe three key areas in defining adventure tourism: control is deferred to experts, promotional media is used frequently and technology is used in adventurous settings. Technology and kit advances characterise the incorporation of more mountaineering in adventure tourism. They also posit that there is no longer always a gradual promotion from low level walking to more adventurous activity. They conclude that the potential of individuals operating independently in mountains may diminish due to the rise in organised adventure tourism but the true dangers will always be present in the activity. It can be inferred that the development of outdoor activities which include some forms of recreational walking necessitates a fresh approach in the study of such phenomena. The increasing organisational
nature of outdoor activities, role of technology, settings and trends noted by Beedie and Hudson are applicable to the understanding of the recreational walking market.

Ewert’s (2000) paper on the rise of adventure recreation study draws attention to the expanding number of different activities on offer, and includes mountaineering under this umbrella. The author distinguishes between hard and soft activities. ‘Day hiking’ falls into the category of ‘soft’. To distinguish the different levels of regulation and independence he presents two axis to define the experience of the end-user (see figure 2.4).
This distinction further suggests the differences between different types of walking: from more independent autonomous activity on the north of the vertical axis (solo walking without guidance, perhaps), to highly regulated and structured activity on the south of the vertical axis (for instance organised walking groups); and from highly controlled activity with low risk certainty and more available amenities (forest parks with a high level of signage) on the west of the horizontal axis to higher risk, lower control and fewer amenities (wilderness) on the east axis. The location of the activity along with the nature of its organisation and the experiences sought are also likely to influence where certain forms of walking fall into this definition. The paper uses data from two surveys to gauge participation in a number of outdoor activities. They include hiking, hiking to a summit, backpacking, backpacking to a summit, mountain climbing and rock climbing. The link between mountain climbing and rock climbing demonstrate a conceptualisation of certain forms of walking with other activities that cannot be characterised...
by walking. This is important to consider in this context as a study of walkers in the English Lake District incorporates mountaineering, hill walking and low level walking.

Many of the theories used in the emergent adventure tourism research strand are grounded in mainstream tourism study, with additional input from the field of recreation and park management. An exploration of the characteristics, motivations and choices of walking tourists can draw much from this area. The tendency of adventure tourism research to focus on the distinctions between the management needs and structures of the different activities, the distinctions between activities and their categorisation and moreover the underlying motivations and criteria for different experiences provides a basis for understanding the varying types of walking and the needs of the participants. However, the tendency of recreation and adventure tourism research to focus on multiple activities, in order to investigate aspects relating to motivation and experience suggests that there is an additional need to look elsewhere for relevant study on walking. The multidisciplinary nature of mainstream tourism study reinforces this need. The next section will scrutinise three other subject areas in which walking has been directly focused upon in academic study.

### 2.2.5 Transportation studies, Geography and Health studies

**Transportation**

Transportation studies is a broad area of study which include research into planning and logistics of transport, transport economics, freight and passenger transport, non-motorised transport, the infrastructure required for transport and more recently the environmental and social effects of transport systems. Like tourism, the branch of study focuses on a human activity, using elements of theory from the more established human sciences including economics, sociology, psychology and human geography. The travel element of transportation, relating to the movement of humans, their transport choices, motivations and experiences are the most relevant aspects here. In the previous chapter, the sustainable travel agenda was introduced
and there are interfaces between transport and tourism, which are significant to this study on walking tourism. There are a number of applicable areas of transportation study.

Studies on the ‘value’ of travel time form an established branch of transport research, which is usually nested within transport economics literature (Beesley, 1965; Hensher, 2001; Wardman, 2001). Research into travel time generally seeks to quantify its value using economic parameters. Often in these terms, this time is considered negatively. Assumptions and values surrounding non-work travelling are founded on the pre-supposition that time spent travelling is a ‘disutility’ (Jain and Lyons, 2005). According to previous transportation studies, the value of time is considered to be higher (meaning that saving this time is more important) when walking to or waiting at a stop or station for public transport, in comparison to ‘In Vehicle time’ (IVT) (Vande Walle and Steenberghen, 2006). A study into the time value of public transport trips found that negative perceptions of walking and waiting time would affect modal choice depending on their proportion within total travelling time - there was a clear maximum accepted waiting or walking time (Vande Walle and Steenberghen, 2004).

Wardman (2001) attributed the premium value attached to walking time to greater expended effort, less pleasant surrounding environment and less opportunities to make the time productive than IVT, whilst the associated stress, frustration and lower opportunities for productivity also made the waiting time of premium value. What this research does not highlight is that pleasurable walking (walking for the sake of walking rather than on a work trip, or between other modes of transport) possesses its own measure of utility. In this branch of transport economics, walking is seen as a linking mechanism, although it is still not given the attention it deserves as an activity in its own right. However it should be thought of as applicable in tourism terms as it is often a mode of choice to navigate destinations, link activities and access attractions.
Walking for pleasure is discretionary travel. People value the health benefits, interaction with environments, adventure, challenge and educational benefits as positive outcomes rather than the effort expended, or sense that time could be best served undertaking more ‘productive’ activity rather than merely accessing a location through travel. Nevertheless, there are important crossovers in the conceptualisation of transport systems in transportation studies and the travel of tourists in tourism studies. Studies which analyse transport networks such as Bielli et al. (2006) use the transport system, made of links, nodes (stops or places), ways (routes) and terminals (stations or destinations) to analyse transport behaviour and this is transferable to the movement of tourists. A tourism study by Murray and Graham (1997, p.514) on pilgrimages in the Santiago de Compostela in Northern Spain notes the marketing of such route-based tourism ventures as themed: ‘the route itself, combining all or part of an itinerary with arrival at a destination, can function as a regional definition, a theme that transcends geographical diversity…..’ The elements of the touristic experience include the ‘way’ or route itself and nodes (individual towns and places on the way). In walking terms, this conceptualisation aligns most to linear walking. However, a day walk or even a short branded trail with stops at points of interest on the way can be thought of in the same way. These synergies, and the consideration of the way in which travellers view their travel time and plan their itineraries are directly applicable to walking tourism.

Geography

Human Geography as an established classic discipline preceded academic study in both transport and tourism, and has direct underpinning theoretical influence on their direction as fields of research. Squire (1994) states that tourism gives geographers an extra dimension in terms of understanding social and cultural elements of human geography and suggests that geography should therefore in turn be a focus in tourism research. She advocates that qualitative methods to understand tourists in social and cultural settings would provide a depth of understanding of the dynamics between tourism and everyday life as they are
interconnected. Geographical studies on walking use walking to understand places better and build collaborative knowledge on them. They particularly focus on the subjective experiential relationship between the body, senses and environment in both urban and rural landscapes, and answer conceptual questions regarding society and the construction of spaces (Anderson, 2004; Middleton, 2010; Wylie, 2005; Edensor, 2010; 2000a; 2000b; 2013). It is most related to human perceptions of external environments which has synergies with the tourism experience and therefore may be used for understanding route-choice.

**Health Studies**

There is a relatively well-established branch of academic literature in the field of health which aims to understand the factors which cause people to walk more. There are many studies which aim to understand the links between walking, its frequency and patterns of activity and elements of physical health (Tudor-Locke et al., 2006; Kruger et al., 2008) the reasons why people do not walk and the sub groups who don’t (Lumsdon and Mitchell, 1999). A significant branch of health research focuses on understanding characteristics related to the environment which are conducive to increasing walking. Researchers mainly use quantitative approaches to measure objectively the influence of environmental variables on walking. Studies have analysed physical and social impacts, urban design and the role of green spaces in neighbourhoods to increase the level of people walking (Sugiyama et al., 2008; Dunton et al., 2008). A number of studies have measured a range of different variables, commonly known as Objectively Measured Environmental Correlates (Sallis et al., 1997; Saelens et al., 2003; Owen et al., 2004; Humpel et al., 2002).

There is evidence from these studies that it is the combination of different surrounding elements such as slope, terrain, green-ness, and human activity which makes an environment more attractive to walk in. Some studies have since developed the idea of a ‘walkability index’ which brings together a number of variables, such as pavement width, buildings and traffic levels to
give an overall assessment of how conducive a given area is to walking (Frank et al., 2010). These studies are relevant to the research question as they give an indication of the factors which affect route-choice. Their findings are useful in informing how environmental characteristics make certain routes popular, but they are almost exclusively based in a North American context and there may be some merit in considering differences in the UK. Additionally they are generally based on research undertaken in urban environments. However, these areas of study are relevant in more general terms to explore route-choice.

2.2.6 Summary of section

The exploration of several subject areas of literature has described their relevance towards the study area of this PhD. Tourism is an interdisciplinary field, but the concepts which apply here surrounding motivation, satisfaction, place attachment and preferences for location transcend other fields and are rooted in more established subject areas. The exploration of leisure, recreation and tourism and their relationship demonstrated that there are many points of overlap and concepts which are applicable: Stebbins’ casual and serious leisure, the behaviour of recreationists and visitor management theory from recreation studies. Drawing from Stebbins, it is posited that some forms of walking are casual and sit more in the mainstream area of tourism study, whilst more serious forms of walking are situated in the adventure tourism area of study. The emergent strand of adventure tourism envelopes mountaineering and hill walking and draws from models such as Maslow’s needs hierarchy which are relevant to most forms of walking.

Transportation studies have sought to understand the utility of walking amongst other modes, and concepts such routes and systems are pertinent when walking is considered as a mode of travel. Whilst the presence of walking in geography focuses on wider societal concepts some of the principles of route-choice and location preference can be drawn from health studies. The next two sections will explore in more depth these concepts and others as the literature review
turns its attention towards addressing the two main areas of this study: categorising recreational walkers by characteristics, motivations and preferences; and determining their choices of location to undertake walks.

2.3 How recreational walkers may differ: an exploration of segmentation and motivation in tourism study

2.3.1 Introduction to the section

This section will build on the groundwork made by the opening section of the chapter which investigated the most appropriate subject areas underpinning the research question. The overall aim is to address segmentation of tourists, and more specifically recreational walkers. It will explore the literature on motivation in studies of tourism and recreation, outlining and critiquing the process of segmenting tourists by motivational traits and other forms of differentiation. It will then apply the analysis to the context of recreational walking. It will analyse the process of differentiating individuals based on their characteristics, and preferences surrounding the focal phenomenon of walking for pleasure. Whereas section 2.4 primarily tackles the decision-making element regarding choice of route and walking location, this section will focus on the individuals and the characteristics that define them. The foci of this section and the next are interrelated and therefore a degree of cross-over between the material and discussion in both sections is inevitable. The ideas of the PhD study assume that it is the differences between individuals that affect the choices they make. A closer look at the segmentation process in tourism is provided at the outset.

2.3.2 Segmentation: the differentiation of tourists using typologies

Segmentation is an organisational process used widely to separate individuals into tangible groups who broadly share similarities in certain characteristic attributes. The technique is based on providing an understanding of the consumer market in order to target different products tailored to varying preferences and needs; or to market the same product differently to defined
groups of tourist in the ‘audience’, based on their differing receptivity toward stimuli or messages used.

Academics and marketers use typologies to increase knowledge of consumer behaviour, to develop products and marketing strategies and predict future trends (Swarbrooke and Horner, 2007). Understanding motivations of those participating in tourism and recreation activities or visiting specific locations has been an important element of the knowledge base for tourism research over the past 30-40 years (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Uysal and Jurowski, 1994). Understanding the differences between groups of people can enable a clearer picture of how to tailor resources, or solve a range of academic problems. For example, in the tourism literature typologies have been used to understand the differences between cultural tourists based on their motivations and preferences (McKercher and du Cros, 2003), the motivations and behaviour of medical tourists (Wongkit and McKercher, 2013), types of gastronomy tourism (Hjalager, 2002), agritourism (Phillip et al., 2010) and working tourists (Uriely, 2001). Consumer segmentation is also important in outdoor adventure tourism research, often interlinking demographics such as age and gender to certain activities (Pomfret and Bramwell, 2014).

Typologies are also used to identify differences in other aspects of the tourism industry, and studies include typologies which differentiate types of organisation, such as voluntourism-related organisations based on function (Coghlan, 2006), the partnerships between tourism organisations, specifically sustainable tourism partnerships (Selin, 1999), types of behaviour, in the case of destination loyalty of tourists (Oppermann et al., 1999), types of attraction to piece together the various elements involved in industrial heritage tourism (Edwards, 1996), tourism-related websites (Pan and Fesenmaier, 2000), and the experiences involved in tourism and recreation (Elands and Lengkeek, 2000). As there are a multitude of uses for a typology in
tourism research, an analysis of the segmentation process is required in order to target appropriate options for designing research aimed at differentiating walkers.

An early example of segmentation by Bryant and Morrison (1980) analysed the tourism industry in Michigan with the aim of understanding how to improve the tourism offer there, and to ascertain where to target marketing in order to maximise the impact, because of the limited available funds. Their technique is described as ‘the classic market segmentation data classification scheme’ (Bryant and Morrison, 1980, p.2) suggested by Frank and Strain (1972). To form segments in their target population, the categorisation process involved differentiating between visitors based on the following groups of factors:

- ‘general’: demographic, geographic and socio-economic factors (these factors describe the person),
- previous travel patterns: place, transport mode, number of people, length of stay, expenditures (these factors highlight characteristics relating to travelling which are also relevant to walking),
- a third group of inferred measures based on the first two sets of measures: likelihood of future Michigan travel, attitudes towards Michigan, recreational preferences, location preferences such as sightseeing. (these factors are more intangible, reflecting individual attitudes, but are important in activity based travel),

From these three groups of category a fourth group, which was also a second group of inferred measures, was created: ‘Characteristic travel and tourism lifestyles’. The possible differences in lifestyles were then used to form segments. This type of categorisation process is typical of the earlier research into tourist segmentation, and is suitable for differentiating tourist markets. It allows a picture to be built up of each group of people, based on simple demographic differences such as age and social class, previous tourism behaviour such as where, when and how people travel, what they spend and some of their preferences for activity.
The effect of such methods is to form groups of tourist based on a range of relevant tourism—related characteristic factors. In the study detailed above, Bryant and Morrison’s (1980) data derived from the four groups of factors was collected by survey questionnaire, and the resulting analysis produced six types (or groups) of tourist based on ‘vacation activity preference’. They included: ‘young sports types’ who were most likely to indulge in activities such as bicycling, hiking or swimming; a ‘sight-seer type’ who was likely to visit historic or natural sites, or museums; and a ‘winter warmer type’ who preferred winter sports such as snowmobiling and skiing but also others such as canoeing and sailing. A further category ‘outdoorsman hunter’ who was likely to undertake power-boating, fishing and snowmobiling, showed similarities to the ‘winter warmer type’ reflecting the importance of acknowledging that segments can be associated with the same traits and activity preferences, and in this sense are never completely homogenous. These groups are meaningful to the particular context of the research but are also sufficiently complex (based on the number of factors used) to reflect the phenomena.

In essence, the process of segmentation ascertains the similarities of individuals within groups, but there is generally a certain degree of fluidity in terms of the individuals’ preferences and characteristics between groups; that is to say, that segments are not distinct closed groups. Bigné et al. (2008) reinforce this idea, when they describe segmentation or ‘clustering’ as primarily an exploratory exercise. Essentially this is correct, when the parameters are outlined in the research design for the segmentation process, but the resultant groups are a consequence of the exploratory analysis and are not known beforehand.

Over time, the use of segmentation in tourism has continued to develop, and academics have aimed to employ improved methods of classifying tourists, by introducing and refining new or more sophisticated techniques. In the industry, it is useful for marketers, tourism managers and planners to understand the groups or types of people visiting destinations and what their preferences are for the tourist product. It is clear that over time, tastes change, as does the
product available, and therefore segmentation will always have a purpose in academic study, in order to isolate the definitive characteristics in the particular tourist of the research interest.

Molera and Albaladejo (2007), for example, aimed to understand new emergent types of rural tourist, conducting a segmentation process using the Spanish rural tourist market. They employed ‘psychographic segmentation’, a commonly-used modern method of grouping, using social class, lifestyle factors (marital status, children, education, travel habits, employment etc) and personality. Molera and Albaladejo (2007, p. 760) utilised ‘as it is common in tourism research, an integrated approach of factor and cluster analysis (...) employed to separate consumers into clusters’. The factors emerging from their analysis, based on a number of stated benefits sought from tourism, were broken down into:

- ‘nature and peacefulness factors’ (calm atmosphere, relaxation, attractive landscapes etc.),
- physical and cultural activities, (visiting monuments, outdoor activities etc.),
- family (time spent, children),
- trip features (price, distance)
- and rural life (activities, food and relationships with local residents).

Following this process, a cluster analysis drew together the individuals who were surveyed into distinct tourist types who shared similarities within groups based on the benefits. The resulting clusters were:

- ‘family rural tourists’, favouring shorter distances, family-based activities and flexible trips;
- relax rural tourists’, who give low value to activities and high value to relaxation;
- ‘active rural tourists’, favouring active and cultural activities;
- ‘rural life tourists’ who were interested in interactive with local residents of rural communities, rural food and nature;
• ‘tourists in rural accommodation’ a group who displayed no particular interest in any of the traditional motivations to visit rural locations.

Once again, this segmentation approach demonstrates results which are suitable to reflect the context, and transferable in this case to rural area. Both examples shown above illustrate the use of segmentation analysis in tourism to understand the wants and needs of different groups of tourist, identified by empirical research. It is clear in both cases, that the researchers were able to identify quite detailed and distinct groups of tourists, most likely to prefer specific activities, and demonstrate certain behaviour when on holiday. In both cases, motivational and preferential differences were used in conjunction with characteristics and lifestyle factors to ‘cluster’ tourists together, and the researchers were able to provide a description of a typical individual tourist belonging to the group.

The context of the typology is all important. Choosing a segmentation approach for the walking tourist should incorporate similar parameters used and analytical process as those seen above, but be directed more for walking. For instance, walkers might encompass several of the tourist types formulated by either study detailed above. Walkers could also be considered a separate segment of tourists by some measures. Moreover, despite broad similarities in approach and outcome, tourism typologies are themselves numerous in their own classification. Whereas the early example by Bryant and Morrison (1980) drew primarily from demographics, tourism preferences and previous travel behaviour, Molera and Albaladejo (2007) focused more on the derived benefits from the activity. There are now whole studies devoted to analysing the nuances between the typologies used by different tourism researchers; ‘typologies of typologies’; and therefore a brief critical analysis will be made of the types of classification suitable for a recreational walking.

Bigné et al. (2007) reviewed segmentation in tourism, using Swarbrook and Horners’ (1999) distinction between typology approaches: geographic, socio-economic, demographic,
psychographic and behavioural, a broad but nonetheless useful categorisation. The dimensions summarise the ‘who, what, how, why and where?’ questions a researcher of tourism phenomena uses when seeking to characterise their focal targets. Another distinction Bigné et al. (2007) make is between segmentation approaches which can either be \textit{a priori} or \textit{a posteri}. Whilst there is some overlap, studies in the first category are generally demographic, geographical and consist of factors which can be differentiated before the analysis stage; whilst the latter category are more typically psychographic and motivational, and are steered by the data in their construction of segments. Later, the more solid characteristics such as gender, age and occupation can be applied to the resultant groups to add more definition.

Caution must be made in terms of the validity of results in studies of this nature. Dolnicar (2002, p.1), performed a review of data-driven segmentation studies in tourism research, and highlighted \textit{‘fundamental weaknesses’} rendering the result of some studies as \textit{‘more than questionable’}. She mentions the distinction between typologies and taxonomies. Typologies are described as a process where the parameters are predictable from the outset. The example of Plog’s (1974) seminal research is given, which resulted in the categories of ‘allocentrics’ (cautious, inhibited individuals who prefer to be guided by outside agencies with regards to their touristic experiences) and ‘psychocentrics’ (confident, outgoing and explorative tourists). Taxonomies use an empirical data set and typically employ cluster analysis to derive groupings (Dolnicar, 2002).

Dolnicar’s (2002) review of 47 previous segmentation studies found that the data quality and the nature of the use of cluster analysis as a method were the two most influential study design elements on the overall validity of the study. Lancaster and Reynolds (1999, p.10) sum up the critique of using data driven approaches to clustering by stating that, in order to achieve meaningful segmentation, the resulting groups should be valid, with clear variations between segments, accessible in marketing terms in order to be targeted effectively and each segment
substantial enough in number to be worth targeting. The inferences made from these distinctions in approach and validity between \textit{a priori} and \textit{a posteriori} segmentation, is that the latter is suited to typologies which are based on personal motivations and the derived benefits of activity choices or tourist location, or more specifically walking tourism. Segmentation methods used and interpretations must be verified by their relevance to the sector.

The use of motivations and preferences for building typologies in tourism study are a somewhat complex approach to the understanding of tourist choices. Decrop and Snelders (2005) suggest that decision-making and lifestyle aspects have been less useful in segmentation studies than marketing, targeting and pricing, and more theory is required to integrate them. They critique socio-psychological typologies as usually presented as universal, often ignoring ‘\textit{interpersonal influences in group decision-making and the cultural environment’}. This idea of groups and individuals is relevant to walking as much as any tourism activity. Any choice made by an individual in a group situation is to some degree influenced by others. Other studies have shown that the tailoring of marketing the tourism product can be subject to cultural dimensions, and national differences (Woodside and Ahn, 2007, p.58). In areas of recreational walking, and particularly rural and protected areas, there are certain specific considerations when considering typologies.

National parks are subject to a range of different types of visitor, of which a large majority will do at least some walking on their visit. A study by Ryan and Sterling (2001) aimed at clustering visitors to an Australian national park found five segments: ‘hedonists’ and ‘four-wheel drive enthusiasts’ which were the smallest niches in proportion; ‘day visitors’, ‘information seekers’ and ‘recreation generalists’, who were the largest segment. There are elements of most of these descriptions in walking tourists. Their satisfaction with a range of elements of the national park varied.
Studies which are aimed at segmenting rural tourists are increasing, and consequently the collective understanding tourism academics have on how motivations and preferences differ in rural settings grows. Kastenholz et al. (1999) characterise groups of tourists to rural areas as: active, independent, ‘traditional travellers’ and nature loving, based mainly on their activities. A more detailed analysis was made by Frochot (2005), who conducted cluster analysis on rural tourists in Scotland based on motivations. The resulting typology comprised four segments: ‘actives’ (interested in all aspects of rural tourism experience, but mainly show a high level of interest in sport); ‘relaxers’ (mainly interested in relaxation), ‘gazers’ (outdoors, relaxation and sightseeing) and ‘rurals’ (culturally motivated by rural life). Again, recreational walkers fit into most if not all of these segments, but the process reinforces the use of motivation-based variables to differentiate them.

Recreational walkers are a sub-category of tourists and likely to be subject to a similar set of variances in their choices. There are likely, but perhaps not be limited to, demonstrate variations which can be associated with rural typologies. Personal motivations and preferences towards activities, settings and tourism experiences play a key part in previous research involving the segmentation of tourists. The overview of segmentation approaches in tourism suggests that, in seeking to understand the preferences of, and choices made, by walkers in rural and protected locations, the more data-driven, a posteri approach favours the complexity of this tourist activity. However, research has in the past indicated that such inquiry be rigorous and readily explained by the nature of the sector in order to have meaning. This section of the literature review therefore requires a closer examination of motivation theory in tourism as, the need to identify significant factors for segmenting walkers relies on an understanding the driving forces behind their choices and actions.
2.3.3 Motivation theory

Motivation theory in recreation revolves around the central premise that participants choose certain recreational activities to fulfil psychological and physical goals (Driver and Tocher, 1970), which principally involve the desire to escape everyday stress (Knopf et al., 1973). Early pioneering work in the field by Dann (1977) reflected a requirement for in-depth investigation into the motivations of tourists. Dann’s discussion initially draws from Durkheim’s (1897) concept of anomie, based on the fragmentation of societies and a change in individuals’ aspirations (the individual derivative of anomie being anomia); suggesting that the society in which an individual resides affects their subsequent responses in life. Dann (1977) suggests that tourism can be compared to other collective products of anomie such as death rates, strikes and unrest, as tourists’ desire for travel and their preferences for activities, settings and experiences is an effect of their anomia in their residential situation. Another concept, ‘ego-enhancement’ is introduced in Dann’s discussion as a need fulfilled from tourism activity. Dann suggests that the tourist who travels in order to fulfil this need, experiencing a freedom unique to being out of the home setting in terms of what they can do, where they can do, and indeed who they actually are. The resultant analysis found that tourists’ motivation to travel could be associated with one of either motivations, dependent on a number of demographic and socio-economic factors and the social geography of their home area.

Crompton’s (1979) study on pleasure vacationists uses the concept of equilibrium to conceptualise tourist motivation, suggesting that that disturbance of an individual’s equilibrium causes them to feel compelled to fulfil a ‘need’. The need is created by the new state of disequilibrium caused by changes which have occurred in their life. The nature of the disequilibrium determines the individual’s perceived need which in turn shapes their motivations regarding the particular tourist activity, setting and desired experience they choose. The disequilibrium may fall on a continuum ranging from cultural in nature to socio-psychological, and can also be termed as long-term disequilibrium – a state which requires more than one
vacation to regain an equilibrium - or short term disequilibrium. The socio-psychological motives include: ‘escape from a perceived mundane environment; exploration and evaluation of self; relaxation; prestige; regression; enhancement of kinship relationships; and facilitation of social interaction (Crompton, 1979, p.408).’ Cultural motives fell into two distinct categories: novelty and education.

Iso-Ahola (1982) presented a social-psychological model of tourism motivation based on two facets of motivation: approach (seeking) and avoidance (escaping). Individual tourists each possess a unique perception of the potential satisfaction from a tourist experience, based on their awareness of goals. The goals may reflect avoidance motives: escaping the personal (personal issues, perceived personal failures etc) or interpersonal world (co-workers, families, neighbours); or approach motives involving seeking tourist experiences which are personal (including relaxation, education or ego-enhancement) or interpersonal (interaction with friends, new friends, fellow travellers or the local residents of the destination). Iso-Ahola surmises that a tourist may travel to a certain destination or seek a certain activity based on a combination of one approach motive and one avoidance motive. They may also act on a different combination of each motive for different tourist activities, depending on outside factors affecting them at the time. It is also possible that an individual will be affected by all four of the potential motives at any one time.

The three studies detailed above by Dann (1977), Crompton (1979) and Iso-Ahola (1982) are seminal works on the nature of motivation in tourism and have shaped subsequent tourism research in the area. They are all still very much relevant in the present day, and their theory can be attributed to the motivations that underpin recreational walking in tourist areas. A central running theme is the focus on the conditions in ordinary everyday life, and the difference which the tourist activity brings in contrast to those conditions. Escaping the normal and everyday, the personal and interpersonal situations at home, and fulfilling needs arising from a
feeling of disequilibrium (ie a stressful situation one may find themselves in such as a work-related issue or situation) are all potential facets of motivation which affect the choices and preferences of recreational walkers in terms of wanting to go out for a walk in the first place.

Walking for pleasure allows one to fulfil motivational goals which might relate to relieving the stress of the everyday through physical exercise and being in close contact with natural environments, to fulfil cultural motives or experience the freedom of walking in open spaces. Once the decision has been made, the same motivational forces then may affect the walk they decide to undertake, perhaps in terms of distance, gradient or the severity the location, how far away from civilisation they want to travel, how many days their walking holiday may take.

Previous studies on walking have shown that affective factors are more closely related to the tourism motivations discussed above. They include a love of the environment (Hinds and Allebone, 2009), companionship and social contact (Kwak et al., 2006) and the reduction of stress (Rappe, 2005). The desire to be within wilderness was suggested by Kay and Moxham (1996) as a motivation for more serious walkers. The escapism element comes is also significant. In addition, instrumental factors have been shown to affect motivation to walk recreationally. They include the desire to not use a car or the need to walk a dog (Ogilvie et al., 2004; Edwards and Knights, 2006).

It is relevant to conceptualise walking as a mode or form of travel, in addition to a tourist activity, as it provides a further dimension to understanding motivation. Anable and Gaterslaben (2005) investigated instrumental and affective factors which determine travel mode choice. They found that instrumental factors such as time and price were significant for work journeys. Affective factors were found to be more important when making leisure trips. As an activity, walking for recreation entails a chain of decisions which differ from walking purely for transport purposes. Anable and Gatersleben (2005) explored affective factors: relaxation, no stress,
excitement, control and freedom. These factors are applicable to both the choice to go for a walk and the choice of walking route, and therefore might be applied to routes as factors or as grouping variables to define sets of walkers. It is arguable that characteristics in individual walkers are to a certain degree responsible for both sets of motivations.

2.3.4 Push and pull factors

In tourism and any travel-related form of recreation, push and pull factors and their interplay are important in the choice of destination (Crompton, 1979; Chon, 1993). Push factors are motivational traits inherent in the individual which cause them to make the tourist trip, and pull factors are specific attractive forces relating to the destination. Recreational walking can therefore be characterised by two types of motivation: general motivations to perform the activity, and specific motivations relating to the routes and locations chosen.

The relationship between push and pull factors is important to consider when theorising the movements of walkers. Uysal and Jurowski (1994, p.844) produced a study which sought to understand in more detail the interplay between the intrinsic forces which ‘push’ an individual into travelling ‘...such as the desire for escape, rest, and relaxation, prestige, health and fitness, adventure, and social interaction’ and the pull factors which reflect destination attractiveness, both tangible (beach quality for instance) and perceived (such as the perceived benefits ascertained from marketing). They conducted a factor analysis of a number of push and pull factors and a subsequent regression analysis, to test the hypothesis that push and pull factors work together in travel-decision making. Their findings led them to conclude that there is a degree of interaction between both. A recreational walk is a similar process which begins during the planning phase, when push and pull factors may act in different orders: the pull factor of the destination may draw in the tourist to then choose walking as a means of fulfilling various push factor motives, or vice versa.
Further work on push and pull factors has highlighted the importance of this relationship in explaining differences in motivation amongst tourists, their behaviour when engaging in tourist activities and the differences between tourists. Kim et al. (2003) studied visitors to Korean national parks. Push factors centred on escaping, seeking adventure and family togetherness whilst pull factors included the perceived value of the quality of information, accessibility, transportation and the available tourist resources at a destination. Significantly in this case a further MANOVA analysis correlated variations in the sample based on differences including age group, occupation, gender and income. It was found that age group had a significant impact on both the push and pull factors which influence travel decisions – younger age groups were more likely to value the escape from daily routine offered by the travel experience, whilst older age groups were more likely to value convenience, information and transportation facilities. There were also significant differences between different income groups, genders and occupations. For example, females and higher income groups were more likely to value ‘family togetherness and study’. It is inferred from this example that the effects of push and pull factors can vary between different groupings of tourist, and by extension potential groups of recreational walkers. Additionally, the influence of push and pull factors on travel motivation and decisions also varies based on certain differential characteristics of individual tourist.

Finally, what perhaps distinguishes walking from a number of other recreational activities is the range of purposes for a particular trip. In a study on mountaineering, Pomfret (2006) considers motivation for a range of adventure tourism activities, including walking, hiking, climbing, mountaineering, backpacking, scrambling and wilderness experiences. The push factors include mastery, whilst the pull factors are environmental or personality traits such as sensation seeking, personal perception and experience. These push and pull factors are suited to the more severe forms of walking, but not to more gentle forms associated with more generalised motivations and ‘mainstream tourism’.
In summary, push and pull factors are directly related to a study on recreational walkers and the literature suggests similar theoretical considerations are apt, based on other tourism and recreational activities. An assessment will now be made about how the review of characteristics in this section can be used to underpin the typology element of this study.

2.3.5 Grouping tourists and recreational walkers

Motivational influences and push factors relating to tourist activity are key to the segmentation process of tourists, and more specifically recreational walkers. Whilst pull factors may explain more about the decisions walkers make in terms of their preferences for certain walking locations, the fact that they are intrinsically linked to push factors means that they reinforce motivational differences for individual walkers, and in turn, differences between segments or groups.

Motivations for touristic and recreational activities are subject to change over time based on new experiences and ongoing attitude change. One may consider theories in psychology research which explain human behaviour. Fishbein and Ajzen’s theory of reasoned action (1975) is based on the premise that an individual’s attitudes and subjective norms (their viewpoint on certain behavioural choices based on their personal perceptions of others’ beliefs) are causal to their behavioural intentions (shown in figure 2.5). A later development, ‘the theory of planned behaviour’ (Ajzen, 1985) builds on the earlier theory by incorporating ‘perceived behavioural control’; an individual’s own assessment of their ability to perform certain behaviours (shown in figure 2.6). These early behavioural theories have been built on in psychology and other areas of study and applied to a number of real-world behaviour examples, including most relevantly, travel decision-making.
In the case of recreational walking, motivations for an individual to undertake particular walks are based on the changing attitudes and beliefs about walking activity. These attitudes may include: to walk for health purposes because of certain subjective norms in society about walking being ‘a healthy activity’; to walk certain routes and locations because of personal attitudes towards walking in those places, or subjective norms regarding what others’ perceive...
about them (for instance consider also recent media focus on national parks such as the Lake District or Yorkshire Dales); and the perceived behavioural control surrounding an individuals’ personal perspective on whether they can complete a walk, perhaps based on an assessment of their ability.

It therefore also follows that different ‘groups’ of walkers may possess similarities between the individuals within the groups in terms of their attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control, which can form the basis of segmentation. Experiences from previous walking activity, or the activity of others are partially responsible for shaping these attributes. This conceptual argument is rooted in behavioural psychological theory, and also relates to differing abilities (perceived and actual), and the confidence of walkers to undertake varying difficulties of walks and will be carried over to later sections of the thesis, during the analysis of results.

In addition to differential characteristics based on experiences, attitudes, and norms a number of other grouping variables can determine segments of walkers. Demographic and socio-economic variables are an obvious, yet significant predictor of walking activity. A study of Australian walkers (both for transport and recreation) by Cole et al. (2006) found that whilst men and women showed similar levels of walking for both transportation or recreation, men over 60 were less likely to walk for transport and men aged 45-59 more likely to walk for recreation. Household income has been found to have a positive association with expenditure on recreation, ethnic minorities and households with children negatively associated, and urban households more likely to spend more on recreation than rural households (Dardis et al., 1981). Ewert’s study (2000) on participation of outdoor activities highlights the influence of variables such as demographic differences, disposable income and education level in determining the propensity of individuals to engage in certain forms of ‘soft’ or ‘hard’ recreation.
A study by Cordell et al. (2002) found that recreational activity choices are related both to demographics and environmental attitudes. In terms of visits to wilderness areas for recreation, a study in the United States (Bowker et al., 2006) demonstrated positive influences of income, gender (males), immigrant status (native US residents) and ‘environmental awareness’ (members of environmental groups) on participation; and negative associations of race and ethnicity (black, Hispanic and other groups), age and residency of urban areas with both participation and intensity for recreation. Given that proximity to natural areas (rural / urban differences) has an effect on participation, it can be surmised that grouping attributes can be based on opportunities to access suitable environments. Social inclusion is of continual relevance to recreation participation, and a number of demographic and socio-economic differences may be significant predictors for a typology of walkers.

Since the commencement of the study, other typologies of walkers have been identified. A typology was developed for pedestrians based on their route preferences (Millonig and Gartner, 2009), for example. No examples have been found which demonstrate that there are available frameworks which adequately identify the diverse needs of walkers in terms of tourism or recreation.

One attempt to classify walkers explored the notion of ‘hoardes’ clogging up the countryside (Kay and Moxham, 1996). The study utilised a classification of types of walking (rather than the walkers themselves they focused on the activity). In this study, twenty categories or clusters, ranging from occasional short stroll to ‘Monroe baggers’ (and including sauntering, ambling, strolling, tramping, rambling hill-walking, and yomping) were generated by a classroom exercise in which students ranked types of walk according to five dimensions. The first three questions related to the level of difficulty of the walk, ability of the participants and level of planning required. The fourth referred to a scale which ranged from a walk which is ‘relaxing and sociable’, to one which is ‘challenging and rewarding’. The fifth asked where a particular type of walk fits on a continuum between mainstream activity and esoteric minority activity. The
exercise highlighted the diversity of walking as a practice, but since then studies which use categorisation to understand walking have been relatively scarce.

Other instances where researchers have attempted to categorise walkers include: research subjects self-classifying themselves as hillwalkers under the umbrella of mountaineering (Highlands and Islands Enterprise, 1996), and studies of visitors to natural areas which focus on multiple forms of outdoor recreation, in which walking and hiking are differentiated from other activities (Tomkins, 1990; Brandenburg and Ploner, 2002). Again the diversity of walking is not illustrated in these categories. Moreover their choices can only be understood further by ascertaining the true nature of their differences. In den Breejen’s (2007) study of the West Highland Way the relationship between walker and location is described as being more complex than often considered to be in the literature. Kay and Moxham (1996) suggest that, when seeking to increase participation, it is important to understand the limitations, aspirations and capabilities of inexperienced walkers. They draw from previous research which stresses that the design of attractive walks must entail providing for occasional walkers and non-walkers (Wilkinson et al., 1985, Kay, 1989).

It is now possible to provide an initial proposal for the key factors which could be used in building a typology based on the findings of this section of the literature review. Whilst the relationships between the factors identified above have been tested to an extent in the studies that they have been drawn from, further empirical research undertaken as part of this PhD study will ascertain exactly how they interact in order to stratify recreational walkers into meaningful segments. They are summarised below:

- Demographic and socio-economic factors: Gender, age, residential location, urban or rural residency, ethnicity, income, household demographics (such as age of children, marital status), education, employment status, occupation, social class
• Previous activity and experiences: Types of recreational / tourist activity, frequency, intensity and past and present experiences of recreational walking.

• Current attitudes towards recreation or tourist activity: Individual attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control towards the recreational / tourist activity. Other attitudinal traits including environmental awareness. Motivations, and needs and wants framed by previous experiences and non-recreational situation (such as stress levels at work, ‘disequilibrium’)

• Current preferences for recreational or tourist activity: duration, difficulty, location, desired experience, push and pull factors

• Accessibility of recreational or tourist activity: available free time, access to recreational resources, access to transport, other potential barriers.

It can be predicted where the linkages between groups of factors may exist. For example, current attitudes towards the recreational or tourist activities are likely to be formed, in part, by previous experiences. Individual personality traits, demographic and socio-economic variables and experiences from non-recreational or tourist settings most likely account for the other elements of existing attitudes. Motivations are formed as part of these attitudes, and work to dictate current preferences for tourism and recreation activity, the desired experience and the formation of an individual, unique balance of push and pull factors, working towards the behavioural goals. A final set of factors addresses the barriers towards undertaking certain recreational activities, and how accessible in practice the activity in question is. To an extent this accessibility affects all other sets of factors dependent on the situation of the individual.
The preliminary model shown above (figure 2.7) is a starting point to building a typology of recreational walkers. It acknowledges the role of motivations, experiences in forming attitudes towards the activity and surmises that each group of factors may be the differentiating elements which distinguish individuals between groups of walker. It is built upon in the data collection design stage.

2.3.6 Summary of the section

This section explored the potential elements which can be used to develop a typology of walkers. It identified the role of segmentation in tourism study, and examined several examples of empirically derived clustering approaches from the literature. The critiques of the segmentation process introduced in this review demonstrated the need for meaningful groups with clear variations between segments. One of the more relevant types of segmentation, the psychographic approach is based on differences between individuals relating to the specific motivations, needs and wants of the tourist. An exploration of motivation theory in tourism
highlighted the influence of needs based on normal life situations such as work-related pressures, disequilibrium and the desire to seek experiences in order to escape normality. Push and pull factors, and their interplay differentiate individuals based on their unique set of motivations and can be used to group individuals as a result of similarities. The behavioural theories from the discipline of psychology can explain the role of attitudes and norms to facilitate behavioural outcomes, and they align with tourism and recreational motivations.

An initial model of factor groupings to build a typology of walkers was presented based on demographic and socio-economic variables, motivations and preferences, attitudes and barriers relating to the accessibility of recreational resources. The typology is likely to be related to actual behaviour of recreational walkers whilst out walking, which is the main focus of the next section of this literature review.

2.4 Exploration of walking route-choice and preference for location

2.4.1 Introduction to the section

The third and final investigative section of the literature review chapter focuses on the process of route-choice and the selection of locations for walking activity. The research idea of the study assumes that distinct groups of walkers exist, based on individual attributes such as demographic and socio-economic variables, and differences in attitudes, behavioural intentions, motivations and lifestyle factors. It also assumes that these groups will demonstrate specific traits in terms of their preferences for different walks, and the settings in which they are undertaken. A swathe of literature exists on preference for locations, both in tourism and other travel related study areas. The theory covers concepts such as attachment to certain places, the authenticity of the experience embodied in certain specific tourist settings, the experience gained from visiting different environments and other elements which unpick the factors which influence route-choice.
The first aim of this section is to interrogate tourism theory and identify relevant concepts. Section 2.4.2 will look in depth at several tourism theories which relate to places, and assess their relevance to the thesis aims. After an initial focus on more broad theories on destination choice, the discussion will narrow down to the elements involved in tourist route-choice in natural spaces. Following on, the discussion will turn attention to focus more directly on walking, incorporating some non-tourism literature including transportation and health studies (section 2.4.3). Finally, a working model of route-choice will be offered, for further empirical study (section 2.4.4).

2.4.2 The factors which affect tourist travel choices: destinations and natural settings

2.4.2.1 Route-choices at tourist destinations

Some of the relevant tourism theory underpinning the choice of locations was introduced in the previous section. They included segmentation approaches which incorporate design elements based on tourists’ motivation to visit certain types of destination, seek out certain experiences specific to settings, or certain characteristics which increase or decrease the likelihood of an individual or ‘type of person’ to choose a location for tourist activity. The relationship between experience and motivation will therefore continue as a central premise in this section, but the overall focus will be on tourist settings.

Push and pull factors are a facet of route-choice and the selection of travel environments by tourists. Push factors may reflect aspects of an environment such the feeling of tranquillity given by being in a natural setting, or a sought experience associated with a specific point, linear rout or ‘journey’ of interest such as The Grand Canyon, The Appalachian Trail or Mount Kilamanjaro, which can only be unique to that particular place and context. Pull factors may include the type of landscape, the perceived safety of the location or a certain climate. This element of location preference theory will also be covered in this section.
Studies of route-choice and the decision making process in the selection of tourist destinations are essentially underpinned by concepts based on more general tourist behaviour. Choice of tourist destination is subject to motivational theory, a degree of planning, variable in different contexts and an evaluation of previous experiences (Shaw et al., 2000). Li and Lai (2011) in a study of forest spaces, suggest that the experience itself, rather than landscape features should take greater importance in the marketing strategies of destination managers. Whilst marketing seeks to align to tourist preference, understanding the perspective of the tourists more directly can provide a better picture of exactly how they evaluate the merits of visiting certain locations.

Anfunso et al. (2014) used physical indicators at coastal locations to assess the desirability of aspects relating to the landscape. Twenty six parameters (eighteen classed as natural and eight human) were measured including the height, gradient and features of cliffs, water colour, vegetation cover (expressed as a percentage), noise disturbance by other humans and the nature of the built environment in populated sections of the coast. The findings demonstrated that natural landscapes are considered as high quality scenery, whilst urban landscapes are considered as low quality in the minds of tourists visiting coastal areas.

Objective tourism studies of route-choice are often based on understanding how and why tourists move around tourist spaces. A recent example by Orellana et al. (2012) provides an insight into an emerging body of work in the field, aimed at understanding visitor management issues in recreational and tourist sites. GPS (Global Positioning System) monitoring was used to analyse the movement of visitors and assess crowding issues. The authors praise the merits of using mobile devices in this case, as they are a means of collecting large datasets on movements, with small cost and effort. Using traces from mobile devices it was possible for the researchers to model the flow of visitors to a tourist site. The approach, developed in a previous study (Orellana and Wachovicz, 2011) and modified by Orellana et al. (2012), used ‘movement suspension patterns’, a static snapshot of where visitors to the site were at a single moment in
time, taken at intervals and modelled using ‘generalised sequential patterns’ (GSP) based on where the tourists moved between the intervals. The modelling process used identifiable features within the site such as car parks, park entrance and the tea. Using this method it was possible to see the locations in the park which were visited most, plus the most frequently used routes between the locations. The findings were important for development of resource management and monitoring at tourist sites and destinations.

The study by Orellana et al. provides an idea of the basic movements of tourists between sites and illustrates the popularity of certain fixed points, and the most desirable routes between them. It reflects the role travel plays in tourist activities, and is applicable to recreational areas in which walking is a primary form of travel. In this sense national parks are a series of points within a geographical area which make up ‘nodes’ in the tourist travel route. The process described above suggests that the nodes are important ‘magnetic’ influences drawing tourists along routes within the region, but the activity of walking also involves an experience which relates to the route itself, not only the trajectory of the journey between nodes, but also the experiential elements along the way: scenery, terrain, company and so on.

Other tourism studies have sought to map tourist movements in urban destinations. Edwards and Griffin (2013) also used GPS tracking to understand tourism movements, and in conjunction with the method, employed semi-structured interviews to ascertain the reasons tourists took certain routes or visited certain locations. The qualitative element in their study, based in Melbourne and Sydney, Australia, provides that extra dimension of unpicking exactly why the respondents choose travel routes, based on their experiences (intended and actual) whilst travelling between places. The research produced insight into the ‘wayfinding’ element of tourist travel around the destination. The findings of the interviews suggested that information provision, particularly regarding public transport was an important element of successful (or
unsuccessful) wayfinding. This demonstrates the added importance of navigation in the selection of locations and route-choice decisions whilst travelling within tourist space.

Xia et al. (2008) investigated the ability of tourists in Australia to wayfind as a function of familiarity with the physical environment. Again, GPS was used, to map travel by tourists, tour guides or rangers. Four models were presented, based on whether a ‘cognitive map’ influenced route-choice. They subdivide wayfinding into pre-planned and unplanned trips, and also distinguish between intangible or tangible elements: a cognitive map is an intangible element, whilst individual characteristics of a landscape are tangible and have an indirect impact on how people travel (for example, their analysis found that women show a tendency to rely more on landmarks). This study contains a number of important ideas to take forward. Familiarity with ones surroundings increased the likelihood of cognitive mapping. In terms of the characteristics of the landscape certain features were important in cognitive mapping and the success of navigation. A river is a linear indicator of direction, whereas architectural buildings are another significant marker. In some cases visitors looked for biophysical elements such as waterfalls. The navigational element is an important part of the walking experience, and the tangible and intangible qualities of the landscape an influence on route-choice. However, the cognitive mapping process which the walker undergoes is most likely variable between individuals.

Xia et al. (2008) found cognitive differences associated with decision making such as the perceiving the most scenic route, time taken and shortest path. The study by demonstrates the use of the visual, in terms of choice (scenery), navigation (man-made and natural landmarks), and familiarity (which increases cognitive mapping for route-choice) in wayfinding, but does not consider the motivation for adventure which may characterise walking behaviour, particularly in new locations. In some cases route-choice may be based more on attempting to embrace ‘the unknown’ and aiming for experiences which are foreign to the participant. Ankor (2012) discusses the travel experience, and explores the importance of new experiences in the decision.
making process, stating that difference and the ‘role of the other’ should be considered by research into preference for tourism activities and locations. This can be relevant to walking, particularly when on holiday in unfamiliar surroundings.

The element of discretion is key to understanding preferences for recreational travel activity in tourist settings. Martin and Woodside (2008) used a grounded theory approach to model choices of destination for discretionary travel. Their framework grouped a series of tourist characteristics and processes: demographics, external influences and ‘pre-framing events’ – which interact to frame tourist’s choices, and their selection of destinations. Following this, their activities whilst at the destination are then influenced by these pre-trip factors, but are also subject to other on-site influences which occur. This model is relevant to a walking trip as initial choices, beliefs and ideas will lead the walker to their destination at first, yet when actually on the route, other influences act to cause the walker to evaluate the choice of route.

Pigram and Jenkins’ (2006) state that, when understanding recreational choices, making predictions is problematic because of the subjective nature of recreation decisions and because choices can sometimes be bound by constraints, including physical capability, awareness, wealth, time availability and family obligations. These constraints may also be considered as situational factors, an important consideration in any travel decision, but perhaps of relevance is the ability of the individual to work around the constraint. Pigram and Jenkins adapt a model by Kates (1970) regarding influences on the demand for recreational travel. Whilst it is not suitable for understanding the nature of tourism choices by individuals it does provide a basis for inferences to be made on a population level. The sites for which journey has a higher cost (extra time, effort, or money are required to visit them) are less well frequented. In terms of recreational walking the context is important, and dependant on whether the journey is ‘transport for tourism’ or ‘transport as tourism’. A journey may be transport for a walk starting point or walking to get to a tourist activity. The principle that the journey has a higher cost may
differ for individuals based on types of walk and location, whether the location is remote, important to the individual in some way, or whether the journey has a specific purpose.

Attention must also be paid to deterrents to tourist locations. Negative factors are of relevance to the decision making process. Lawton (2012) sought to ascertain the ‘least liked’ experiences in protected areas in a study of ecotourists. Lawton makes the point that some areas notice very high levels of satisfaction in quantitative surveys, which can ultimately be misleading, and that qualitative investigation using open ended questions into ‘hidden dissatisfaction’ can draw out the least satisfying elements of a visit (open ended questions). A survey was undertaken on a tourist site in a hard to get to area. Interestingly, approximately 55% of respondents answered an open question which asked them to name one least satisfying aspect of the visit. One can speculate why the response rate was relatively low – perhaps visitors who had generally had a positive experience found it difficult to consider negative aspects – however, a greater understanding of dislikes regarding location choices provides a more rounded picture.

Thus, route-choice and preference for location at destinations is subject to individual context and perception. Perceptions of landscape and physical setting are significant to understanding how and why tourists move around at destinations, as is wayfinding, although this process is partially intangible and difficult to completely explain. One way of rationalising the process is considering the cycle of choice: from pre-trip triggers to choices made during the tourist journey. Part of the ‘on-site’ travel decisions are due to situational factors, and another part are based on motivations and experiences. These experiences then help to influence future decisions to visit and travel around certain places.

The settings studied have been both rural and urban, but it has been found that natural environments are often intrinsically valued higher, at least in visual terms, by the tourist. This is
significant for recreational walking in national park areas. A closer look at the literature on preferences in natural environments is now appropriate.

2.4.2.2 Route-choices in natural settings

The relationship between tourists and their surrounding environment is complex in natural settings. In valuing a favourable tourist setting, both tangible and intangible elements of the environment are considered by the individual. Agapito et al. (2014) identified a lack of holistic approach in tourism studies to understand tourist sensory experiences in natural environments. Their research in South West Portugal involved open-ended interviews with tourists and content analysis to draw out elements of the sensory experience associated with the location. The most frequently cited sight-related aspects of the experience were landscape, natural light and diversity of colours. Hearing-related sensory elements were predominantly birdsong, wind and the sound of the sea, and to a lesser extent, silence, animals and waves were also significant. In terms of touch, heat and coolness were cited most often and for smell, salt, sea and less often, plants, flowers, fresh air and soil. The taste aspects were all food related. An analysis of activity-based tourist segments, using Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) and cluster analysis, indicated that hiking and trekking were most highly associated with rural sensory or a nature based experience. Light and fresh air are also key elements of the experience. It is clear that sensory elements are considered important to differing degrees, but that the holistic experience in natural settings encompasses a combination of many elements.

Research on tourism from New Zealand (Higham, 1998) has acknowledged the emergence of trends which suggest that tourists are becoming more likely to branch away from more established routes and locations reflecting a rise in wilderness tourism and independent travel. The preference of some tourists for a holistic wilderness experience suggests a different need being met in terms of exposure to certain natural elements associated with locations. Climate and weather are also relevant. Whilst traditional warm climates are becoming rivalled in this
sense by visits to colder countries, there is the possibility that the long-term effects of climate change may cause further diverse conditions to be available to the tourist (Førland et al., 2013). Walking trips for discretionary purposes are negatively affected by adverse weather conditions such as precipitation (Aaheim and Hague, 2005). It is yet to be proven, but the weather in natural environments may be a greater part of the experience for walkers and other recreationists, than in other settings.

In natural landscapes, colour is part of the attractive force which influences route and location choice. New research is considering blue spaces or ‘waterscapes’. White et al. (2010) based research on the constant close relationship between humans and water throughout time, and the increasing focus of tourism research on preferences for visual stimuli. The wide-open feel of coasts for example, is something which visitors almost subliminally become relaxed around. The study involved a series of photograph images being shown to respondents. They contained a variety of combinations and differing proportions of three primary groups: aquatic, green and built environments. The results showed that blue/aquatic visual stimuli not only receives more positive effect on preference; in both built and natural environments higher levels of preferences occur when the visual stimuli has some proportion of blue.

To an extent these findings reflect an important concept - the ‘living’ appeal of natural environments and the state of flux in nature which draws people towards them. However, when conceptualising tourists’ perceptions regarding the choice of natural settings for tourist activity, the inherent state of movement associated with nature is at odds with some of the stimuli available to potential visitors. Marketing material is often based on still imagery of landscapes, flora and fauna. Additionally, an individual’s memories or mental images of natural settings, which guide them in their decision to visit destinations, are often snapshots. Pan et al. (2014) used travel photographs to capture tourists’ preferences for and feelings surrounding visual elements of destinations. The authors base their approach on the concept that travel
photographs reflect the feelings of the photographer at the time when the photograph was composed and also provide a visual record of the event at which the photograph was taken. In order to capture the tourism experience their research was framed by several key strands of the tourism literature including: affective feelings for places and given actions, tourism destination image and the ‘tourist gaze’. Their analysis framework was based on the presence of adjectives within the literature and found that ‘arousing’ and ‘pleasant’ were the two most frequently used adjectives in analyses of photographs of natural resources. Natural environment photographs were most often thought of as relaxing and pleasant. The use of photographs to examine tourists’ feelings with regards to location choice therefore provides a pertinent example of the static nature of imagery, which may be an important determinant of pre-trip triggers. This is in contrast to actual time spent in tourist settings which are subject to change. Momchedjikova (2002) examined this idea in the context of the miniature city in the museum, which provides a different type of static imagery to a visitor to a destination. Natural environments are intrinsically linked to the changing processes of life which are constantly occurring within them, but the tourist may make decisions on location choice based on the value they place on an unchanging physical or mental image.

Consumption is an important tourism concept: a walker, like any other tourist, consumes the landscapes they walk in. Particularly in rural areas, the landscape is conceptualised as ‘countryside capital’, and there is a direct link between landscape quality and experience (Garrod et al. 2006). McNamara and Prideaux’s (2011) paper on visitors to rainforests draws from the socially constructed ‘culture-nature’ binary which assumes that each is the polar opposite of the other (culture being a human phenomena and nature its antithesis) when considering the consumption of spaces. This concept embodies the complex relationship between human interference with and construction of nature. Results from a survey of visitors to an area of rainforest McNamara and Prideaux (2011) found that, predictably, ‘nature’ elements were valued higher, but that the local tourism organisations mediate consumption by
marketing a ‘paradise’ and a high degree of authenticity. A number of activities were valued and the analysis found that tourists favoured ‘passive’ activities such as viewing wildlife and photography.

McNamara and Prideaux (2011) make clear that these activities necessitate a boundary between nature and humans, for instance a viewing platform, which reinforces the culture-nature binary. These passive activities are considered as one end of a passive-active continuum, and hiking (as a more active activity) was valued high in terms of satisfaction and associated more with reducing the boundaries between humans and nature, and active embodiment. Interactions with nature can convey variance in perceived embodiment of ‘wildness’. Brandin (2009) applied the concept of perceived spatial settings to a study of human-wildlife interaction concluding that the presence of fences can blur the culture-nature boundary.

The rise in sustainable tourism affects the need for tourism research to consider more the consumption of places, particularly natural spaces. Shaw et al. (2000) used Britain as a focal point of understanding the consumption of tourism destinations in the context of tourism and also the wider geographical context. Their extensive review of earlier work in these fields details three themes of modern tourism consumption: heritage tourism, theme parks and sustainable tourism. The last of these, Shaw et al. point out, is difficult to frame as a form of consumption due to the changing collective attitude towards the environment.

The concept of the tourist gaze underpins aspects theory relating to the tourist experience. Developed by Urry (1990) to describe the commodification of places, it can be applied to both culture and nature (Rojek and Urry, 1997, Cloke and Perkins, 2002). The tourist gaze refers both to the expectations of the visitor to a tourist setting and the reaction of the agencies involved in tourism development towards those expectations. Perkins and Thorns (2001) discuss the consumption of historical landscapes, and the nature of interpretative experiences, suggesting
that travel based active tourism gaze is only one part of the experience and that the overall ‘tourist performance’ should also include the physical activity element. The commodification process over time will involve the tourist area becoming a reflection of the individuals who visit. ‘Tourist narratives’, are an individually constructed embodiment of self-awareness, landscape cues and memories drawn from experiences of places to result in shared meaning of spaces which become ‘place’ (Rickly-Boyd, 2009).

The relationship between the self and the surroundings is important when understanding the experience of walking and therefore the choices made whilst walking. Wylie’s (2005) study of walking in the countryside uses a post-phenomenological perspective to interpret the elements on a single day’s walk. His account of the walk includes moments where his own feelings interact with the surroundings – for instance the woods possess a certain quality of light, a perception of being ‘in a tangle’ in contrast to sections walked along the coast detailed earlier in the paper. Stopping in the woods produced a feeling of being more ‘hemmed in’ and at the end of the walk ‘painful walking’ caused a more insular experience in which the surroundings became less prominent to his perception. This exploration of experience, and the level of immersion one has in natural spaces are important to consider, but troublesome to measure in any way other than an individual context. Generalisation is not possible. Two relevant concepts, sense of place, and authenticity are now discussed in the context of natural environments.

Shamai (1991) provided a theoretical basis for measuring sense of place in tourism. It is defined by Shamai as a potentially very vague concept, which can reflect both personal and collective feelings and sensory experiences relating to certain places. Based on previous literature, three steps to sense of place emerged: ‘The first phase is belonging to a place, the middle phase is attachment to a place, and the highest phase is commitment to a place. (Shamai, 1991)’. Place attachment is important in this context. Kaltenborn (1998, p.172) states that ‘Place attachment encompasses a wide range of related ideas and phenomena, including place dependence and
At its core, the concept captures the unique attachment of an individual to the environment around them, and has been used in tourism to quantify the strength of attachment for locations by tourists.

Current tourism research has advanced and defined theory which now generally considers place attachment as one of several dimensions comprised within ‘sense of place’. Ramkissoon et al. (2013) for instance, used a combination of related dimensions to understand pro-environmental behavioural intention in natural areas. Their study reflects growing concerns within the management of environmentally fragile tourist areas, and the need to understand better the role of place attachment. Their model indicates that place attachment is a function of four sub-components:

- ‘place dependence’ (the practical attachment to a place, in terms of how well it facilitates the activity)
- ‘place identity’ (the relationship between an individual’s personal identity and the place),
- ‘place affect’ (the emotional attachment, which can also be the feeling of mental well-being generated by visiting a place) and
- ‘place social bonding’ (the interpersonal benefits of visiting a place, derived from social contact or ‘group bonding’ perceived by the individual).

The combination of those four elements produces a unique personal place attachment which in turn generates their ‘place satisfaction’ and also determines the likeliness of an individual to engage in pro-environmental behaviour in a natural space. Concepts of sustainable attitudes, the level of management in wild spaces, visitor satisfaction and sense of place are intertwined in research on wild areas. Place attachment can also be negatively affected by increased management of natural spaces (Davenport and Anderson, 2005) and environmental degradation (Brown and Raymond, 2007). Destination managers will draw upon sense of place to market
locations, not only to generate demand, but also to promote sustainability (Walsh et al., 2001), educate tourists and inform management decisions (de la Barre, 2013).

Authenticity, a concept which is closely related to place attachment amongst other place-related elements of tourism research (Ramkissoon, 2015) can also explain tourist location preferences. The basic premise involves experiences which are ‘authentic’ in tourism settings, most often in a human cultural sense, but increasingly more in natural settings. The range of different interpretations of authenticity has caused debate on its true meaning (Wang, 1999). Cohen (1988) notes the idea that authenticity is subject to the depth of the experience sought by individual tourists. In national parks, the nature of authenticity is partially seen by tourists as a result of the designated protected area status (Backhaus, 2003).

The subject of what is ‘authentic’ in a tourism experience, has traditionally been considered in its juxtaposing role against the research issues surrounding cultural erosion. According to early sociological tourism research, the commodification of culture is diametrically opposed to authenticity, resulting in ‘staged authenticity’ (MacCannell, 1973). The authentic experience in a natural setting can be considered as equally diverse, individually perceived and subject to interpretation. The staging of natural authenticity has been identified in ecotourism destinations (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005). Marketing of walking areas often plays on notions of nature-authenticity, and it is of some importance, but is abstract in its involvement in route and location choice.

The rural setting of national park areas, including those similar to the Lake District and other parks in the UK, involves a particular pull factor relating to an authentic experience. It incorporates not only the natural landscape, but also the socio-cultural elements of rural life. Hinrichs (2000) discusses the concept of ‘embeddedness’ in rural tourism in which the attractions are embedded into the society, culture and identities of tourists, local residents and
the landscape. This is the touristic attraction of many walking locations, as they become immersed in the local culture, histories and people. The concept of slow travel (Dickinson and Lumsdon, 2010), which identifies the authenticity which can be experienced in local cultures from spending longer at destinations and travelling by slower means, is particularly relevant in this sense to walking.

The relationship between self and landscape in natural settings is complicated and extends from visual and sensory elements to the holistic experience of being within the environment; the weather and climate, colours, movements of nature and the cultural settings of rural areas. This section of the literature review has identified a number of theoretical concepts which are relevant to recreational walking, and the decision making processes which tourists use when they select both destinations for tourist activity and routes when travelling within them. The discussion will now take these ideas forward and aim to narrow down to route-choice specifically for walking as an activity.

2.4.3 The factors which affect recreational walking choices

There are minimal studies within the tourism literature which focus on walking, and therefore, this part of the discussion will venture into other bodies of literature, including health studies. Much of this work is aimed at monitoring the walking activity of populations, which routes they choose (often in urban settings) and monitoring usage of facilities for non-motorised travel (including walking, cycling and other non-motorised modes). Governments at local and national level will verify funding for the installation of non-motorised trails, or seek to understand the pedestrian environment in cities by mapping the routes which people use, and the effects of characteristics of the surrounding environment. Where necessary, this part of the discussion will also introduce any relevant material from other fields which directly address the needs and preference of walkers.
Health studies include a growing body of literature which analyses preference for walking location. The primary aim is to understand how to increase levels of physical activity in a target population which is generally inactive. This work involves the study of ‘objectively measured environmental variables’ (see Humpel et al., 2002, Saelens et al., 2003, Giles-Corti et al., 2005), that is, characteristics in the walking environment which may increase or decrease the population of walkers using certain routes. Whilst there is a mechanistic nature of this particular research focus on walking, which is perhaps at odds with the theoretical discussion of tourism which has characterised much of this review, it can give insight into some of the environmental influences which influence route-choice.

Many of these studies make a distinction between walking for transportation or recreational purposes, but stop short of any further classification of types of walking. Owen et al. (2004), for instance found that walking for recreation is associated with access to ‘aesthetically pleasing neighbourhoods’, living in a coastal location, access to convenient facilities and services, and walking trail length. Troped et al. (2006) used a GIS tool to demonstrate that physical activity is influenced by environmental variables including the characteristics of recreation parks (such as the size of the park), the aesthetics of the surrounding environment, human environmental factors and situational influences. The study found that the presence of slopes, vegetation, path surface and access points to recreational trails were significant variables in the frequency of walking activity.

Lee and Moudon (2006) also found that socio-demographic and physical environment variables play a more significant role in determining route-choice when the walk is for transportation purposes rather than recreation. Additionally they found that hills have a positive association with recreational walking as opposed to walking for transportation, and suggest that views and greater exercise drive preferences for hilly landforms. Cerin et al. (2007) found that the level of land use mix was an important factor affecting walking in urban locations. Giles-Corti et al.
(2005) add that access to walking locations, security and people’s individual situations are significant. Whilst these studies provide insights on route-choice they are generally focussed on urban and suburban locations, restricted to the US, and more often than not combine recreational and utility walkers. There is a distinct lack of this type of study in rural locations, or in a UK context, however the findings of these studies reflect some of the more general pull factors for natural environments, and also for walking in a recreational context. Certainly, aesthetic elements, and slopes and vegetation are relevant to walking in national parks.

This body of literature is sufficiently developed that systematic reviews of previous work can boil down the factors which influence route-choice, using numerous studies as a baseline. Pikora et al., (2003) studied the physical and social determinants of walking and cycling participation in Australia. From previous studies, they drew together environmental factors grouped as:

- functional (gradient, access, path design, surface width, traffic speed and volume),
- safety (crossings and lighting),
- aesthetic (architecture, trees and street maintenance) and destination (local facilities and parks).

The aesthetic dimension had been identified in previous studies in that field as ‘pleasant scenery’ (Sallis et al., 1997) and ‘attractive environments’ (Baumann et al., 1996). Humpel et al. (2002) undertook a review of 19 studies which assessed levels of physical activity using objectively measured environmental variables. Barriers to walking were significantly influential on route-choice. They refer to Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory which is based around the interaction of three sets of factors (social, behavioural and environmental). The theory dictates that, if the environment begins to constrain behaviour, environmental factors become the most important determinant of route-choice.

This environmental constraint is important in the level of opportunity one has to walk, although it is not clear where recreational trips to the countryside fit into the theory. Using an urban
study area Abildso *et al.* (2007) assess the effects of trail-proximity on walking activity, suggesting that psycho-social barriers such as lack of time and energy can be an impediment to trail use. For recreational trips, the balance between urban dwelling location and access to national parks and other natural areas is pertinent. The level of urban ‘sprawl’ has an effect on how often and how long people walk (Ewing *et al.* 2003). Transportation studies model environmental factors including topography variables, population data and ‘sidewalk availability’ relating to urban form in conjunction with other variables such as travel time to understand modal choice (Rodriguez and Joo, 2004). Modelling of non-motorised travel is often long-term, and augmented by increasingly sophisticated sensory equipment, with increasing accuracy: electronic counters are positioned on trails which provide more generalizable data to predict usage patterns based on a range of factors; including variations due to weather, socio demographic differences and urban form (Fairfax *et al*., 2014; Lindsey *et al*., 2007). These methods, usually in urban pedestrian settings are relevant because they relate to the objective determinants of walking, but they do not consider in enough detail the more intangible triggers which underpin tourist discretionary travel. Tourism route-choice involves a greater level of complexity and perhaps, in terms of modelling, a completely different emphasis and arrangement of factors.

For example, a study by Alfonso (2005) assessed walking in an urban setting using environment behaviour theory. Walking ‘needs’ were modelled using a hierarchy: an ecological and sociological framework influenced by group, individual, regional and physical environmental variables. The resulting model, drawing from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1943), provides a pyramid-like representation of the needs which walkers fulfil in order to choose a walking trip. The first order of variables, feasibility, was considered the most important and must be realised by an individual for them to consider the second variable, accessibility. Following this, thirdly, safety must be realised, and then fourthly, comfort. Pleasurability was the ‘least important’ group of factors, and the last one to be fulfilled. This order of causality would appear in contrast to the motivations and decision-making inherent in recreational walkers.
Studies which capture walking route-choice in a rural or discretionary context are less prominent in the literature, but there are a few examples. In terms of the tourism element of walking, benefits of the experience are key to understanding the choices which walkers make. Goldenberg et al. (2008) examined the Appalachian Trail with a focus on the types of benefits hikers drew from it. The research was a response to previous studies focusing more on the experience and place attachment elements of walking trails. Benefits were associated with the wilderness experience, as visitors achieved greater self-fulfilment and self-esteem, and they as a consequence of the activity experienced camaraderie, and companionship. The benefits of walking tourism are also discussed by Plate (2006) in the context of the urban walking tour. The sense of place is dictated by the movement of the city, and the tourist will slow down in a way people in cities do not usually do. It is often the case that history, particularly in a literary sense, will enhance the touristic experience and the cultural meaning of walking tour. The experience of the city as part of a walking tour is therefore at odds with the models of route-choice from the transportation and health studies fields presented above.

The other area in which walking route-choice has been researched is related to conflicts and barriers to walking. These studies often compare different groups of trail users to understand how they interact as groups. For example, Cessford (2003) studied walkers and mountain bikers on a trail in New Zealand. Of 370 walkers surveyed, many perceived more negative feelings towards mountain bikers if they had not had any encounter with them, than if they had actually encountered them. Barriers include weather, and there are very few studies which concentrate on the influence on walking. One example is a review of 37 studies from 1980-2006, which focused on physical activity collectively, but emphasised the effect of poor or extreme weather on walking in the outdoors (Tucker and Gilliland, 2007).

Vegetation density levels in park areas have been another focus of research into barriers. As part of a wider study on physical activity, with a primarily urban focus, but specific to green
spaces, recreational walking was assessed (Bjerke et al., 2006). The research involved respondents looking at photographs to evaluate the attractiveness of different densities of vegetation and then evaluate the appropriateness of what they saw for outdoor recreation. Some interesting results included an increased preference among people with an increased education level for moderate to dense vegetation, for example. It was also suggested that an interest in wildlife will positively affect the attractiveness of landscapes.

Recreational walking, in particular long-distance trail walking, is the focus of den Breejen’s (2007) of the West Highland Way in Scotland. The study incorporates the dynamic experience theory, suggesting that the in situ experience represents a peak in intensity in comparison to the entry and exit points of the journey. It is very much an experience which marries person and place, and the intensity represents the level of immersion one has with their surroundings. As a long-distance trail can be the actual holiday, the author used in situ surveys in addition to a priori to capture the experience over multiple days and found that a level of experience is related to enjoyment level trends over the course of the trip. Although this material is representative of a niche of recreational walking and not route-choice per se, it indicates the role of the environment in dictating experience and the level of immersion a route such as this offers is an important pull factor for recreational walking in natural areas.

This section has examined the tourism literature on route-choice in the context of destinations; more specifically for natural spaces and then summarised the small amount of available material from the existing literature on walking route-choice. It reflects a process characterised by a complex interaction of factors, some more tangibly perceived than others, but does not conclusively provide a framework as yet for walking. The nature of the tourist experience in natural spaces reflects an important dynamic between the individual and their surrounding environment. However much of current research has not considered walking as an activity, and given the pace of walking as a mode of travel, there is a lot of potential to understand broader
touristic experiences in natural spaces. The studies which do focus on walking, often in the health or transportation fields, measure objective variables such as population density, urban form and as such are incongruent with rural tourism experiences and in a significant proportion of existing research have not given enough attention to walking as a tourist activity. Nevertheless, the final section of this literature review will draw together elements to take forward into the research design stage which will seek to bridge this gap.
2.5 Initial conceptual model of route-choice and summary of the chapter

Figure 2.8: Initial conceptual model of route-choice

Figure 2.8 provides a simplified outline of the elements which lead to a route-choice decision, resultant from the review of the literature. It highlights the role of walking characteristics, which form the basis of a segmentation exercise: personal ability and characteristics; and experiences of walking, place and memories which underpin motivations which inform route-choice. Coupled with the physical attributes of a route or walking location relating to landscape and scenery, it is surmised that an individual will have a unique preference for a walking environment. However, given the role of situational variables such as weather on the day and other influences which may be barriers or enabling factors for choosing the particular route at the given time the choice is made, it is suggested that an individual walker will respond in a
certain way based on their characteristics. The interaction of this response with the preference one has for walking locations will provide an evaluation of particular route-choice options. This process may happen at any time, either pre-trip or repeated whilst during the walk if changes in the perceived desirability of physical characteristics of routes occur or situation factors alter the chances of completing a route: for example poor weather, crowding or management aspects.

The model is a reasonable beginning in the process of understanding route-choice for recreational walkers, and also might be applicable to other tourism activities. However the literature review has indicated there are gaps in tourism research regarding recreational walking and therefore the author advocates an initial focus of the research design to build theory. The research aims require an in-depth analysis of the characteristics of walkers in order to ascertain segmentation, which reflect the diversity of an activity which has often played a marginal role in tourism study; as a vehicle to solve wider problems pertaining to the tourism experience, or the management of recreational spaces.

In conclusion, recreational walking involves a complex decision making process, which has been partially investigated in a variety of contexts across a range of fields, but never in one overall context. These subject areas form a background to map out the coverage of walking studies within the various subject areas and frame the research area of the PhD. Some initial conclusions have been made regarding the nature of the recreational walking experience. Whilst there are no agreed existing typologies of walkers, the literature on other activities and recreation in general suggests that motivations for similar activities are both unique to individuals and dictated by perceived qualities of locations. Walking is a form of leisure which presents conceptual problems in the diversity of the way it is approached both by participants, and those wishing to study it.
Walking is an active form of tourist activity and should be treated as such. Whilst general motivations for tourists may vary from outdoor activity participants, travel-based tourism activity should also be considered. Studies in the field of health provide some useful indication of how environmental variables influence people’s walking routes, but this is generally within an urban setting for utility rather than recreational walkers. They show some validity in that they prove that there are measurable factors which affect how often and where people walk. The question is do they extend to tourism? Tourism experiences, as discussed above, are complex, and given the role walking plays in the movement of people around tourist spaces, the body of work so far can be considered limited and does not provide the necessary dimensions in itself. The theoretical deficiencies should therefore be approached by an exploratory approach to research in an attempt to understand walkers further and build an adequate theoretical base. This will be addressed in chapter 3 when the methodology is outlined.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction to the chapter

The foundation for this research study has been presented in the initial chapters of this thesis. This study sits in the field of tourism, a social science subject area, which has previously only sparingly concentrated on walking as a research focus. The diversity of walking as an activity and the fragmented nature of the subject areas which have previously addressed it necessitates a research design approach which seeks to build theory. This chapter lays out the research methodology, the system for conducting the research and the reasoning behind its choice.

A restatement of the research aims is useful here:

1. Develop a typology for recreational walkers
2. Understand the choice sets of recreational walking with regard to route preference
3. Develop a model which explains route-choice

The review of the literature demonstrated that in order to fulfil these aims, the research should adopt an exploratory approach. At the outset of this chapter, the position of the researcher is made clear in choice of methods for the study. A combination of data collection methods were chosen to bridge the gap between the lack of a clear or appropriate theoretical framework in the tourism field; the acquisition of the necessary data to build a meaningful typology of walking tourists, and to ensure the most appropriate parameters were tested with regard to route-choice. This entailed a two-stage process in the primary data collection component of the study:

- An initial programme of qualitative interviews with ‘experts’, practitioners who are rooted in the walking world. This process drew together the core themes underpinning the differential characteristics in walkers, and their choices of walking routes and locations;
- followed by a quantitative survey questionnaire administered to recreational walkers in the Lake District National Park.
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Whilst both parts of the research produced separate findings, which complimented each other, the order of execution was chosen because the interview process made up for the theoretical deficiencies isolated in the previous chapter, by providing a research framework for the survey design. In this sense, the findings of the interviews directly informed the construction of the survey. The overall end result of the research therefore was a quantitative output, underpinned by qualitative elements in its design and augmented by the additional qualitative output from the interviews.

Combined-methods studies are still somewhat contested in terms of their validity as a research approach, but can bring benefits including triangulation (strengthening the validity of the research by employing different methods to evaluate the same dimension), ‘complimentarity’ and the synergistic effect which involves the qualitative and quantitative elements adding extra influence to one another’s rigour (Nagy and Hesse-Biber, 2010, p.4). On the whole, they are now thought to hold a stable and legitimate position in social research (Sarantakos, 2012, p.54). Flexibility is heightened by using the top-down, ‘deductive’ quantitative approach with the bottom-up ‘inductive’ qualitative approach to research (Watkins and Giola, 2015, p.12). This strength of the approach is the key reason for their selection as the approach to this study.

It is the exploratory requirement of the research which has provoked the choice of the other significant research design element for this study. In order to build theory, a grounded theory approach was used, which encompassed both the qualitative and quantitative components of the method. Grounded theory was pioneered by Glaser and Strauss (1967), and involves the development of a theoretical framework which is ‘grounded’ in the data. The premise of the approach is allowing the theory to emerge during the data collection process, thus allowing key concepts uncovered by the analysis of the data to form the necessary foundations to build meaningful theory. The approach is ideal for researchers dealing with and in need of rich and
varied information (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). It is both a research design framework and a data analysis strategy (Newman, 2008, p.70).

There are differing perspectives on how grounded theory is applied which have evolved from the original work by Glaser and Strauss (1967), later refined and debated by the originators in two differing ‘streams’ of grounded theory approach (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Glaser, 1992); and then further built upon in what are essentially different but nuanced iterations by a ‘second generation of grounded theorists’ based on their interpretations of how the approach should be applied (see Birks and Mills, 2011). They will be discussed in more depth in section 3.3, with the exact approach to data collection and analysis selected for this study outlined and justified. The sampling strategy and research design will be explained in section 3.4, with attention also given to the data collection methods and study area. The data management and analysis process will be reviewed in section 3.5, and the chapter summarised in section 3.6. Before any of these methodological elements are to be addressed, an exploration of the philosophical approach to the acquisition of knowledge used in this study is appropriate.

3.2 Research philosophy of the thesis

A key requirement of a thesis is to provide a philosophical viewpoint for the research undertaken. Traditionally, ontologies and epistemologies form the overall framework for aligning a piece of research into a world viewpoint. Ontologies refer to the variations of how reality is viewed; whether a phenomena acts independently from human notions of science or whether the human influence on the phenomena helps to shape it. Stokes (2011, p.91) describes a continuum which ranges from ‘at one end – a position of realism that espouses objectivity – to the other end, a position of relativism, aligned with subjectivity’. Realism is a way of thinking about existence which suggests that researchers should apply their data collection approaches to an understanding that any findings are external to the scientific framework they have constructed (Bryman, 2012, p.29). Academic thinking on philosophical positioning has
evolved over time; the realist end of the spectrum has been closely related to the paradigm of
‘positivism’, founded by Comte (beginning in 1822), which is based on the view that human
knowledge of a given phenomena is not and can never be absolute, as the relationships in
existence occur external to our collective knowledge of the world (Lenzer, 1975). The early
foundations of much of social science drew from this way of thinking, applying a physical science
approach to understanding societal relationships which conform ‘...to invariable laws, in much
the same way that the physical world does’ (Giddens and Griffiths, 2006, p.11).

The ‘master paradigm’ of positivism has, over time, increasingly been challenged in studies of
tourism and other social science fields (Riley and Love, 2000). A wide and philosophically diverse
area of ontological positions occupy the ‘non-positivism’ way of thinking, the most prominent
being ‘constructivism’ and ‘interpretivism’ (Sharman et al., 2007, p.120). The relativist end of
the ontological spectrum also termed ‘phenomenology’ (Kalof et al., 2008, p.19) encompass
these areas. Whilst phenomenology derives some of its ethos from classic philosophy such as
Plato, the modern philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859-1936) is credited with its foundation as a
concept (Sokolowski, 2000). Phenomenology is defined as:

‘a philosophical movement based on a self-critical methodology for reflectively
(reflexively or introspectively) examining and describing the lived evidence (the
phenomena) which provides a crucial link in our philosophical and scientific
understanding of the world.’ (Reeder, 2010, p.21).

Alongside the realist-relativist/phenomenology ontological spectrum are differing
‘epistemological’ positions relating to the philosophy of knowledge. Whereas ontology steps
outside of the researcher-researched relationship and questions existence itself, epistemology
focuses on the way knowledge is acquired by human beings. Denzin and Lincoln (2011, p.91)
suggest that epistemology asks the questions: ‘How do I know the world?’ and ‘What is the
relationship between the inquirer and the known?’ The crucial differentiation between the
ontological positions of phenomenology and realism and the epistemological underpinnings of
positivism is embodied in the links made between knowledge and its acquisition – the need for a relationship between the researcher and phenomena is undisputable, and the way in which knowledge on the phenomena is acquired is both evaluated and re-evaluated, and also specific to those acquiring and analysing it.

The epistemological spectrum generally reflects where knowledge acquisition fits on a continuum which ranges between objectivity and subjectivity. Rescher (2012, p.16) says of the reflexive element of human cognition: ‘Nothing is more significant for and characteristic of our human cognitive situation than our ability to step back from what we deem ourselves to know and take a critically evaluative attitude towards it.’ He notes the ‘epistemic gap’ between objective factual claims and the imperfect acquisition of evidence to back them up which is associated with our own cognitive imperfections. One paradigm which sits in the ontological realm of phenomenology is ‘social constructivism’, describing a way of thinking which values equally all attempts to the social reality constructed by knowledge acquisition due to its subjective epistemological outlook. As an alternative, interpretivism occupies a realist ontological position, and is described by Scott and Morrison (2007, p.131) in the following terms:

‘Social actors negotiate meanings about their activity in the world. Social reality therefore consists of their attempts to interpret the world and many other attempts by those still living and those long since dead. These are real and constitute the world as it is.’

There are other paradigms which have emerged that seek to traverse the middle ground of the epistemological and ontological spectrums. Kuhn (1962) draws specific attention to the scientific communities which surround particular paradigms, suggesting that they hold the power to determine which elements of theory are acceptable, based on the values of their peers. Post-positivism arose as a new positioning, not yet a ‘unified school of thought’ but an orientation which unites its proponents ‘in believing that human knowledge is not based on
unchallengeable, rock-solid foundations – it is conjectural. (Phillips and Burbules, 2000, p.26)’. Critical realism is another epistemological positioning which also acknowledges the drawbacks of adhering to the rigid confines of a positivist outlook, whilst also deflecting the tendency of relativism to value all world beliefs, discouraging epistemic and cognitive challenge towards conflicting views on the world (Groff, 2004).

The paradigms introduced thus far in this discussion all to some degree rely on an ontological or epistemological variation in order to separate them, and they display a tendency to be in some senses ‘time-limited’, subject to evolution and the changes in thinking over time amongst different scientific communities. This gives rise to the disagreements between academics and philosophers in the very nature of paradigms and following on, the potential for researchers to identify appropriate philosophical positioning for their research. Creswell (2013, p.6) uses a different terminology, positing that a ‘worldview’ is a more appropriate term to describe ‘a general philosophical orientation about the world and the nature of research that a researcher brings to a study’.

In defining a philosophical position for this study one must look closely at the nature of the research itself. The known factors here are as follows:

- The research is about people (walking tourists), and identifying factors which put them into segments or groups. These factors are human-centred factors reflecting their characteristics: demographics, activity preferences, and more intangibly, motivational and experiential preferences. In tourism study and other social science fields these concepts are constructed by the research community, as seen in chapter 2, but are still also being refined and debated.

- The research was undertaken by a person (also a walking tourist himself), and in its first stage involved qualitative depth interviews with other people (who although could be described as practitioners who work with and for walking tourists, are also tourists
themselves in their spare time). Without much depth analysis of the research situation, it becomes clear that the researched and the researcher are both to some degree positioned in the real-world in this part of the process. The acquisition of knowledge in this regard, might reflect a constructivist approach:

‘the mind is instrumental and essential in interpreting events, objects, and perspectives on the real world, and that those interpretations that are personal and individualistic. The mind filters input from the world in making those interpretations. An important conclusion from constructivistic beliefs is that we all conceive of the external world somewhat differently, based on our own unique set of experiences with that world, and our beliefs about those experiences (Jonassen, 1992, p.139).

Furthermore, the grounded theory approach chosen as the most appropriate research design mechanism suggests that personal bias on the part of the researcher is unavoidable. Theory was built due to the shortcomings of the tourism fields’ understanding of walking as an activity.

- The process then involved the researcher undertaking a quantitative research exercise to understand patterns in the data, acquired through a survey questionnaire. Traditionally positivist researchers use quantitative methods, whilst paradigms such as social constructivism and interpretivism use qualitative methods. There are, of course, exceptions and positivists may be more measured in their assessment of their qualitative findings (Rubin and Babbie, 2009, p.37). An important consideration is that the quantitative stage of data collection was partially constructed on the base findings resulting from the qualitative depth interviews. Although the researcher used a structured approach to building theory in both primary stages of data collection, the overall approach can neither be considered completely objective or subjective.

Approaches which combine data collection methods are rooted in pragmatism, a worldview which places importance on the consequences of the research in a real-world perspective
(Watkins and Giola, 2015, p.12). This is reflective of a wider movement within the social sciences towards pragmatism as a natural evolution of the paradigm shifts from positivism, to interpretivism, through critical realism, to a worldview which facilitates the need (particularly for management subjects such as tourism) for an applied way of thinking towards problem conceptualisation (Baert, 2005). Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p.16) suggest that the paradigm represents a necessary antidote to the traditional arguments between the opposing positions of quantitative and qualitative purists, and align communication between researchers from different paradigms in a way which offers ‘the best opportunities for answering important research questions’.

On grounded theory, Mills et al. (2006) argue that the differing approaches originating from the theoretical differences between the founders, Glaser and Strauss all exist on a ‘methodological spiral’, reflecting variations in epistemological underpinnings. Although the nuances between approaches are to be described in better detail in the next section of this chapter on research approach, Mills et al. note a critical difference emerging between the traditional approach of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and latterly Glaser (1992), and the evolutionary grounded theory approach developed by Strauss and Corbin (1990), which reflects a constructivist way of thinking based on acknowledging multiple truths, reflecting the relation of research to the context of the world of its participants. They also note that both the Glaser method and the Strauss and Corbin strand have shown ‘post-positivistic’ tendencies when addressing the need to handle biases and objectivity.

The joint inductive and deductive nature of grounded theory, and the triangulation involved in multiple methods of data collection are complimentary, as they involve careful consideration of concepts to form theoretical frameworks. In particular, tourism study is associated with ‘interdisciplinary triangulation’, as it is a multidisciplinary phenomenon encompassing: sociology, anthropology and other fields. It involves ‘multi-level triangulation’, using a
combination of data about people, (perhaps from interviews) and data about phenomena (such as demographic particulars about the interviewees) with other facts and behaviours in conjunction with broader activities and processes (for example broader tourist trends towards certain activities) (Decrop, 2004, p.163). The focus of this study on the relationship between motivations and preferences of individual walkers and the impact on their choices of more solid and tangible place-specific variables, also suggests a multi-layered approach to knowledge acquisition is in evidence.

It is particularly important, given the relatively new nature of tourism as a field of knowledge, for tourism researchers engaging with interpretivist paradigms to justify and make transparent their approaches to qualitative research, data collection and analysis, as the rigour and validity of results and their acquisition will be questioned (Goodson and Philimore, 2004, p.38). This consideration informs the way in which the position of this research study is now made clear. It is stated that the author subscribes to a worldview approach to pragmatism, accepting that the tenets of quantitative and qualitative paradigms have been quite rightly argued over time in terms of their reflection of the acquisition of knowledge. Especially given the need to build theory, the selection of combined data collection methods, and grounded theory approach to this research reflects the pragmatist view of using the necessary research tools for the given context to supply a meaningful research outcome to the real world.

Bryant (2009) provides an in-depth exploration of the development of grounded theory as a research approach and the subsequent dischord amongst advocates of the two emergent strands they posit that pragmatism can harmonise some of the conflicting theoretical views on the application of the method. Whilst there are interpretivist and constructivist philosophical underpinnings of grounded theory, particularly in the Strauss model, the grounded approach can draw together the necessary rigour of post-positivism and an application to the human sphere of knowledge in a coherent research framework. Although pragmatism may not be
considered as the only suitable paradigm, it portrays a worldview which adheres to the evolutionary nature of knowledge acquisition in the philosophy of, and thus is congruent with the development of research in the social sciences and tourism management. The particulars of the research approach will now be discussed.

3.3 Research approach: grounded theory and combined data collection methods

The primary data collection process of this study used multiple methods, with the qualitative first stage interviews preceding and directly informing the design of the quantitative second stage survey questionnaire of recreational walkers. Although the main use of the grounded theory method to code qualitative outputs occurred in the first stage of data collection and analysis, it was also an overarching approach to research design which tied together both stages of research.

As such this study encapsulates elements of both inductive (bottom-up) and deductive (top-down) reasoning employed in the formulation of theoretical ideas and the subsequent testing of them. Grounded theory can employ elements of both (Walker and Myrick, 2006). The inductive element of the grounded theory approach reflects researchers ‘who have no preconceived ideas to prove or disprove’ (Mills et al., 2006, p.26). Whilst the interview stage could be considered as predominantly inductive, the survey stage used elements of both approaches. The overall effect of using this research approach was to move from a position of not having suitable tourism-based theory to build upon in the investigation of walking typologies and route-choice, to one of presenting a data-driven theoretical framework on the phenomenon.

Glaser and Strauss first pioneered grounded theory together in their publication ‘The discovery of grounded theory’ (1967), in which they described an intuitive method of data collection and analysis which was predominantly qualitative, but was structured with a level of rigour that, at
the time in social science research was not the accepted norm, and could be presented in more
traditional quantitative terms. The method builds theory that is grounded in the data, does not
require an existing theory as a basis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), but instead uses parallel data
collection, analysis and conceptual theorizing to produce a robust theory to explain the social
phenomenon under scrutiny (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

There are precedents in the field for the use of such approaches. Grounded theory is a relevant
and powerful means of gaining a deep understanding of tourism behaviour (Martin and
Woodside, 2008), and has been used as a method to create tourist typologies (Decrop and
behaviour because of the holistic nature with which the effect of past touristic experiences and
external stimuli on behaviour during tourist activities could be analysed, ‘capturing the
complexities and nuances of travel experiences’. Hardy (2005) used grounded theory to explore
stakeholder perspectives towards tourism development in North Australia. It was precisely the
involvement of the stakeholders within the social setting which prompted the researcher to use
a grounded approach to effectively understand the complexities of sustainable tourism
development. The human dimension is all important. During the formulation of the research
process for the first stage interviews, the relationship of the participants (the practitioners who
were interviewed) and the walking tourism industry was best understood using the same
reasoning. Whilst grounded theory does not provide a vehicle for testing a hypothesis, it is
suited to building theory and therefore acts as a platform for generating hypotheses for
subsequent research. A qualitative first stage of data collection which produces theory for
further quantitative enquiry in the second stage of data collection can fit this model.

A key characteristic of grounded theory research revolves around the acquisition and analysis of
the data. Glaser and Strauss (1967, p.2) note in their original work, the tendency then of social
scientists to forego attention on the generation of theory, instead being preoccupied with
verifying existing theories or more obscure theories they have ‘barely started to generate’. Their critique of qualitative research (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.17), as a method for theorising about social structures, and a means of obtaining ‘data on many areas of social life not amenable to the techniques for collecting quantitative data’ reflects the reasoning behind using the approach to generate theory. The coding of data requires identifying categories (in an interview transcript this would occur within the text at appropriate points in which categories are uncovered) which are then constantly compared against and refined into theoretical propositions surrounding the research focus.

The key divergences in grounded theory occurred after Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) ‘Basics of Qualitative Research’, and subsequently in Glaser’s critical response ‘Emergence vs forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis’ (1992) which described the former as neglecting some of the key elements of the original work. The methodology effectively split into two paradigms, separated by variations between the visions of the two founders regarding the analytical process (Glaser, 1992; Strauss, 1987; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The crucial distinction in this case is the use of Glaser’s ‘Key Point’ coding approach, rather than Strauss and Corbin’s ‘Micro-Analysis technique’. Key point coding fundamentally involves identifying key points during the data analysis process, allowing concepts to emerge. The method involves coding themes, usually from interview transcripts, by constantly comparing the ideas which are generated. By coding within the text in this way, Glaser’s (1978) original method allows the analyst to reach a saturation-point in which theories are then grounded. The distinction between his idea of coding and Strauss and Corbin’s method is that the latter involves some deduction between the ideas generated and previous coding activity, meaning that the analysis process slips into the realms of verification, an element of research which was not focal in the original formulation of the grounded approach (Walker and Myrick, 2006). The micro-analysis technique verifies its categorisation process by organising the data analysis into three stages: open-coding, which generates initial categories; axial coding, which links concepts together into conceptual ideas;
and selective coding which solidifies the ideas into theoretical constructs. Glaser’s (1992) criticism of this format centres on the potential rigidity of the method, using verification and deduction to diminish and subdue ideas after a certain point in the process, which then becomes iterative in nature. The author agrees with Glaser’s idea of this approach being ‘over-analysis’, meaning also that some of the focus on letting the theory emerge is lost in the data.

The selection of one, or the other version of grounded theory therefore becomes a thorny issue. The decision is also characterised by the informed decision to use a combination of data collection methods, and the aforementioned philosophical leaning towards a positioning of pragmatism. The overall approach used in this research was as follows: the Glaser approach to coding was the predominant philosophy used in the analysis of the interview phase of data collection, as themes emerged without the enforced verification which comes with the three stages outlined in Strauss and Corbin’s micro-analysis technique. However, part of that technique involves structuring the data by eliminating irrelevant material, in order to streamline codes and provide a more solidified set of theoretical principles. This process was applied, but only at the end of the coding process after the final interview had been transcribed.

The two-stage qualitative-quantitative process of data collection is also relevant. If the Glaser philosophy, primarily inductive and based on allowing emergent themes to generate theory without ‘forcing’ or verification, embodied the first stage interviews; the Strauss and Corbin philosophy partially permeated the second stage survey analysis which verified some of the results from the interviews. Charmaz (2006, p.179) discusses the utilisation of a qualitative approach in grounded theory research, noting that objective proponents of more traditional quantitative approaches would be critical, due to the potential bias involved. However it is argued here this bias is a credible provider of emerging themes in such research, and thus this course of action enabled valid parameters to be established, which then were tested (and verified) in the operation of the quantitative stage of data collection process.
It is the juxtaposition of the relative vagueness involved in the interpretive and relatively bias-
laden qualitative stage of data collection producing suitably meaningful parameters to explore
recreational walkers empirically, which provides this research study with its theoretical rigour.
Kelle (2009, p.207) recommends that ‘theoretical categories with limited empirical content’ can
act as ‘heuristic devices’ to prevent ‘forcing’ of the data in grounded theory research, and to
sensitise researchers towards suitably broad, abstract and non-deductible concepts. These
concepts can provide a powerful means to form empirically grounded categories which Kelle
posits are useful to then construct research questions and frame theoretical categories which
are high in empirical content.

Thus, the grounded theory methodology employed here has been carefully considered in
maximising the theoretical usefulness of the two-stage research approach. The research
phenomena of recreational walking, subject to a fragmented literature base in the tourism field,
has been given a theoretical framework designed to produce the most relevant and useful
categories, resulting in a second stage of data collection which furthers the theoretical
understanding of the phenomena. Although the discussion of the research approach has
detailed some of the mechanics relating to how the method was executed, there now follows a
more full account of the application of the data collection process.

3.4 Research method

3.4.1 Qualitative stage of data collection

The first stage of research in this study involved a programme of grounded theory interviews
with experts, practitioners immersed in the world of recreational walking. The justification for
this approach was the lack of a clear theoretical basis from which to construct an initial typology
of walkers, necessitating an exploratory exercise to understand the key decision factors involved
in recreational walking. The merits of using an initial qualitative stage in the grounded theory
process have already been extensively covered in previous sections, but the use of qualitative interviews to collect data generally is worth summarising.

The in-depth interview is a research method used for understanding the lived experiences of people regarding a particular subject area, rather than testing a hypothesis or discrete evaluation (Seidman, 2013, p.9). In simple terms, it is a conversation with a research purpose (Kvale and Brinkman, 2009). A good qualitative interview will achieve breadth and depth in terms of insight into the subject area (Yeo et al., 2013).

Bryman and Bell (2015, p.214) delineate different types of qualitative interview, accepting that different authors will vary in their terminology. They include the unstructured interview in which the researcher has only a list of topics to cover; in-depth interviews which can include both structured and semi-structured interviews (where a list of questions is prepared but the researcher can deviate where appropriate); and focused interviews which entails open questioning to enquire about a specific subject area or situation of interest to the researcher. To an extent the grounded theory interview encompasses all of these categories, as the principal aim is to generate theory from the research subjects without forcing, and therefore the more unstructured the process, the less chance that the interviewee will be pushed towards a particular line of reasoning.

What qualitative interviews do not do are provide generalizable, replicable statistics in the format that quantitative research does. In addition, the qualitative researcher must guard against the misinterpretation of data, or the overemphasis during an interview on preconceived ideas held by the researcher at the expense of adequately listening to and understanding the interviewee (Silverman, 2006, p.46). The interview context is also important: when the interview feels less natural or less like a conversation there is potential for the interviewee to limit their openness towards the discussion (Bryman, 2010, p.49).
Alternatives to the depth-interview include focus groups and participant observation. Participant observation is an ethnographic ‘method in which a researcher takes part in the daily activities, rituals, interactions and events of a group of people as one of the means of learning the explicit and tacit aspects of their life routines and their culture.’ (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2011, p.1) Its main advantage over interviews is the means to distinguish between what people say they do and what they actually do. It is, however, time consuming and recording data can be problematic (Ferraro and Andreatta, 2014, p.109) and in this case was dismissed as a viable method because it would require a lot of walking. Using the observations of ‘experts’ is therefore superior because in a sense they have all been participant observers for a number of years, allowing a rounded picture of the phenomena of walking to be built. Focus groups involve groups of eight to twelve people discussing a research subject area with a facilitator (usually the researcher). They have been used adequately to understand walking preferences (Davies et al., 2012), although this example was a localised trail and not an overall picture of walkers in general. They were not considered as appropriate for this thesis, as more depth material was obtainable by interviewing people separately.

When conducting interviews for grounded theory research, the researcher must ensure that conditions are optimised for the acquisition of meaning and context surrounding the subject area, and much of this consideration can be addressed by creating a relaxed atmosphere and allowing the interviewee to be immersed in the discussion.

3.4.1.1 Sampling strategy

The interviewees were engaged in walking-related occupations including: writers, researchers, countryside and recreation managers, equipment developers, walking planners and group leaders. They were selected because of their experience and knowledge of recreational walking. Each of the interviewees selected were engaged in a slightly different context in terms of their
relationship with recreational walking; encompassing commercial ventures, management of walking resources, promotion of walking for health or sustainability, interest groups, accommodation provision and other tourism-related suppliers. This selection method is known as purposive sampling (see Patton, 1990) which is focused on developing a frame for the research area. The intended result was to produce a multifaceted but comprehensive jigsaw of the walking market from all angles of the supply context.

As the walking market in the UK is comprised of a diverse yet interrelated supply network, sampling was partially based on the recommendations of some initial interviewees. ‘Snowball sampling’ refers to a non-probability form of sampling in which the researcher accumulates respondents by obtaining information from the members of the population they have been able to contact (Rubin and Babbie, 2009, p.149). Although this method is often used on hard-to-reach populations, the main reasoning behind this approach was to make sure that the most appropriate people were contacted and in turn and, the most useful data were collected for the research purposes.

The key criterion for interviewees was their breadth of knowledge of the walking market. Level of experience in managing recreational walkers was prioritised – many had been involved in supplying some form of walking resource for over 20 years. Where possible, national and regional perspectives on walking in the UK were preferred to localised knowledge. For example, national representatives of the Ramblers’ and Long Distance Walking Association were pursued, followed by regional representatives when the former were unobtainable. The limited travel budget available to the researcher precluded longer trips for face to face interviews.

When the saturation of data was becoming of relevance, the remaining few interviews were targeted towards areas where the researcher felt there might be ‘missing perspectives’ (on the research area) rather than running the risk of replicating the data from previous interviews. For
instance, for the final few interviews, the researcher avoided countryside managers and group walking representatives as people operating in these roles had already been interviewed at least once. Instead respondents were sought out who were involved in roles relating to access, accommodation and research, as these areas had not been represented. The saturation of data coincided with the moment when all conceivable contexts of walking supply had been focused on in the sampling programme.

3.4.1.2 Data collection approach

In total, 23 depth interviews, lasting between 60 and 90 minutes, were conducted. Interviews were ‘face to face’ with the exception of two telephone interviews, because the respondents were either too busy to meet, or transport logistics made travelling too difficult. In most cases the interviewer travelled to the respondent’s place of work, or in a few cases their home or a neutral location. The interviews were all audio-recorded by consent of the interviewee.

The data collection approach involved open questioning, which allowed the interviewee to talk freely around the subject area. The PhD research aims were presented before the interviews as the framework for enquiry (usually in the email or telephone call sent beforehand to request an interview), but questions and prompts were kept to an absolute minimum, with the intention of the interviewee talking as much as possible without any leading questioning. In some cases it was evident that the interviewee had considered their answers before the interview. Generally, interviewees were able to talk for the allotted time without much interference from the interviewer. Once the conversation dried out, and no new material was being generated, the interview was brought to a close.
3.4.1.3 Data management and analysis

The interview recordings were transcribed and coded using QSR-NVivo software. NVivo is a powerful tool for qualitative research data analysis, which can produce good quality grounded theory research because it facilitates many key processes of the approach (Hutchison et al., 2009). In particular it allows the researcher to store large quantities of text from interview transcripts and to easily link concepts together when coding in a far less unwieldy fashion than use of a pen and paper. The data management element was the most useful aspect of using this software. Concerns over the use of computer assisted software to store and analyse qualitative data include whether it changes the way it is analysed, impedes quality and the distortion of choice of theoretical perspective based on the capability of the programme (Bringer et al., 2004). Nevertheless, the use of this software increased understanding of the linkages between core concepts, and the nature of NVivo as a tool, necessitates the researcher to take responsibility for the data analysis process rather than the software itself.

The interviews were coded in the NVivo interface using a ‘bottom up’ approach (Pidgeon et al., 1991), by constructing the codes and identifying their relationship as the transcripts were examined. Open coding was employed to produce categories within the data, which over time became numerous. As each transcript was analysed, categories were superimposed over the previous set of codes; resulting in instances where themes were becoming more prominent, due to repetition, increased emphasis in the interview discussions being examined and in cases where concepts were being discussed from a number of different perspectives. The researcher was then able to link categories together into groups based on common emergent themes in the data. The key findings of this stage of data collection are presented and discussed in chapter 5.
3.4.2 Quantitative stage of data collection

The second stage of primary data collection was a quantitative survey questionnaire, administered to recreational walkers. It was directly informed by the findings of the first stage, and drew from the themes resulting from the interview analysis in the construction of its design. The questions reflected the main theoretical concepts and concerns regarding recreational walkers and their choices of location, as identified by the interviews. They focused upon: the demographic details of the respondent, details of their walk on the day, motivational elements about their walk, and about walking in general, preferences for navigation and equipment, questions about their attitudes towards aspects relating to walking such as access and details of the participation levels in different types of walk. The principal aims of the thesis (to build a typology of walkers and explain route-choice) were the underlying purpose behind the choice of these questions.

Quantitative research espouses an emphasis on measurement, accuracy, causality and generalisation; asking questions which seek to define with precision the relationship between entities and phenomena in social science research. The direction of causality, internal validity and the researcher’s confidence in their causal inferences are of primary concern in the design of quantitative research (Bryman and Bell, 2015, p.74). Whilst testing and measuring can explain much about the nature of human phenomena, there are numerous criteria for good quality research outputs: sufficient planning, analysis and revision; consideration of the way in which numbers and measurement are interpreted and put into context; and determination of the limit to which human ideas and constructs can be quantified and how to employ quantification (Weathington et al., 2010, p.230).

The benefits of survey methods are an extension of the accuracy and precision of the quantitative approach. With probability sampling, large populations can be described according to their characteristics, and questionnaires in particular allow a large number of measures and
relationships to be tested in a reasonably quick and efficient manner (Cargan, 2007, p.90). Thus, in order to provide the necessary data to answer the research questions and fulfil the principal objectives of this study, a questionnaire is the most obvious and appropriate research instrument for the second stage.

3.4.2.1 Sampling strategy

The sampling strategy for the quantitative stage of data collection was carefully employed to provide the most representative dataset to make inferences for the target population: recreational walking tourists in the Lake District. The Lake District National Park is a tourism location for millions of visitors per year, many of them engaging in walks of some length and can provide the necessary data to ask questions on the preferences and characteristics of walkers. Visitors travel to the study area throughout the year, although they are more numerous in the summer months, and therefore the survey was conducted over the course of a year.

Numerous visitor patterns influence the propensity of the researcher to gain an accurate sample. Seasonality affects visitor numbers, which increase during holiday periods and decrease otherwise (Baum and Luntorp, 2001). There is a strong relationship between weather and visits to outdoor recreation areas (Arneberger, 2002), and weather is often associated with seasonality. Numerous areas of the Lake District are quieter, reflecting less developed tourism approaches on behalf of the park management authority, often to preserve the tranquillity of those areas (Lake District National Park, 2010) and therefore these areas are subject to considerably fewer visits than the areas in which tourism is promoted more. Nevertheless it was important for the researcher to cover all area types, in order to have the necessary available data to build a typology of walkers which included all preferences for types of location.

Therefore the sampling approach involved visits to as many areas of the Lake District as possible at a rate of twice a month, for one whole calendar year. Each month, one weekday (Monday to
Friday) and one weekend (either Saturday or Sunday) survey was planned and executed. Geographically, as much of the national park area was covered as possible during 24 survey days, and these locations were pre-assessed to include a balance of: busy and quiet sites; remote and easily accessed sites; tourist areas and areas with less tourism; sites with busy attractions in close proximity; sites which are only generally used for walkers; rural and urban (towns or villages) sites; and sites which were in the vicinity of a range of different walk difficulty, altitude and length. The data collection strategy (detailed in the next section) was optimised to produce the highest possible number of cases from these sites.

3.4.2.2 Data collection approach

The data collection method used was an intercept survey involving the administration of a self-completed, self-reply paper survey questionnaire. A reply-paid envelope was provided with each questionnaire. The researcher visited the survey sites and approached walking tourists, asking them to take a questionnaire and fill out after their walk. The number of people seen was recorded, as was the number handed out, in order to give an indication of the response rate once the surveys had been returned by post. The selection of self-completion survey over the survey interview method reflected a trade-off between the available time of the researcher and the requirement to achieve a favourable response rate. If the researcher had utilised the survey interview approach, they may have missed many walkers whilst interviewing respondents, even though they would have guaranteed a response. Given that one survey was estimated to take, on average, ten minutes to fill in, it was faster to administer self reply questionnaires to as many of the walkers seen as possible.

Using the self-completion approach has its own drawbacks, namely the propensity of respondents to actually fill out the questionnaire and return it, once they had taken one. The researcher therefore had to build up a rapport as quickly as possible with respondents to boost the chances of this happening. Fortunately, walking in picturesque settings does generally make
people more receptive to this possibility, and therefore the researcher maximised the opportunity for a few friendly words, with potential respondents before sending them on their way (with a questionnaire!). Additionally, one must be sensitive to situations where walkers don’t want to be stopped. Allison et al. (2010), whilst talking about interviews, discuss the stress of poor weather and certain mountain descent situations which must be taken into account by researchers. In these circumstances, conversation was kept to a minimum, but there might be a potential bias if these people were less likely to remember being given a survey due to the lack of rapport.

The questionnaire almost exclusively consisted of closed questions which are preferential for research into attitudes and behaviour as they limit responses to a set choice of answers and, produce definite answers which can be analysed more decisively (Brace, 2008, p.47). Additionally, exclusive answers were requested for many of the multiple choice questions (accompanied by text asking respondents to pick one option only, rather than selecting as many options as relevant). This approach was selected with the analysis in mind, as it allowed for a broader range of statistical testing possibilities, with the answer choices fulfilling the requirements of being mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Lavrakas, 2008, p.96). Many of the questions were Likert-scale based, including all of the attitudinal and motivational questions, with the answers given as numbers (for example, ‘on a scale of 1-10, rate the difficulty of your walk’ or ‘How much do agree with this statement on a scale of 1-5, with 1 meaning disagree strongly and 5 agree strongly’). The questionnaire is included in the appendices.

3.4.2.3 Data management and analysis

Questionnaires were collected after return, and given a unique number. Any questionnaire which was significantly incomplete was discarded. Those that were kept were processed using IBM SPSS statistical data software package. The software offers a comprehensive means to manage and store data, and all the necessary functions required to do the most appropriate
analyses. An initial descriptive (univariate) analysis was made to ascertain the characteristics of
the sample. In order to build the typology two principal statistical techniques were used: factor
analysis and cluster analysis.

Cluster and factor analysis are both forms of multivariate analysis, specifically analysis of
interdependence. No variables are considered as dependent as such (Wheeler, 2013, p.218).
The factor analysis method used was principal component analysis (PCA), which focuses on data
reduction and allows the researcher to: ‘determine which, of a large set of items “hang together”
as a group, or are answered most similarly by the participants’ (Leech et al., 2005, p.880. It gives
a strong basis to understand which variables are likely to be useful to determine segments, a
process which is typically quantified using cluster analysis.

Dolnicar (2002, p.143) distinguishes ‘common sense’ segmentation where the segmentation
criteria are based on the parameters already known to the researcher, from a more
multidimensional ‘data-driven’ approach where the parameters are generated by the data itself.
The latter approach is more conducive to inductive research and therefore a better fit for the
process. The review by Dolnicar (2002) on data-driven segmentation approaches in tourism took
into account 47 segmentation studies which used cluster analysis. It found that the smallest
sample size was 46 cases, but the median was 461. The number of variables in each study
applied to the clustering varied from 3-55. The use of factor analysis or other ‘data pre-
processing’ techniques, is common in such studies, although the author hints caution in terms
of using factor analysis, as ‘part of the structure (dependence between variables and thus
distance information) that should be mirrored by conducting cluster analysis is eliminated.’
(Dolnicar, 2002, p.143)

These considerations were taken into account when the data were analysed. Factor analysis
was used as a precursor to segmentation, but was correctly applied to all variables relating to
cluster analysis, in order to make sure the relevant variables were either used or eliminated. Hierarchical cluster analysis uses the ‘distances’ between objects to understand how similar they are. It is useful for exploratory analysis on variables to understand which characteristics are shared by people, can be applied to data with a mix of interval, ordinal and nominal properties (including Likert data), and provides a proximity matrix which explains the distances and similarities between cases and objects. In SPSS a ‘dendrogram’ (tree diagram) gives a visual indication of groupings to begin exploring clusters, and with further testing, the most viable cluster situation, or number of groups can be achieved (Verna, 2012, p.332).

A second method of cluster analysis, K means analysis, assigns observations to a pre-set number of clusters, minimising errors associated with the distances between cluster-points (Wishart, 2012). It is useful to test the resultant clusters from the hierarchical clustering method. Both of these methods were used concurrently, in order to validate the cluster solution. The settings for the SPSS method and results are detailed in chapter 6. Cluster analysis is an exploratory method, for which the success of the outcome is partially dependent on the parameters set by the researcher. (Kaufman and Rousseeuw, 2009, p.14). The final testing process of the segmentation exercise involved a series of statistical bivariate tests to understand more about the sample. Depending on the nature of the data (whether the dependent variables were nominal, ordinal or interval), the most appropriate statistical tests were used: Mann Whitney-U tests, chi-square, and t-tests.

To investigate the sample for route-choice, a series of bivariate analyses were made on the route-choice variables and characteristic variables. This allowed inferences to be made on how the cluster groups differed in terms of their decision making process, and some more general findings about route-choice – whether certain conditions affected the length, difficulty, duration and remoteness of walks. The process was undertaken in an iterative fashion, to ensure that as new findings became apparent, that they were analysed.
3.5 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has detailed the research methodology for the PhD study, beginning from an initial position of needing to build a theoretical base for the research aims to fit. This requirement reflected the fragmented and broad range of sectors which facilitate walking, and crucially, the lack of a presence of walking studies in the tourism literature. Therefore, in order to ask questions, foundations are needed, which steer this research towards a grounded approach using a combination of methods.

To frame the method, an exploration of research ontologies and epistemologies was made. This research takes the worldview of pragmatism which reflects that the acquisition of knowledge focuses on a people-oriented perspective, and is practically implemented to solve ‘real world’ problems. This philosophy aligns to a combined methods approach. Additionally, given that grounded theory has epistemological variations based on its application and interpretation, the pragmatist worldview fits the Glaser strand of the methodology. The tourism field draws from several disciplines, and understands tourism problems and phenomena using the most appropriate tools from those disciplines. This research, in order to understand the activity of walking, adopts the pragmatic need of tourism research to draw from the most relevant places in its development of theory.

The research followed a qualitative (inductive) – quantitative (deductive and inductive) approach within an overall grounded theory framework. This method has been used effectively in tourism research to build typologies and explain choices of locations for tourism. The Glaser strand of grounded theory involving ‘Key point coding’, was selected above the Strauss / Corbin strand after careful consideration because it is data-driven, and allows for emergent theory. Although more central to the qualitative stage of data collection, the thinking behind which variables were chosen for the design of the quantitative stage, and its final analysis process, are
fundamentally suited to emergence of theory, and therefore the final product of this thesis is a result of the grounded theory process.

The qualitative stage of data collection involved in-depth interviews with expert practitioners, to understand their experiences of walkers. They were purposefully drawn from the full range of walking-related job roles, accounting for the various fragments of the supply sector. These results fed into the quantitative stage design, although both stages of data collection had their own independent findings. This stage involved an extensive survey of the Lake District, executed in as many walking areas as possible, in the pursuit of achieving the most balanced sample of walkers to produce a typology. The significant analysis process involved two complimentary forms of cluster analysis, preceded by principal component analysis.

Thus, the justification for the research approach of grounded theory has been solidified in an appropriate philosophy, and the methods used to collect data and fulfil the research aims carefully chosen. The research now turns to an exploration of the recreational walking market.
Chapter 4

Research Context: The supply and demand of recreational walking in the UK

4.1 Introduction to the chapter

Before outlining the primary data analysis and results, extra context on recreational walking in the UK is now provided. Previous chapters produced a number of theoretical areas which frame the study; some tourism fundamentals relating to motivation, preferences for location and the formation of tourist typologies. Recreational walking, although one of the most popular leisure activities, is still yet to receive substantial attention in the field of tourism. The grounded methodology, selected for the study to build a theoretical framework, reflects an exploratory approach. In chapter 1, an initial overview of the rise of walking for recreation was given. This chapter now explores the development of walking in more detail.

Walking is an activity which spans much more than the tourism and recreation sectors. The prominence of walking in the transportation and health sectors (and indeed, the literature base) is greater, and this is an important contextual consideration for this study. Professionals in all related industries are concerned with walking to a significant degree. A lot can be learned from how the supply of walking resources has developed and became a key part of the recreation sector in evidence today. An analysis of the organisations and locations can also reveal the contemporary challenges of managing the locations in which walking occurs, including national parks. Additionally, an exploration of the demand for walking in the study area is also of value to the research study. Whilst academic literature has offered some theoretical insight into walking, choice-making and motivation; a range of ‘grey literature’ exists at local and national levels on participation and this can augment understanding of walking behaviour.
Therefore, this chapter will add valuable context to the data-analysis section of this thesis, the focus of the next three chapters. It will be broken down into sections charting the development and current situations for demand (section 4.2) and supply (section 4.3), but essentially the two areas overlap, and the discussion will at times deal with both simultaneously. There is also a place in this chapter to provide background contextual material on the study area, the Lake District National Park (section 4.4), and this will then be followed by the closing section of this chapter (section 4.5), which will draw together the academic and industry circumstances underpinning the research, in justification of the research design which will be introduced in the next chapter.

4.2 The demand for walking in the UK

4.2.1 Historical context

Walking is a universal and highly popular activity undertaken for leisure, recreation or pleasure. However, finding historical information about the exact nature of demand for recreational walking in rural Britain is difficult. Some shared knowledge and understanding of the change of motivations over time exists: generally the meaning and purpose of walking has shifted depending on the dominant society. Today, with an established working week and allocated leisure time, most individuals in Britain now have a degree of choice in their walking destination. A description of the changing nature of walking in Britain by Edensor (2000) details that, after centuries of individuals confining their walking locally (based on daily activities and adventures) to a ‘day’s walk circle’ (see Wallace, 1993 cited in Edensor, 2000), a significant change occurred on a social scale during the 18th and 19th century when relatively cheap travel began to become available, enabling the development of walking as a leisure activity. Walking ‘by choice rather than pure necessity’ in Western Europe became ‘fashionable’ in the 18th and 19th centuries (Karrholm et al., 2015).
Over the last few centuries, walking has developed meaning in society, and in turn has been the focus of increasing attention by other industries. Poets and travel writers have based their work on recreational walking experiences. Wanderlust and the work of Kant demonstrate walking being used as a vehicle for philosophy (Wylie, 2005). Rural environments were managed for recreational purposes, restricted in earlier times to elites. In the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, urban middle classes visited the countryside either with family or for enjoyment (Roberts and Hall, 2001, p.2). The idea of walking as being a leisure pursuit for the aristocracy changed over time to a more accessible and desirable activity for a greater proportion of the population. The gradual opening up of the countryside for recreational visits coincided with the growth of rural tourism in Victorian times.

‘By the close of the nineteenth century the idea of the countryside as the ‘real’ England, with its landscapes, villages and remaining traditions standing in contrast with urban capitalism and industrialisation had become dominant’ (Snape, 2004, p.1).

Essentially, the expansion of walking leading into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century was dependent on societal changes, leading to more accessible time and space to walk in.

In terms of figures detailing the frequency of people undertaking recreational walks, information is scarce. Research is restricted largely to the census, which contains information on personal travel, and is only available from the middle of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The Office of National Statistics (ONS, 2010, p.170) detail transport trends between 1952 and 2008. Walking is given scant attention in comparison to other modes of travel, and what exists only seems to reference walking for transport until recent decades: statistics such as transport-related deaths, injuries and trips to school. In terms of all trips for walking, there was a decline between 1995 and 2008, of trips per person, per year, from 292 to 221 (ONS, 2010, p.170). The Department for Transport and Office of National Statistics (2007) reported that in a similar time period (from 1986 to 2006) walking ‘just to walk’ rose from 12% of the total number of walking trips to 17%. These two
trends are based on measurements which are not entirely congruent, and therefore comparisons have to be assessed with a degree of scepticism.

Statistics from the National Travel Survey in the UK showed in 2008 that walking was still important over short distances: 78% of people in Britain walked over short distances with the average walk 0.6 miles, but walking was in decline overall, with a 20% decrease in walking trips in the period between 1993 & 2003 (Ramblers Association, 2008, National Statistics, 2004). In the period following 2008, there is some information on walking from Mintel (2013). The headline statistics based on a TGI survey show a recent decline between 2008-12 in the level of walking participation: regular walking dropped from 20.9% to 17.8%, occasional walking from 20.6% to 20.1% and any interest in walking from 46.2% to 42% (Mintel 2013). Overall, statistics in the recent past show a slight decline in overall terms, but much of that can be attributed to the change in modal frequency associated with the rise in car use, and may include large proportions of commuter or utility trips. The figures which suggest leisure trips (short trips and walking ‘just to walk’) show relatively high participation overall and slight rises in recent years. However, the measurements of walking given from each source are fundamentally incongruous, and even separating out recreational trips from functional journeys is problematic. As later sections in the chapter will show, the rise in the supply of walking resources over the same period suggests that in the context of tourism and recreation, walking is becoming more important.

4.2.2 Current situation

4.2.2.1 Global perspective: The UK in context as a ‘walking nation’

It is clear there are a range of ways in which walking participation in the UK is reported, either for tourism, recreation or as an undifferentiated activity. Most data is based on surveys of relatively small and varied samples, and methodologies differ depending on organisation and context. Looking at the UK in the context of other countries is similarly problematic. At present
no precise global figures on walking exist, but some agencies keep records of frequency, duration and distance of walking trips, usually given as an average. In the US, the 2009 National Household Travel Survey (US Department for Transportation, 2009) found that Americans participate in approximately 41 billion walking trips per year (10.4% of all trips), and that 17.5% of ‘social and recreational’ trips are by foot. This latter figure compares to the 17% share of UK residents’ walking trips being for leisure reported above at a similar point in time. Whilst the proportions do not reflect absolute numbers, the context of walking recreationally demonstrates similarities between the countries.

Figure 4.1: Comparison of selected countries’ participation in recreational walking
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Sources: Bell (2007), except UK (Ramblers, 2008) and New Zealand (SPARC, 2014)

Figure 4.1 compares findings from three studies to demonstrate the level of recreational walking in population terms. In New Zealand a national survey of participation in recreation activities (SPARC, 2014) found that 60% of adults walk for recreation (60% of all adults aged 16 or over, which is by some distance the most popular recreational activity, at least once over a 12 month period). A study by Bell et al. (2007) compared the participation in walking as a recreational activity in six countries, and a consultation by TNS (2008) provides a figure for the UK from a similar timeframe. The UK at 63% (at least once a year) is equal to Denmark, but demonstrates
less walking in population terms than Finland (68% of the population), Holland (74%), Norway (84%) and the USA (67%). Bell’s comparison drew from secondary data taken from national surveys, and it is not clear whether all figures included the whole population (it states, for example, that the Danish data only covered the adult population, whilst the Finish data related to the ‘whole population’). Whilst these figures vary widely, both in their results and method, they do provide a rough benchmark on the importance of walking recreationally.

Aggregating national figures of walking would be useful to gain a global perspective, but an exhaustive search for reports by organisations including the World Tourism Organisation and World Health Organisation suggests that no overall figures exist. There have been efforts to provide guidance for measurements: ‘Measuring Walking’, which concluded at the 2006 Walk 21 conference analysed data collection methods from different countries, cultures and professional backgrounds to form ‘a set of international guidelines for the collection, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative techniques for measuring walking’ (Walk 21, 2007, p.1). On a global level, this data is often generated by pedestrian counts, does not differentiate walking by purpose and is restricted to cities. The UN-Habitats ‘State of the World’s Cities’ Study (United Nations, 2001) – the most recent version (United Nations, 2013) does not provide figures - states that walking is the third most popular form of transport behind buses and cars, but similarly these figures most likely comprise a majority of non-leisure walking trips.

There are also efforts to compare international demand for adventure tourism activities. The Adventure Travel Trade Association (2013) undertook a study on adventure tourism, valuing the market overall at approximately 264 billion American dollars in the three continents of Europe, North and South America. In terms of walking, their categorisations, which underpin this valuation, include hiking as a ‘soft-activity’, and walking tours as a ‘non-adventure’ activity. Although there is no mention of mountaineering, climbing is referenced as a hard activity. In terms of the populations of the regions, and using the definition of including an adventure
activity as the main activity of their last trip, the market in 2012 comprised 4.7% of the population for hard activities and 37.2% for soft activities, although this varied by region. This is useful in assessing the global picture on the rising appeal of adventure tourism, at least in developed countries, and as a consequence the more committed forms of walking.

4.2.2.2 Walking participation in the UK in the current period

The Active People Survey, an annual telephone-based questionnaire undertaken by Sport England states in its most recent update that 86% of adults walk at least once a month for any purpose; 55% for recreation and 59% for functional purposes (Department for Transport, 2015). It reports no change for the overall percentage of people walking from the previous year (86%) but there are variations at the local area level (ranging from a high of 96% to a low of 76%). The findings reflect a nation of people who walk, albeit to differing degrees of regularity. They also suggest a short-term arrest to the long-term decline in walking reported in the previous section. In terms of all recreational activities, Sport England (2015) actually report a 3% rise in outdoor activities in the last year. The local area context provides more insight into variations: ‘Generally, authorities with higher proportions walking at least once per month also have higher proportions walking at least 5 times per week’ (Department for Transport, 2015, p.5). This is in agreement with academic thinking on measurements made at smaller geographical levels. Curry and Ravenscroft (2001, p.289) suggest area-based studies are more useful than national data (they cite the UK Day Visits Survey) which they warn might be subject to ‘considerable error and misinterpretation’.

Recreational demand is similarly prone to problems with estimating the size of markets, mainly due to a range of definitions. The British Mountaineering Council (2013) detail figures for climbing and hill walking. They estimate 246,000 people over the age of 16 engage in these activities, at least once a month. This figure represents approximately 0.3% of the population. Whilst this figure suggests a relatively small niche, ‘hill walkers’ conduct hill walks 2 to 3 times
per week on average (Sport England, 2015). This is a relatively high frequency compared to other ‘types’ of walker. In terms of trail walking, Natural England (2015) synthesised research and monitoring from a number of national trails; people counters, anecdotal estimates from the observations of their wardens and baseline data from their ‘Monitor of Engagement with the Natural Environment Survey (MENE)’. This provided them with a range of 63 million to 140 million people passing through areas intersected by a national trails – the large variation is due to an upper limit of people being surveyed within a range of 500 metres from a trail. These estimates encompass any visitor, from those walking very small distances to the few that complete the long-distance trail. It is possible to estimate demand based on visits to locations and national scale surveys on activity participation, although the fragmented nature of available data suggests a low degree of precision.

There are some recent estimates of the walking tourism market. The Mintel report (Mintel, 2013) on walking and cycling holidays provides a picture of walking participation for UK residents in terms of their holiday activities. The research is based only on their holidays, both at home and abroad, and therefore does not cover inbound tourists. The definition given of a walking holiday perhaps excludes some sections of the walking market as it refers to holidays where walking or cycling is the main purpose, or as an excursion on other types of holiday. More than half of people venture outside the UK for a holiday. The Tourism Alliance (A UK tourism alliance comprising local and regional tourism organisations, associations of hoteliers, attractions, tour operators and a number of other stakeholders) published an annual report on tourism statistics on tourism for the UK (Tourism Alliance 2015). Within the report there are approximate figures for activities (walking and non-walking) undertaken on domestic trips only. They include: ‘site seeing on foot’, at 25.69 million trips per year, the 2nd most popular activity; a short walk or stroll of up to an hour or under two miles, the 3rd most popular activity at 22.78 million trips; a long walk, hike or ramble (which appears to be from anything from 2 miles / 1 hour upwards to a
day’s walk) is the 5th most popular activity at 14.57 million trips and ‘centre based walking’, the 8th most popular activity at 10.85 million trips. These figures indicate a number of things:

- Firstly, and most obviously, that walking is an integral part of tourism in the UK.
- Although the purpose and location of the walk complicates the way participation is reported, there are different classifications and all are significant (4 types of walking in the top 8 tourism activities)
- If one were to amalgamate the figures, walking would be by a long way the most popular activities, but some of the nuances between purposes would be lost

### 4.2.2.3 Who walks in the UK?

Overall figures are useful for gaining an idea of the size of the market for walking; however it is more pertinent to understand the make-up of demand. A number of research activities by national organisations are available. The Active People Survey (Sport England, 2015) found that gender is not particularly relevant in walking prevalence but the proportion of the population walking generally declines with age. The rural recreational context suggests that the situation is more nuanced. For instance, more young professionals between the ages of 30-39 are now visiting rural areas in England for recreation to experience the peace and quiet that remote areas provide (Saxena and Ilbery, 2008). The market study on the National Trails (Natural England, 2015) found that people over 45 and adults without children more likely to find the trails ‘appealing’, and the Active People survey also suggests a growing active 3rd age, but that an increase in urban living is important in demographic trends. Additionally, adventure tourists are generally younger in age than ‘non-adventure’ tourists (Adventure Travel Trade Association, 2013), suggesting that age distribution may vary in terms of the severity of walking preference. Overall these findings give a picture of a predominantly older market for walking, with younger age groups favouring more extreme forms of walking or other recreational activities.

The Mintel (2013) report on walking and cycling holidays contains details of walking ‘as a leisure activity’ and is detailed in table 4.1, below.
Table 4.1: Walking for leisure statistics in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>&lt;9.5k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>9.5-15.5k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>15.5-25k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>25-50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>&gt;50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures suggest that the gender balance is almost equal and that walking is relatively evenly split across age groups but skewed towards higher incomes. Additional trends for walking holidays include higher proportions of employees than retirees or unemployed, higher socio-economic groups, families with children (especially between the ages of 5-9 years old), and a greater likelihood of married or single people walking than separated people (Mintel, 2013). Analysis of ethnic origin determines that at present white British people walk more for recreation, whilst people with other ethnic origins walk more for functional purposes (Department for Transport, 2015), although there is a growing trend towards a higher ethnic diversity in participation (Sport England, 2015). These distributions are expected to a degree, but trends show a move towards a more balanced and diverse picture of participation.

In addition to demographic data, the available research reveals some useful contextual information on motivations and preferences for walking. The Mintel (2013) report on walking and cycling holidays states that health and fitness (57% of respondents), outdoor enjoyment (47%), relaxation (35%) and time spent with family (28%) and friends (18%) are key motivators, and a small niche (16%) value the physical challenge presented by their walking activity. Attitudinal values held by people who go on walking or cycling holidays: 65% thought walking or cycling holidays were more environmentally friendly, and 61% considered that people who walk are ‘like-minded’. In terms of walking visits to other countries, the important factors affecting choices of UK residents include exploration of a foreign country from a unique perspective, viewing landmarks and reconnecting with wildlife. However, 52% saw no need to travel out of
the UK. In terms of more general recreational walking motivations, respondents to the Active People Survey (Sport England, 2015) place importance on relaxation and de-stressing. Significant barriers to recreational walking include time and commitments (Sport England, 2015), poor weather, health, lack of time and lack of local trails (Natural England, 2015).

There are a different set of motivations for more committed forms of walking. Adventure tourists are more likely to look for professional services such as guides and tour operators than ‘non-adventure’ tourists. They are increasingly using social media and on-line resources to discuss and research their activities. They value scenery, protected natural environments and access to activities, and in comparison to ‘non-adventure’ travellers, are not affected by the presence or absence of family and friends when selecting holiday destinations. They are also spending longer on their adventure holidays and more money on equipment (Adventure Travel Trade Association, 2013).

The UK population is therefore characterised by a number of trends on walking participation, attitudes and motivations. The information on demand, for tourism, recreation and other purposes is of use to this study as it provides context on the walking population, and as is the case with the forthcoming section on the supply of resources, a backdrop for conducting the research.

4.3 The supply of walking in the UK

4.3.1 Historical context

The supply of walking resources in the UK dates back to early footpaths used by Stone-age dwellers and Celts, before the introduction of a comprehensive network of Roman roads, some of which still exist today and are points of interest for walkers. Fundamental elements of walking infrastructure such as signage and even lighting were established by Roman times, although it would be centuries before these aspects were significantly used for any form of leisure walking,
reflecting the functional nature of the activity until more recent times. The crucial elements for tourism were established in the 18th and 19th centuries. The increase in provision of accommodation, transport and management of the countryside, offering walking opportunities to an ever-widening market. Activities such as leisure camping and cycling were also emerging in the 19th century, and with this came the beginnings of an equipment manufacture industry for the outdoors: lightweight tents, walking boots and clothing (Pannell, 2015).

Although the marketing of rural areas for recreation is relatively new (Bromley, 2014, p.105), tour operators have been offering breaks in the country via rail or coach to cater for the domestic market since their invention. This has not been to the same extent as the more widely known explosion of mass tourism that began with Thomas Cook in the mid 1800’s, or the package tours to the continent which followed due to the rise of international travel in the middle of last century. The latter category have included trips to the Alps and other adventurous destinations, but concurrently people were increasingly also visiting the mountainous regions in the UK. Alfred Wainwright’s guides to the fells in the Lake District, published from the middle of the 20th century onwards, included detailed line drawings and descriptions of routes and opened up hillwalking in England to recreationists (The Wainwright Society, 2015). These guides were among the first and most recognised of an industry for walking travel guide books which are now a prominent form of marketing tourism in rural areas in the UK.

Since the popularity of walking in the countryside had begun to establish itself in the 19th century, walking groups established themselves in the UK, the most well-known being the Ramblers’ Association (Ramblers Association, 2015). Groups such as these had campaigned for access to rural walking areas, the most famous event being the mass trespass at Kinder Scout in 1932. The Ramblers’ were formally inaugurated in 1935, and have since grown to incorporate regional and local branches throughout England, Scotland and Wales. They have been a
significant promoter of walking for leisure and health, of countryside conservation and a leading campaigner for access, to a high degree of success, given the access context in the present day.

Access to rural areas has been an ongoing process of legislation spanning almost 200 years. The Hampstead Ramblers’ group (2012) give a detailed account of how the various acts have also affected the maintenance and responsibilities of footpaths in the UK. They describe the transition of responsibility from the 1835 highways act:

‘The repair provisions in s 23 of the Highway Act 1835 did not apply to footpaths and bridleways, which continued to be the responsibility of the ‘inhabitants at large in the parish’. In practice maintenance was carried out by the County Councils in the rural districts and by the Borough and Urban District Councils in urban districts, although by 1947 a number of highway authorities had ceased to maintain footpaths and bridleways, invoking s 23 of the 1835 Act in their support ….’ until the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, which ‘….. resolved the situation by providing that all existing public paths (i.e. footpaths and bridleways), including those that had arisen over private roads or occupation ways were repairable by the inhabitants at large….(Hampstead Ramblers’, 2012).’

The 1949 Act is notable in the supply context for a number of reasons, not least because of the formation of laws to conserve and protect national park areas for recreation. It also provided the ‘Definitive Map’ which contains the details of the legal status regarding access to footpaths and other rights of way in the country. The Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management (IPROW) (2014) describe the map as: ‘being to rights of way what property deeds are to land’. The process of making rights of way public is usually subject to agreement between local authorities and landowners, and is then recorded on the definitive map (Countryside Agency, 2008). However, the current access context has been developed subject to a series of legislative changes, culminating in the Countryside Rights of Way (CROW) Act (2000). Parker and
Ravenscroft (2001), suggest that despite the CRoW Act symbolising a greater freedom of access for the public to the countryside, the powers it gives to landowners to control or moderate activity (such as where dogs can be taken) ‘...implicitly, further tightens where people can and cannot go.’

Nevertheless, the legislation since the middle of the 20th century has been responsible for creating protected areas for recreational walking, which cover significant land areas in the country. National parks have been in existence in the UK since 1951, and the 10 (of 15 in England, Scotland and Wales) parks in England cover approximately 9.3% of all land (National Parks, 2015a). They are governed by the ‘Sandford Principle’ which states that: ‘Where irreconcilable conflicts exist between conservation and public enjoyment, then conservation interest should take priority’ (National Parks, 2015b). Their importance to rural tourism, both domestic and international, is significant, at around 162 million visits per year (STEAM, 2009).

In addition to national parks, other designated areas including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), have also been introduced into legislation to protect natural areas. Also resultant from the post-war legislation are the National Trails, 15 long-distance trails in England and Wales which constitute approx. 2,500 miles. Their upkeep is maintained by a combination of a designated trail manager (for each trail), local authorities, landowners, the highways agency and volunteers (National Trails, 2015). These areas for walking, and other outdoor recreation activities now off-set some of the access problems which have faced the public over the preceding two centuries or so, and like many other countries which use similar legislative approaches to access, the UK has a significant supply of walking resources.

Thus, the rise of walking in the countryside, access rights and protected areas for walking has resulted in a diverse and wide-ranging group of industries to serve the walking market: government agencies and NGOs, accommodation and tour operators, walking guide books,
equipment, footpath management, walking groups and charities. The context surrounding walking tourism by UK residents leading up to the present day reflects a move towards more environmentally friendly tourism, interconnecting with the needs of landowners, commerce and the conservation of nature. The Mintel report on walking tourism in the UK (Mintel Oxygen, 2013) reflects that branding relaxation, nature and the health element are important. Tour operators market holidays in the UK and elsewhere by utilising the concept of the great outdoors, and the number of operators and businesses involved in walking tourism is increasing (Mintel Oxygen, 2013). The supply sector for walking has to react to an ever-diversifying fields of activity. New types of walking are becoming part of the overall picture, such as Nordic walking and there is a rise in a number of new sustainable types of tourism, including slow travel. An analysis of the current organisational and political context surrounding the supply of walking resources will now be made.

4.3.2 Current situation

4.3.2.1 Policy on rural tourism and walking

The national tourist agency, Visit Britain produced a new tourism strategy in (Visit Britain, 2013) which was based on tourism being a primary economic growth tool for the country. The strategy makes clear that many visitors are attracted to the countryside, yet there is a disproportionate amount of marketing to London and between cities and other parts of the country. Walking is an important component of the rural tourism strategy. Part of the political focus is to create tourism bodies which focus on individual activities such as walking (Penrose, 2011, p.22), a move which is designed to provide competition for tourism organisations focusing more generally on geographical areas.

The economic benefits of walking have become important to the development of tourism in the British countryside. Walking has potential as a means for rural economic regeneration in particular (Huse et al., 1998). In England, day walking trips to the countryside have been
calculated to generate between c.£1.5 billion and £2.8 billion of income annually, with an average of £9.10 spent for each walking trip (Christie and Matthews, 2003). Given the relatively dated source of this estimate, inflation may dictate figures are now higher. Rural tourism also brings socio-cultural benefits outside of the national park areas. Whilst UK national parks report (figures from STEAM, 2009) visitor spend as over £4 billion per year, peripheral regions such as the Marches between England and Wales can increase their tourism offer through integrated rural tourism (Saxena and Ilbery, 2008). Particular walking areas draw in visitors and walking tourism disperses spending away from major road networks, boost rural employability and jobs, reaching the more isolated rural settlements, spreading the spending out, and retaining income through higher multiplier effects (Midmore, 2000). Tourism also augments rural development which is traditionally focused on agriculture (Saxena and Ilbery, 2008).

Rural tourism also has a greater impact on sustainability because of closer linkages between the environment, social and cultural dimensions and the economy. Previous approaches have often leant more towards one element, for instance the economy (Saxena and Ilbery, 2008) and trade-offs between the economic, social and environmental benefits have been observed, but rural tourism seeks to balance these better (Garrod et al., 2006). Defra (The Department of Environment, Food and Local Affairs) (2010) place importance in their Action Plan (2010-2020) on diversification, balancing demand and environmental pressures in rural areas, but developing products based on natural capital. Transportation is a key issue, given the dispersed nature of rural tourism areas, but the action plan stresses the problem that it is difficult to reduce car trips to the countryside. In general terms, more time spent walking is environmentally beneficial, for the time spent walking which could otherwise spent undertaking more environmentally damaging activities, particularly walks which start from home, and those which don’t require cars. Of course, recreational walking trips are not often car-free, as many people use a car to reach the start of a circular walk, and some even use two cars when participating in linear walks (Davies et al., 2012).
Environmental benefits derived from encouraging people to walk more as an alternative to car travel are well-documented, and include reducing traffic levels, congestion, air and noise pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions which contribute to global climatic change (Pucher and Dijkstra, 2003, Houghton and Woodwell, 1989). Additionally, in rural and green-urban settings, contact with nature is influential in fostering sustainable attitudes (Ballantyne and Packer, 2005). More specifically, walking is also associated with higher than average pro-environmental attitudes (Jackson, 1986). The Rural Tourism Action Plan (Defra, 2010) places focus on encouraging education of sustainable values as a positive benefit of tourism.

The health benefits of walking are well documented, and it is a key policy area. Walking at a brisk pace falls under the category of ‘moderate physical activity’, and it is widely recommended that adults should spend at least 30 minutes participating in such activities, on most days of the week (Pate et al., 1995). The benefits of moderate physical activity to health include: reducing levels of obesity, coronary heart disease, non-insulin dependent diabetes (Type 2), colon cancer, osteoarthritis, osteoporosis and high blood pressure (Bassett et al., 2008; Gortmaker, 1999; Leon et al., 1987; US Department of Health and Human Services, 1996; Dunn et al., 1999). There are also mental health related benefits associated with walking. Indirectly, the physical effects of walking can boost feelings of well-being and happiness (Taylor et al., 1985). Walking in the vicinity of others boosts psychosocial health (Mason and Holt, 2012) and, particularly when solo, relaxation by providing the participant with time to think or escape the stresses of everyday life. In particular, contact with green spaces, and natural environments in rural and semi-rural areas, has been proven to have positive effects on mental wellbeing (Maas et al., 2006; Priest, 2007; Maller et al., 2002). In addition to direct monetary benefits, economic impact assessment of walking trails can also place a monetary value on health benefits, reduced number of accidents, decongestion and increased work force (Sustrans, 2013; Living Streets, 2012).
4.3.2.2 Organisational context: stakeholders for the promotion of walking and protection of natural resources

Thus, the political context to include walking in rural tourism development reflects a multi-sectoral approach, as an activity which can be key to achieving a number of economic, social and environmental benefits to the UK population. This is reflected in the number of types of organisations which use walking as their focus. Health bodies such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) provide guidance on setting up walking programmes aimed at increasing physical activity. ‘Walking for Health’ groups provide walking opportunities for approximately 70,000 participants annually (Walking for Health, 2015). These initiatives fulfil an additional need in a rural context, as they draw more people to the countryside. Social inclusion is an additional and also related issue, and there is a need to encourage younger adults, low income groups, disabled and older people and women to the countryside (Shucksmith, 2000). These aims are in many of the local and regional authority strategies associated with countryside access and which provide trail examples which are accessible to all and local groups to encourage walking (see examples: Visit Scotland, 2010; CCAS Delivery Group, 2014; National Parks Wales, 2015; Cornwall County Council, 2011).

Other groups who are concerned with encouraging more walking include advocacy agencies, who promote walking as a sustainable activity to increase participation and car-free travel. Living Streets are a charity who are concerned with increasing a culture of walking by visiting organisations such as schools and community groups and educating people about the benefits. Their principal concern is the walking environment, generally in urban spaces, but also in the towns and villages in national parks and other areas (which are a key part of the walking tourism experience), and they campaign for better spaces including the need for more walking-friendly routes (Living Streets, 2015).
Walking groups are proliferate around the country. Other than the Ramblers’ Association, many local areas have independent groups which organise their own programme of walks through the year (Davies and Weston, 2015). Some sport organisations also have an input into the recreational walking sector. Sport England, the national agency to promote sports, and other local sport-based government agencies include walking as a ‘sports’ activity in their guidance on participation, and connect people with local groups. Niche walking organisations include the Long Distance Walkers Association, who promote fell-walking, challenge walking (typically between 20-100 miles), and long-distance walking events organised by 43 regional and local groups in the country (LDWA, 2015). Typically, groups organise and govern themselves and demonstrate (in the case of national organisations) hierarchies, but they also work with local authorities and other related countryside agencies to resolve issues in the walking environment such as footpath management and access provision.

The British Mountaineering Council provide advice on a range of elements for walking (amongst a number of other activities such as rock-climbing and mountaineering), including safety, routes, clubs, events and access. They are also significantly involved in the protection of walking areas such as the hills and mountains of Britain, funding projects to ‘...promote sustainable access to cliffs, mountains and open countryside by facilitating education and conservation projects across the United Kingdom and Ireland. (BMC, 2015)’. 

The natural environments of England are protected by a range of charities, NGOs and other organisations including the National Trust, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), British Waterways, The Woodland Trust and The Forest Enterprise. They provide and maintain a significant proportion of the walking environments in the UK and are funded by memberships, parking fees, attractions and entry fees, augmented by voluntary workers who engage in conservation and land-management activities. These contributions from the public are a key part of preserving the rural product, and are of high importance to the sector.
4.3.2.3 Organisational context: commercial stakeholders

A further element of the supply sector reflects commercial aspects of walking as a popular leisure activity in the country. There are a range of magazines on walking, the most prominent including ‘Walk Magazine’, produced by the Ramblers’, ‘The Great Outdoors’ ‘Country Walking’ and ‘Trail’. Each is pitched at a slightly different readership in terms of ability, experience and walking preferences. They provide route information, reviews of walks, locations and equipment, and advertisement space for companies which produce footwear, clothing and other walking accessories. They are also a means for readers to share their own experiences, photographs and gain ideas for new walks.

Guide books are proliferate for UK tourism locations and there are hundreds available for the Lake District, and many other areas of the UK. They are often available very close to walking location start-points: tourist information centres, village centres and near accommodation, and thus profit from the walking tourism market. Walking leaflets are an additional navigational element, which are either provided by councils and other promotional agencies (usually free in order to increase walking) or at tourism centres (sometimes for a cost). They usually provide route maps, a simplified version of the more detailed Ordnance Survey maps (see Ordnance Survey, 2015), and information on travel, attractions and Points of Interest; and they represent a tool for local authorities, tourism organisations, and other stakeholders to encourage education, sustainable tourism, and to direct people in the most environmentally beneficial routes through protected areas. The world wide web is increasingly becoming a resource for recreational walkers. A number of websites exist, holding large repositories of walks: route guides, information and maps. They are usually a product of personal interest and managed and produced ‘for the love’ rather than commercial gain, although some sites such as Go4awalk.com charge a subscription fee. The National Trails, amongst other organisations now use website visits as an indicator of engagement with the public (Natural England, 2015).
4.3.2.4 Organisational context: tourism

The tourism context for walking encompasses a range of organisations from both the public and private sector. Visit Britain (2013) describe the supply network for tourism as ‘...fragmented – there are 200,000 small and medium-sized tourism businesses and a host of sectorial interests in tourism.’ They include attractions, food and drink, transport and accommodation and all are related to and benefit from walking tourism. Tour operators have marketed walking holidays for many years, domestically and internationally. They are at present seen as one of the more flourishing types of domestic package tours, in comparison to other package holidays which are declining (Penrose, 2011, p.37). The current norm is to offer a range of trips, aimed at different grades of walk, with flexibility to choose routes, attractions and a baggage transfer service. They are generally marketed towards age groups over 45 or families, and some operators use elements of the emerging focus on slow travel (see, for example, Inntravel, 2015). The drivers at present behind walking holidays for UK residents are the group element and meeting like-minded people, connecting with nature, relaxing and for families, steering children away from technology such as x-boxes and I-pods (Mintel, 2013). There is also a market for walking events and festivals (examples available from Walking Festival UK, 2015), which bring together walking tourists and are of valuable economic impact to local communities in walking areas.

4.2.3.5 Organisational context: management of resources

A significant part of the sector is the management of walking areas. This is implemented by a network of stakeholders: local authorities, charities, volunteers and protected area authorities. Footpath management addresses a key issue, which is concerned with the balance between satisfying demand and preserving the natural environment (Daniel, 2002). Pröbstl (2003) contrasted the needs of the participants of different forms of outdoor recreation in terms of facilities needed, and elements of the landscape. Walking does not require either as such (in the sense that rock-climbing requires a cliff, and sailing requires water) and therefore is a low-impact form of recreation in terms of its impact on ecology (unless there is a high level of
visitors). More relevantly for walking, provision of appropriate fords, bridges, signage, ramps and other furniture is an important management concern on footpaths and trails (Edwards, 2007). Kay and Moxham (1996) suggest that, whilst there are concerns for damage done to the environment by ‘hoardes’ of visitors, many more footpaths suffer from under-use. Concentration often occurs at specific areas or points. The effects of under use in certain walking areas include accommodation and other businesses closing because of poor business (Edwards, 2007).

The British walking supply structure is a mosaic of different types of organisation, with a range of different interests. In a theoretical terms, networks in rural tourism areas can be soft (co-operative and ‘horizontal’ involving more local NGOs, community groups and individuals) or hard (hierarchical, co-operative and competitive) (Saxena et al. 2007). To an extent, political concerns over health, environment and the rural economy drive supply, and there are commercial interests involved with this large sub-sector of the visitor economy, which suggests a hard approach, but the work of NGOs, charities and individuals in the management of walking resources is significant in the UK. Whether the sector is demand or supply led is another question for debate. Curry and Ravenscroft described a predominantly supply-led approach to recreation provision in 2001, and suggested that demand-led development of recreational resources would prioritize quality over quantity. The overview here of the situation in the present day would suggest that the sector has begun to move more towards this, but the demand context requires further exploration to understand the synergies better.

4.4 The Lake District National Park

The Lake District is situated in the North West of England, on the southern border of Scotland, and is characterised by glacial lakes, mountain ranges (the highest of which, Scafell Pike, at 978 m is the highest in England), and rural agricultural landscapes (National Parks, 2015a). Traditionally, it has been home to agriculture, forestry, fishery and other rural industries, but
has been increasingly important to tourism in the country throughout the late 19th and 20th centuries. The population of 40,800 (National Parks, 2015a) have gradually changed from a mainly working-class demographic, predominantly involved in the aforementioned industries to attracting and integrating more wealthy inhabitants from southern areas in England, a trend which has accompanied rising house prices in the last 30-40 years (Shucksmith, 2002, p.128). The park area of approximately 2,292 km$^2$ (National Parks, 2015a) covers much of the county of Cumbria, which has population centres in Carlisle to the north, Kendal to the south east, and several other principal towns to the west, which are near to, but outside of the boundary of the park. They are shown in figure 4.1. There are still pockets of relative deprivation in the county, particularly in the settlements on the western coast, which are outside of the park area (Parry, 2009). The boundaries of the Lake District are due to be extended in August 2016 (Carrington, 2015), adding 3% more land area to the national park, and forming a continuous protected area with the Yorkshire Dales National Park which is situated to the east.

The area has a relatively low population density (Peck et al., 2010), mainly concentrated in several small settlements, including Keswick, Windermere, Ambleside and Grasmere. The geography of the area, with many of the largest hills and mountains situated in the centre, causes the transport infrastructure to be limited in terms of moving the 16.4 million visiting tourists per year (National Parks, 2015a) around the park. There are several ‘A roads’ intersecting the park, which can be subject to congestion issues, and a number of much smaller minor roads connecting the villages. There are train routes connecting the national network to Windermere, and a coastal route which circumnavigates the boundary of the park, and bus provision on the road network, although there is a challenge for the authorities in terms of sustainable transportation policy. The only motorway in the region (the M6) is a major road in the UK, which connects Scotland to the Midlands and North West of England. Visitors travelling by car can access the Lake District from the south-east near Kendal, or the north-east near Penrith.
Figure 4.2: Map of the Lake District Area

The Lake District tourism offer extends to a wide range of visitors engaging in cultural and heritage tourism activities, attractions, food and drink, sightseeing and outdoor recreation. There is a diverse repertoire of outdoor activity provision including, climbing, caving, orienteering, mountain biking, mountaineering and walking. The sense of place element of the Lake District as a tourism destination is an important, evolving marketing focus, fuelled by the ‘Wainwright’ influence; media through books, television and other medium; and literature such as Beatrix Potter, Wordsworth and others. The most extensive recent analysis of tourism in the region is the NWRDA (North-West Regional Development Agency) staying visitors’ survey (Arkenford Ltd and Locum Consulting, 2008) (political developments have since rendered the regional focus on this type of analysis as defunct since this time). This report covers the whole North-West region of England. It found that the Lake District was the most popular destination in the North West and in terms of rural locations, the Lake District was by some margin the
most popular rural district in the North West by far (72% of all rural visits). 57% of visitors to Cumbria cited walking as an activity undertaken during their visit.

The NWRDA survey (Arkenford Ltd and Locum Consulting, 2008) also found that men more likely to select attractive views and scenery, exercise, health benefits and challenge, whilst women were more likely to select safety, clean toilets and cheap prices. In terms of awareness tourists were more likely to be aware of routes if they were rural based, and the demographics favoured older age groups, white ethnic groups, and higher socio-economic classes. The most important reasons for visiting Cumbria include the scenery and ‘because it feels away from it all’. The remote feeling generated by the physical characteristics of the area are important to the tourist experience but counter-productively, the high number of visitors to the region threaten to erode these benefits. Cullinane and Cullinane (1999) describe the large numbers of tourists who historically arrive at national parks by car, and the majority who stay within them are concerned about congestion and surroundings being spoiled. The Lake District is traditionally characterised by honey pots (Eaton and Holding, 1996), where large numbers of tourists converge.

The walking locations in the Lake District range from busy sites in Windermere, Bowness, Grasmere and Keswick, to more remote places in the more ‘hard to reach’ areas such as Eskdale, Wasdale and Ennerdale. They are managed by the national park authority, National Trust, Forestry Commission, landowners and a number of other non-government organisations, collectively known as the Lake District National Park Partnership (LDNPP). They are aiming to make the area a UNESCO World Heritage site by 2017, and the 5 year plan (2015-2020) emphasises a focus on low carbon living, and balancing the natural environment with cultural heritage, with specific attention to the agricultural landscape: upland farming has significantly affected the visual appeal of the Lake District, but brings its own issues regarding the ‘...sometimes competing interests of maintaining traditional farming models, improving the natural environment, and profitability’ (LDNPP, 2015, p.90). As these locations are a large part
of the walking environment in the national park, they also shape supply and demand for walking tourism.

The State of the Lake District National Park Report (LDNPP, 2013) emphasises the importance of tourism, but there is a need to attract younger people to the area, due to an ageing visitor population. Additionally, it places importance on sustainable travel, as the increasing congestion reduces tranquillity, particularly in rural tourist centres. Walking is the most popular activity for tourists, with responses to a visitor survey suggesting that 53% engage in ‘short walks’ and 36% ‘long walks’ during their visit.

The Lake District provides a valuable case-study area to analyse the walking tourism market in the UK. It is an important area for both tourism and walking in the country, and physically, although there is a strong agricultural influence, provides a study area which can give insights into walking preferences in natural and protected areas. In terms of building a typology, there are a broad range of visitor activity preferences ranging from short walks to activities on the more adventurous end of the spectrum.

4.5 Summary of the chapter

The chapter has provided a detailed analysis of the walking context in the UK, using a range of literature sources from organisations which provide walking resources, policy documents, academic work and reports on participation. Walking has developed in both supply and demand terms over a long period of time. The current picture is one of a diverse network of organisations which are involved in managing and developing the walking landscape in the country, and facilitating the demand for walking. Walking is the principal outdoor recreational activity in the country and a key element of tourism, particularly in the significant areas of the country which are protected. The role walking plays in connecting tourists to the natural landscape is fundamental to the national policy on health and physical activity, economy and environment,
and therefore in-depth study on both walkers and their choices regarding the environments they walk in is of significant value.

Figures on participation vary widely in measures and rigour and the problem is exacerbated between countries, but the UK has a relatively strong walking tradition. The more technical and committed forms of walking such as mountaineering appear to be skewed to younger generations as a relative niche, but there are many others are walking less frequently in tourist areas such as the Lake District. More detail is available on characteristics of participants in adventure tourism and Mintel research reports.

When assessing walking tourism, it soon becomes clear that the activity can be differentiated by purpose, context, derived experience, and the people who are engaging in the activity. The current tourism and recreational walking market can be categorised to some extent, but terms to describe types of walking, differ between researchers, practitioners and in the available statistics on participation. This reflects to an extent the diverse range of stakeholders involved. Walking is appearing in many policy areas separately and should be more joined up (anecdotally, practitioners are working to fix this). The Lake District is very reliant on tourism, and by extension, walkers. There are people of all origins and interests visiting, which makes it an interesting and viable study area.

Overall the last three chapters have done much to frame the research area. An understanding of the tourism field, and other subject areas in which walking is researched has been gained; theories on segmentation in tourism, preference for locations and route-choice at destinations and in natural areas have been explored; and the demand and supply contexts relating to walking in the UK and more specifically, the Lake District have been investigated. However, the grounding of the research aims into the established academic literature field of tourism is not completely adequate. The fact that recreational walking is: firstly, not established in the tourism
literature; secondly, is an activity which is very diverse in its nature and the motivations of its participants; and finally, because it spans a number of sectors (adventure tourism, tourism, recreation, health, and others); leaves the research in a situation where, in order to satisfactorily nest walking research into the tourism study area, theory must be built. As such this chapter has already begun the grounded theory research, but the following three chapters will build theory from primary data collected at the study area.

Moreover, this chapter has reinforced that there are a number of valid requirements for a study of this nature. The policy background which values walking participation for personal health, reduction of environmental impacts and the need for more sustainable tourism and recreation, shapes both management strategy at site and destination level and the direction of research in the fields of tourism and recreation. The variety of needs of the different participants and potential new recruits to the market suggest that, as with many other elements of tourism under scrutiny by research, a form of segmentation would be beneficial to understand how best to provide resources. At present this form of investigation into walking is scarce and fragmented and therefore there is scope for a tourism based study to provide a much-needed theoretical underpinning.
5.1  Introduction to the chapter

This chapter details the findings of the first stage of primary data collection. It will provide a detailed picture of the UK walking market, as seen through the eyes of practitioners. The findings presented here frame recreational walking as an area of study. The discussion in the literature review (chapter 2), provided a starting point in terms of understanding that walkers, like other forms of tourist, differ in terms of their motivations, preferences, characteristics and the impact that environmental variables have on their travel behaviour. The relative lack of cohesion of literature on recreational walking signifies a need to build theory with a structured, inductive research approach. Specific consideration has to be given to the local context in the UK. Chapter 4 identified walking as an important component of the tourism sector in the country. Chapter 3 included a justification for an inductive approach commencing with a series of grounded theory interviews. The focus of enquiry to address the research problem is the nature of recreational walking behaviour:

- firstly, are there differences between walkers in terms of their characteristics and can they be grouped?
- and secondly, does this then determine their choices of walking location and route?

The process of grounded theory research is well matched to solving this problem.

The structure of the chapter is as follows. Initially, the data collection and analysis will be reflected upon, the coding structure summarised and the interviewees introduced (section 5.2). Following this the main areas of enquiry will be addressed: an exploration of the grouping
characteristics of walkers (section 5.3) and an appraisal of the factors influencing route-choice (section 5.4). They will be discussed in detail, highlighting the most important themes resulting from the analysis. Finally, the chapter will be summarised, and the findings reflected upon in section 5.5. The chapter then directly leads into the results of the second stage of primary data collection in chapter 6.

5.2 Reflective summary of grounded process and emergent themes

5.2.1 NVivo coding

The snowball sampling approach yielded 23 expert interviews, which provided a rich and varied range of qualitative data for analysis. Using the ‘bottom-up’ grounded approach to coding (Glaser) and the social research software package, NVivo, each interview transcript was analysed consecutively, and concurrently in tandem with the data collection process. The analysis process was deliberately unstructured to allow the development of core themes. The exploration drew out a number of key themes relating to the main research focus.

The intensive NVivo analysis process drew together codes into a ‘coding tree’ which stemmed from a ‘top level’ of main themes relating to the principal aspects of the subject area of recreational walking and route-choice. A simplified example is shown in figure 5.1, using one of the top-level themes ‘characteristics of walkers’. In reality, most top level codes had more numerous next-level codes, and so on. The top level themes were sub-divided as new themes emerged in the analysis process. In some cases, there were as many as six hierarchical levels of codes, becoming both more nuanced and defined towards lower levels of coding. The organisation of codes was part of the grounded analysis process, and increased understanding and meaning in the data. The key themes arising will be discussed in turn, in the next section.
5.2.2 Breakdown of main themes.

5.2.2.1 Research ideas: related themes

Three main themes related directly to the research question:

1. **Characteristics of walkers**: This top level code draws from the observations of the experts on people who walk for leisure including similarities between individual walkers, their differences and the presence of potential typologies.

2. **Behaviour of walkers**: This code overlaps characteristics of walkers in some cases. The theme deals with the general behaviour of walkers, such as buying equipment for walking, aspects of planning and preparation for walking, involvement in other recreational activities, different ‘types’ of walking and general traits in terms of walking.

3. **Preference for location**: This theme deals with more specific motivations to choose walks in certain areas at certain times and also reflects the myriad of different factors which affect these choices and decisions.

5.2.2.2 Emergent cross-cutting themes

Within the top level code relating to characteristics two important themes emerged, which crossed through all themes.
A. Firstly, during the analysis process, a core theme relating to an individual’s confidence with relation to the walks they choose was apparent across many of the codes. This is discussed in depth in section 5.3.3.

B. Secondly, the findings suggest several different related factors which indicate that a typology may exist and which may also explain route-choice. The most frequently mentioned distinction between walkers or in some cases types of walk, is based on the suggestion that they may be ‘casual’ or ‘serious’ by nature. This is discussed in section 5.3.5.

5.2.2.3 Contextual themes

Three further top-level themes became apparent within the discussion and provided further contextual background used to build theory.

4. **General motivations to walk:** This code relates to the reasons why people choose walking as an activity for pleasure in a general sense, rather than at a specific time or a certain walk

5. **The Lake District:** A number of the interviewees either worked in, lived near to, or had experience of the study area and therefore this theme provided important contextual material, particularly for understanding the second stage of research as the survey dataset was drawn from recreational walkers in the Lake District.

6. **Supply of resources:** Given that the interviews were self-focused accounts of experiences with the walking market of the UK, a great deal of insight emerged regarding how resources are managed and supplied. Furthermore, this element offered an exploration of how supply affects demand and vice-versa.

5.2.2.4 Reflective themes

Finally, two additional top-level themes provided a perspective on the sample, and their relationship with the research area.
7. **Personal experiences:** Several respondents shared their own thoughts and experiences with regards to walking and working within their job roles.

8. **Reflective material on the research:** There was some dialogue on the research itself, its relevance and value to academics and professionals and some comment on potential limitations and issues associated with understanding the subject area.

It is helpful, for discussion purposes, to use the relationship of supply and demand to conceptualise the above main themes and their interaction. The interviewees were involved in supply roles, but were in general briefed with discussion of demand. Whilst the main focus of the research was on the walkers themselves, it was unavoidable to spend some of the interview time taking about the interviewee’s own experiences and this provided insights into preferences, which were relevant to the core research goals. Broadly, the discussion areas fell into four overarching headings outlined in table 5.1.

**Table 5.1: The supply demand relationship and main themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of walkers</td>
<td>Personal experiences</td>
<td>Reflection on research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour of walkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General motivation to walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Preference for location</td>
<td>Supply of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Lake District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 **The sample and how personal experiences affected the data**

The respondents were drawn from a range of different occupations linked by the common theme of recreational walking. Each individual’s personal context was fundamentally important when analysing the data. The respondent, their job role, and their interface with the walking world, both past and present, made up their own unique perspective, which underpinned their insights into walking tourists. This allowed them to make individualised observations, on others who walk for recreation. In many cases, respondents would generally focus most on one part in the market (for example health walks, long distance walking or urban walking), because of their area of involvement. However, the diversity of the job-roles of interviewees helped to create a
multi-faceted perspective on the research area. The roles of each respondent are summarised in table 5.2.

**Table 5.2: Occupations of expert interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking-related occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional writers of walking guidebooks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer of walking route leaflets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic researchers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside and recreation managers for local authorities, countryside services and Forest Enterprise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking equipment marketing experts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and regional executives of prominent group walking organisations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of popular UK walking magazine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday and accommodation providers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban walkability expert</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large walking events organiser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National health walk co-ordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National access forum representative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable transport campaigner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several topics arose frequently in terms of job involvement. They included: ensuring access for walkers and other path users, encouraging diversity and social inclusion in the countryside, Rights of Way and waymarking, user conflicts, plus the networking process between different organisations which make up what is evidently a complex supply sector for walking. Sustainability was a common theme, either in terms of encouraging sustainable tourism by facilitating more walking, ensuring minimal recreational impact on the landscape, involvement in conservation or the economic and social impacts of recreational walking. Respondents involved in managing walking groups would frequently refer to the dynamics of organising walks and managing the group, whilst those involved in the production of leaflets, books, magazines and equipment would generally be based more in offices but would in most cases have their own relationship with walking involving a great degree of their time walking themselves in order to deliver their product.

In general, respondents had a relationship with recreational walking in one way or another in their personal lives, and often it crossed into their professional time. The exception was one
respondent who rarely walked himself and only produced leaflets. However the majority had walked for recreation all of their lives, and continued to do so as often as possible. Their entry into walking as a regular recreational pursuit or as a professional focus was a common area of discussion. Many respondents walked as children with their families, or as young adults with youth clubs or work colleagues. Others expressed limitations to walk as much as they liked due to everyday life. For some people, walking was one of several outdoor recreational interests and often the least ‘adventurous’ compared to other pursuits such as climbing.

In addition to insights on the relationships of respondents to walking, a prominent theme emerged in the dialogue regarding the relationship between respondents and this piece of research. In some cases respondents were considering similar questions about walkers. Understanding more about walkers and their differences was a common perceived benefit of the research, but the complexity of doing this was also acknowledged:

“Well, there’s a huge range of variables at work, and quite a few of them are appearing in your notes already. But I guess to add to that, the things that we found. It’s actually very very fluid – what motivates people. And what motivates someone one day, doesn’t necessarily motivate them the next day. So I think sometimes past studies have acted as if people were quite fixed in their characteristics…”

This complexity became an important finding in the research in itself, adding to the idea that simple demographics, such as age, are not enough to make distinctions or predictions regarding individual:

‘…which makes it an extreme research challenge, trying to build up a profile, and understanding people’s motivations, because, you can’t just say this person is a woman of this socio economic group, therefore they will do this activity. It seems to be very very complex.’

Other respondents appraised the value of meeting gaps in the market by exploring the categorisation of walkers. The value includes gaining a better understanding about walkers in
order to market more effectively to the broad range of needs in evidence. In the case of an equipment specialist, these needs reflect an element of responsibility involved: ensuring that people receive the equipment most likely to guarantee their safety in more extreme conditions. In addition another respondent reflected on the need to understand more in order to direct funding for outdoor recreation resources to the appropriate places. Finally, one respondent, whose background was as a researcher and campaigner for ‘Living Streets’, provided a unique perspective. He described the ‘Living Street’ approach, based in cities in which the attractiveness of the pedestrian environment is assessed by a set of indicators to reflect its overall ‘walkability’ (pavement dimensions, safety, crossings, noise, friendliness etc.).

‘…..realistically I suppose it could be used in almost any environment. We used to use it on industrial estates and town centres, and residential roads- big range of urban spaces. There is no reason you couldn't...and in parks and gardens, recreation grounds, that sort of thing...so there’s absolutely no reason you couldn't go up on the fells and do the same thing.’

An application of this approach towards walking tourism in a broader context, including more rural areas was discussed as an interesting perspective to take forward in future.

5.2.4 Summary of the research process and sample

To summarise, grounded theory interviews and analysis provided a strong foundation to explore the core research goals. Based on walking practitioners’ personal experiences with recreational walkers, their job-roles and responsibilities, and their positioning in the midst of the recreational walking world, interviewees themselves formed a significant part of the wider study phenomenon and thus an organic picture was built of the market. Their accounts also reflected a complex supply sector which supports the walking tourism sector, which is underpinned by the principles of sustainable tourism. The research goals were appraised by many of the respondents, who value the greater understanding gained by exploring similarities and differences between walkers, to aid practitioners and guide the flow of resources for walking.
The research produced several top level themes which were analysed further, which will now be discussed in turn. The next section will focus on the characteristic based themes with a view to understanding the requirements for building a typology of walkers.

5.3 Towards a typology: Characteristics, behaviour and general motivations of recreational walkers

5.3.1 General motivations for recreational walking

Table 5.3 displays the main themes arising from the interviews on general motivations to walk.

Table 5.3: Codes relating to general motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A general love of walking (a commitment, a unique experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An escape from normality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration (of a locality, of the countryside, understanding the culture of a destination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (to become more healthy, to maintain a level of health, rehabilitation, fresh air, mental wellbeing, inclusion of minority and hard to reach groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social element (group walking, meeting people, friendship, encouragement and support, mutual discovery, following loneliness and bereavement, friendly and likeminded people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought and reflection (solo walking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental awareness (to use cars less, to appreciate the external environment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge (set objectives, new challenges, progression to harder challenges, sport, beating times, ‘peak bagging’ and completing ‘sets’ of walks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A casual interest (tourists, occasional walkers, spontaneous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with the elements (Weather, natural landscapes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (landscapes, society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceputalising motivations to walk

- Frequent and fluid changes in motivating factors due to changing every day influences
- Functional walking (dogs, utility trips, where functional walking can become pleasurable)
- People wanting to walk more than they can / do

Walking in relation to other activities

- Certain age groups more suited to walking rather than more strenuous activities (winding down physical activity at an older age, walking with parents, with young family)
- A desire to participate in a range of different outdoor activities
- A relatively low cost activity in comparison to others
- Combining other interests with walking (geology, history, geocaching, cartography)

Walking because of an outside influence

- A love of maps
- Media Inspiration (television, magazines, books)
- A romantic depiction of rurality (Heritage of the landscape, rural life)

The discourse reflected several universal motivations for recreational walking such as health and wellbeing, relaxation, the escape from the everyday and the interaction between the walker and
their environment. Discovery of the surroundings, history, culture and the visual experience were also referenced often. In particular, visitors staying in areas like the Lake District National Park may use recreational walking to discover the area.

‘...you tend to find the reason they’re there is the countryside, or the history, the views or the wildlife.’

The physical exertion and feelings associated with more challenging forms of walking was also discussed, and this reflected a complex range of emotions, and reinforced that individuals are very different in their reasons to participate.

‘As in, within their peer group, what’s the acceptable way to do things? What’s cool, and if you’re going to get the acceptance of your peers to do something, obviously that’s kind of motivating. And that may or may not be aligned with the experiences you want to have...in terms of your actual bodily experience of it. You can consider so-called adrenaline sports as an example. Some people might actually genuinely seek out feeling those kind of experiences, whereas other people might find themselves doing those types of activities because they’re expected to. They maybe doing care that much about experiencing that adrenaline.’

In some extreme cases, motivations extended to seeking the most challenging experiences, based on completing long distance walks.

‘You’ve got these hundred milers who are in for the slog. They’ve got two and a half days to do it in. Seems astonishing to me.’

The speed of walking as a mode of transport was considered unique in comparison to cycling, car transport and other modes, as it offers a unique experiential interaction with surroundings. Walking was also considered a social experience, particularly in organised groups as it represents a chance to meet likeminded people, combat loneliness, share an experience and spend valuable time with family and friends.

‘There are certain elements about, in terms of relationships, with partners and friends and family, that’s the one time they are uninterrupted by the things that they have in
normal life. So celebrating those moments is cherished time. There’s a powerful health aspect to it, but I think if walking were bad for them they’d still go and do it.’

Solo walking was considered as being a more insular experience, where one engages in thought or reflection, and the walker becomes immersed in their external environment with minimal human interference. Walking is not always the primary motivation of the activity, as for some people other interests may be fulfilled at the same time such as photography, discovering heritage or history.

A significant theme reflected an increasing culture of walking as an aspirational activity.

‘Well it’s all fashionable now. It’s all become very fashionable. It’s all this telly stuff about it...survival living.’

This suggests a perception of ‘an identity of a walker’, which can be aspired to. This may stem from increased media coverage of walking and walking areas, manifested particularly in television programmes on national parks and fell walks.
5.3.2 Characteristics of recreational walkers

Table 5.4: Breakdown of themes relating to the characteristics of walkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demographic (age, gender, class, disability, ethnicity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical (ability, technical, fitness, handicap, age, navigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Navigation (being led, getting lost, finding a route, cognitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mental characteristics (navigation, confidence, ambition to walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Previous experience (as a motivation, as a measure of confidence, increased open mindedness, negative experiences, shared experiences, memories of previous walks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confidence (Access, effect of gender and other attributes on confidence, increased confidence, false confidence, feeling safe, improved confidence with experience, relying on group leader, decision making, walking outside of the local area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interests (love of the countryside, photography, wildlife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attitudes (Environmental awareness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Seriousness’ (Casual and serious walkers, competitiveness, level of ‘seriousness’, walking being a ‘way of life’, ‘type of person who walks’, immersion in a culture, obsessiveness and ‘box-ticking’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside influences (how people’s motivations and preferences are shaped by others):

• Group influences (from group leaders or other group members)
• Friends and family (upbringing, being brought up by parents who walk or brought up in countryside)
• Society (including media, social class, social inclusion)
• Area of residence (near to a walking area, urban or rural, being restricted to utility walking)
• Educational background
• Employment (influence on attitudes; unemployed and retired people have more time)
• Visual material (guidebooks, magazines etc)
• Cultural influence (walking culture, wider culture)
• Available time (including barriers)

Issues with developing a typology

• Are there casual and serious walkers or is casual and serious types of walking more appropriate?
• Continuum of types, rather than discrete groups
• Does a typology exist?

A large part of interview discussion focused on the similarities and differences between recreational walkers. This theme is significant to address the research requirements to develop a typology of recreational walkers. The emergent themes which emerged were diverse, and several became central to the entire investigation. Deconstructing the mass of material on this subject required an exploration of some individual ‘attributes’ discussed by respondents. Some of the most obvious attributes of significance included demographic differences (such as age,
gender, socio-economic variations and ethnicity). For instance walking was seen by one respondent as an activity for older people:

‘But I think that it’s an older persons’ activity. A more mature person’s activity. People might go to walking after they’ve done adventurous things.’

Additionally, socio-economic class was also seen a potential means of characterising walkers:

‘There’s not a big range there. They are mostly middle class people who are wanting to go on a guided walk.’

Characteristics were discussed in terms of differences between individual walkers, collective characteristics of segments or similarities reflective of all walkers. For instance, walkers were deemed by some to have a relatively high environmental awareness, or in the eyes of a countryside manager who was interviewed, a tendency to obey the law, and appreciate the peace of the countryside:

‘the people... most people you meet when you’re walking seems to...it’s hard to put into words... seem to be the type of people who are law-abiding, work hard, pay their dues and just want a bit of peace and quiet on the weekend. And that seems to be a general...That’s the kind of people you meet.’

Another respondent suggested that during young adulthood, more adventurous outdoor activities are attractive whilst walking represents a less strenuous activity in later life. Gender was not often mentioned within the discussion. However, one respondent suggested that for females, walking can be an escape from families and work. Social inclusion was explored, principally in terms of a tendency toward middle classes and the relative underrepresentation of ethnic minorities or other social groups in recreational walking participation.

‘Yes, I think when we’ve been looking to expand walking for health, we’ve recently had some money from DoH, and that has been one of the recommendations. Looking at how to make walks more appealing to different sections of society, how do we go about doing that, and it may well be that you do need a specific set of walks aimed at younger people or ethnic minorities.’
Overall, the discourse reflected that practitioners have certain fixed ideas about the characteristics which constitute a walker, who does and does not walk, and why.

5.3.3 The role of confidence: a core theme in the analysis

It became clear that respondents considered that relationships between potential variables to segment walkers are likely to be more complex than using only demographics and primary motivations for walking. A core emergent theme became apparent during the interview analysis which transcended many other aspects of the subject area. Many interviewees perceived what can be described as an intangible and variable level of confidence in recreational walkers, which can explain behaviour and choices made.

“We’ve definitely found confidence to be a major factor and sometimes it needs to be more acknowledged I think. And there are different aspects to that because some of it is about tangible skills: map reading, basic techniques or knowing about equipment and so on. And other aspects of confidence are quite intangible and almost about cultural expectations.’

Within the numerous instances where interviewees discussed confidence (most interviewees independently referenced an element relating to it), individual characteristics which particularly affect walkers’ level of confidence were boiled down to:

- Their level of experience of recreational walking (a result of the previous amount of walking undertaken, and the level of challenge involved in those walks)
- Their technical ability (for instance knowing ‘how to walk’ on difficult surfaces, challenging, longer distance and hill walks)
- Their navigational ability (the ability to read and follow maps, and negotiate the environment using physical aspects of the landscape or landmarks)
- Their physical ability (personal fitness and level of stamina).

Figure 5.2 shows a model of the influences confidence, ability and experience have on each other. If an individual’s level of confidence is considered as a continuum, the research findings
suggest that people with high levels of experience and ability are likely to be more confident and attempt walks of greater distance and difficulty.

**Figure 5.2: How an individual level of confidence is related to ability and experience**

A consensus amongst experts indicated that individuals who are unused to the outdoors or have little walking experience are generally less confident. They require accurate, uncomplicated information on navigation, landmarks and transportation. They benefit from a greater level of visible interpretation of the surroundings, such as interpretation boards or leaflets.

‘The barriers that they faced and the things they were telling us was that they needed better information and much more information. They needed somebody to help them to start with whether it was a guided walk to start with whether it was a bit of training to use a map and compass so it is – it’s building up their confidence.’

These requirements apply to tourists who are not frequent walkers and use walking as a vehicle for sightseeing, although there are a number of other contributory factors. People at this end
of the scale are characterised by the relative safety felt by having others make route-choice decisions for them. Guided walks remove decision making completely in this regard. The concept of perceived safety and security was a recurring theme, in both natural and built-up urban settings. Although safety issues differ, both contexts are important in understanding the relationship between walker and environment.

‘Someone walks past an estate on a busy London street you know not to turn around and look at them and treat it as if nothing happened because there’s always this challenge. There are people around who may be looking to check whether you’re comfortable or not in that environment and clearly if you’re not then you can give out the wrong signals. So I think that relationship between person and environment is a strong one.’

There were indications that confidence increases by gaining walking experience, learning from more experienced walkers, engaging in decision making on walks and walking solo.

‘Because they know it’s up to them to take the lead or to get themselves out of trouble or so on. And if there’s someone else more experienced sometimes don’t develop the confidence because it’s always left to the same person to read the maps read the routes whatever. So I think beyond that there’s quite a lot of complex dynamics going on there...that can make people more or less confident.’

In this way, increased confidence from such activities can instigate a progression from easier routes with simple instructions detailed in leaflets to self-navigation using detailed topographic maps.  

‘Absolutely, I think you could draw a pyramid, and at the bottom, you’ve got people who go to a National Trust property, and people who follow the Way marks round the red route for a mile and another half who are navigating largely with a map and compass.’

---

1 In the UK Ordnance Survey maps at 1:25000 or 1:50000 fit this description. Other countries have their own equivalent.
Interviewees suggested that building confidence to a higher level often stimulates an experiential desire for more adventurous forms of walking, the motivation to seek new challenges and risks, venture further, and in some cases lead others. A long-distance walker’s group manager discussed how group members progress to leading the group themselves:

‘So the leader will go out and reccy a walk. And then he’ll take a party of whoever turns up. And it wasn’t until I’d been in the group 4 or 5 years until I felt confident enough to lead a walk.’

In some circumstances however, walkers experience ‘false confidence’. They then potentially face difficulties in challenging conditions: at altitude or when weather changes. A lack of experience or comprehension of what to expect is the main cause.

‘The casual walkers probably don’t. You do occasionally see people who are trying to get along Striding Edge in winter on the snow and they are just wearing trainers’

Despite the core theme of confidence appearing to be the most significant differentiator of individuals from the data, it still remains an intangible, and hard to define element to take forward. From many of the respondents’ opinions, experience seems to be interrelated with gaining confidence. The data did reflect that the experts generally saw different types of walker, who could be characterised by certain attributes and their walking preferences. It is important then to dig deeper and explore what other aspects of walkers behaviour might characterise a typology.
5.3.4 General walking-related behaviour

Table 5.5: Breakdown of themes relating to more general aspects of behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Acquiring gear (as a ‘symbol of status’, being overkitted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wider context of recreational walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Involvement in walking-related issues (campaigning for more access , active environmental interest, involvement in conservation, involvement in walking groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walking as part of a job (farming, conservation, management, conservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interest (buying walking magazines, using guidebooks, leaflets, the internet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Navigation (Navigating oneself, being led by others, being lost, developing map skills, spontaneity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transport to a walk (public transport, car, coaches, ease of access, sustainability, linear walks, bus and train walks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accommodation (baggage transfer, long distance walking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Life stage: (Winding down physical activity, as a child, in education, at work, having less or more time available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time (Time of year, whilst on holiday, at a specific time of day, whilst on holiday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequency (infrequent walkers, walking as a regular activity, increasing level of walking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Duration (the walk feeling longer when height is involved, multi day walks, associating time with distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of walking (Casual, continental, day walks, distance, ascent, functional, dog walks, deriving pleasure from utility walks, group walks, health walks, hill walks, pub walks, mainly local, mainly urban, long distance, challenge walking, walking as a sport, variation of types by individuals, niche such as Himalayan walking, non-stile walks for all, serious walks, short strolls, solo walks, themed walks, classification of types and related issues, walks aimed at children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group walking (Group identity, Rambler’s, individuals leading the group, leading walks, considering others, keeping group members interested in surroundings when leading walks, knowledge or specialism, training, progression to being a group leader, progression to leading more difficult walks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walking events (festivals, regular attendance, ownership of festival, walking holidays, camaraderie developed through holiday, settling in at first, non-walking activities as part of the experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progression (from short walks to more serious walks, more confidence, developing leadership skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Introduction to walking (through family, groups, work colleagues, initial experiences, from holiday, walking career)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another top-level code referred to general walking-related behaviour. Although there were crossovers and duplication of codes with individual walking characteristics, and preferences for location (discussed in 5.4), this was justified as an individual theme because it refers to general observations of the experts regarding walkers and walking activity, rather than differences between individuals or their choices on individual walks.
One particularly important group of codes, in terms of walking-related behaviour, reflects the multiplicity of different categories used to classify walks. Firstly it demonstrates the diversity of walking contexts in evidence, and secondly the range of tastes which are addressed in terms of both organisational (supply) and motivational (demand) aspects of walking. Walking can be functional in purpose or range from being undertaken for relaxation purposes to being a serious sport. A range of abilities are catered for in the classifications given by respondents from ‘niche’ walking in areas such as the Himalayas, long distance and challenge walking; to short walks aimed at people improving health and rehabilitation from illness or injury or non-stile walks which are inclusive for all. The many classifications gathered here (see table 5.5) are the sum of all the discourse given by a number of experts in a variety of roles and perspectives of walking. They demonstrate that in the different supply contexts, terminology varies, and that practitioners frame the activity according to their purposes.

A number of different aspects of general walking behaviour were addressed within the interviews, including preferences and trends in buying equipment, cultural aspects and contextual factors. Regular preferences of walkers in terms of the frequency, level of difficulty and distance of their walks were discussed. A more long term perspective was provided by some respondents. A recurring concept centred on changes in walking behaviour over the course of a person’s life which constitute an individual’s ‘walking career’: in particular the context surrounding the introduction of a person to walking varies considerably which may affect their later walking activity and preferences. They may have had more opportunities for recreational walking as a child, for instance. Additionally, individuals may change their habits based on employment, life stage, changing tastes, changing cultural influences or other circumstances.

Involvement in walking groups has the potential to influence walking-related behaviour. In line with the above observations on the role of confidence, walking group activities may cause an individual to walk more, or increase confidence to eventually design and lead walks. There was
also an indication from interviewees that this involvement can raise interest in other activities such as becoming involved in activism for increased access to walking environments or conservation. It appears that walking groups have their own culture based on the walks they do and the individuals within the group. Respondents mentioned a camaraderie which builds up over time based on the social element of group walking. This was also referenced in conjunction with walking holidays and festivals, where people spend sustained periods of time with one another, walking together or engaging in other activities such as eating together.

Some of the dialogue also focused on map use and other forms of navigation. Maps are an important part of the process, and most serious walkers and committed hill walkers will invest some money and effort into ensuring they have the necessary navigational material when out walking.

‘They will spend all day from 9 o clock until 5, just going out on a hill walk. They’ll go and buy the stuff – they’ll have the maps, the Wainwright books, and all that kind of stuff.’

To some people maps are very much part of the holistic experience.

‘Now also, when I’m going on holiday I get the maps out before I go. Because I like maps as well, I’m very fortunate, I can map read. I studied geography and I do like looking at maps. I’ll have a look at the footpath and the walks here and the walks there. I don’t really look at a guidebooks and things like that first off, it’s the maps. I know sometimes guidebooks or walks leaflets are useful.’

Guidebooks, to a lesser extent also reflect an independent investment in obtaining walking information, and offer a different dimension to interpret potential walking locations.

‘Well often they’ve done the research already and they’ve bought some of the books.’

To an extent the need for information is ‘segment-specific’, with more easily accessible information required for casual walkers and residents.
'What came out from the urban and rural residents and the casual walkers is that: they wanted short circular walks, of easy grade, well surfaced, but also a huge part of this was about information provision. It was signposted, well way marked, potentially maps or interpretation boards at the start and end of each walk so they know what they are doing. They could be short but they could also be guided so there was that sort of welcome to an area.'

More experienced walkers, who are more familiar with routes may use maps as a backup in situations where weather turns. However there was concern from one respondent over the potential for reliance on technology, and the potential for walkers to get into trouble, as the below dialogue shows.

‘I could have it as a backup, just in case the weather does something that you’re not anticipating but to be honest, I don’t feel that that’s strictly necessary and again do you then start to take decisions that you shouldn’t take, to go out walking on days...when you talk to the local farmers they don’t go on the top in adverse weather conditions unless they have to.’ (Interviewee)

‘The traditional way, and now you’ve got people with iphones and GPS?’ (Interviewer)

‘Absolutely, and talk to the mountain rescue. The number of mountain rescue callouts is going through the roof. People are getting themselves in difficulties because they are using technology. I think they are using technology...they are relying on it too much and they’re failing to see that.’ (Interviewee)

Finally, the tendency for some walkers to walk without guidance, or even a plan, perhaps making route-choice decisions spontaneously, was discussed. One respondent suggested the derived experience of a walk changes when a combination of their experience of recreational walking and certain routes allows them to forgo using navigational aids:
'But also in getting to know routes intimately now, so I often go out without compass and a map, because I just know that route, and can walk it without that. And that’s now a fundamentally different relationship for me as a recreational walker with the landscape....'

5.3.5 Casual and serious walking or casual and serious walkers?

A second significant theme emerged from the data which may have some relationship to the first emergent theme of confidence. This theme related to differences between ‘casual’ and ‘serious’ recreation. In chapter two, the work of Stebbins (1982, 1997) on casual and serious leisure was introduced, as a theory which might be applicable to walking for recreation. However, during the interviews, a number of respondents used these terms without being prompted by the interviewer to differentiate walkers. One respondent, from the Lake District National Park Authority, encapsulated some of the general characteristics of these two groups when discussing information needs.

'We worked with a consultancy company and they did a needs and preference research. And they categorised all the different types of users and one of their categories was serious and casual walkers. So the needs and preferences of each of them came out to be quite different. And I think and it’s my opinion but you look at serious walkers – you think of hill walkers. It’s not something that they just do as part of a day out or as part of a general holiday. It’s something that is their primary purpose especially when you’re in a national park like this. The reasons that people come here are different.'

In some cases the distinction was used to describe traits of individuals based on their attitudes to walking as a recreational activity. The two categories provide a means of conceptualising the difference between: a group of people who consider walking an important recreational pursuit to which they devote a reasonable amount of time and energy in their lives; and another group of people who do not necessary pursue walking as a regular activity, engaging in walks
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sporadically or for sightseeing at a destination. For serious walkers, the strenuous nature of the walks they choose and the inclusion of hills and mountains, are indicative of their preferences:

‘Personally I’m a hillwalker. I class myself as a serious walker…..my preference is to be really active and steep, over the hills, whether it’s on bike or whatever or climbing. I’m not so inflexible that that is all I will ever do. I like the rolling hills in the South Lakes, between Kendal and Windermere.’

Another measure to separate the two characters was distance:

‘The other end of the scale is the people who want to go 4-5 miles…’Where’s a nice walk to go on?’ Not too far you know.’

The interviews also strongly suggested that the devotion of serious walkers encompasses attitudes to weather, the environment, skills and equipment, and to other areas of their lives.

‘They don’t seem to mind even if it’s wet. That’s when the serious walkers differ. They go out rain or shine.’

The commitment of this type of walker extends from being prepared to brave and even enjoy bad weather, to the use of a map to plan the walk and the holistic experience:

‘I think. A lot of the fun of walking for the more committed is that planning process mug of coffee maps out. Where are we going to go. How are we going to plan this?’

Respondents suggest that experience is an important element in the distinction between casual and experienced walkers. This significant dimension ties together confidence, experience and ‘seriousness’. Seriousness also implies an autonomy in terms of needs for information provision, and taking ownership in their walking activity. More serious walkers are comfortable with, and even insistent on sourcing their own information regarding routes and will also spend time researching equipment. The account of a practitioner working for ‘Nurture Lakeland’, a tourism and conservation organisation, implied that in addition to these traits, their transport needs are also less likely to be addressed by local tourism organisations, whereas casual walkers, who are more in need of information and direction, may be more likely to be directed towards alternatives to the car, using public transportation or walking from their accommodation.
‘We have not actually approached the really eager, experienced walkers, because in our experience these people have got an idea of where they are going. They’ve planned how they are going to get there. And they don’t arrive and think: ‘Where do I go?’ They’ll know what peaks they are going to do. They’ll know that they are probably going to drive there. And that’s what they are going to do. Whereas casual walkers will arrive in the local area, they’ll actually have no idea where they are going to go, and will wait to be told where to go. So if they go to a tourism information centre and somebody tells them where to go in the county, they’ll do it, because they need to be guided to be shown where to go.’

In some cases in the data, respondents alluded to the autonomy of serious walkers in a different sense: needing independence and distancing themselves from the ‘other’ walkers:

‘Your serious walkers would probably not come on a guided walk to save their lives. That’s for the novices. They would rather be off in the hills somewhere.’

Table 5.6 summarises some of the characteristics which respondents associated with serious and casual walkers.
Table 5.6: Characteristics used to describe casual and serious walkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining characteristics</th>
<th>Casual walkers</th>
<th>Serious walkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking as a priority of recreational or tourism interest</td>
<td>Part of holiday or day out.</td>
<td>Primary purpose of recreation / tourism activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fits around other things.</td>
<td>Will walk whatever the weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will change plans if barriers such as poor weather occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills required</td>
<td>No skill generally required</td>
<td>Technical skills similar to sporting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>May have equipment, some people do not.</td>
<td>Spends significant money on equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of walking</td>
<td>Day walking or strolling</td>
<td>Hill walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-distance trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for type of landscape</td>
<td>Manicured visitor sites</td>
<td>Steep, wilderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Little preparation</td>
<td>Planning part of the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of interest</td>
<td>Some enthusiasm</td>
<td>Enthusiasm ranging to obsession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for amenities</td>
<td>Prefers to be within reach of facilities and civilisation</td>
<td>Prefer to be away from civilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of transport</td>
<td>Open to bus and train walks</td>
<td>Mainly car users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several respondents also referred to the notion of a serious walker’s ‘identity’, hinting at a visible subculture of recreationists; the high specification clothing represents a ‘uniform’ in this sense to identify a ‘walker’. This commitment extends to certain motivations found in other serious forms of recreational activity, such as challenge and competitiveness, more akin to sporting activities.

‘My local in Kendal is full of walkers. And you always overhear people: ‘What peaks have you done?’ People get competitive with each other. So yeah it’s about the achievement rather than the: ‘Oh it was great weather. We just chilled out’.

It was suggested that the concept of ‘serious walking’ may be as much indicative of circumstances as it is behaviour. There were many references to situational variables which affect walking behaviour such as lack of available time, which affect the ability of individuals to be able to walk as much as they liked. Indeed, the proximity of an individual’s residence to suitable locations to go walking may have an impact into their current ‘status’ as a serious or casual walker:

‘Absolutely...well it’s pretty much the same thing but it depends on their incumberences and their time of life. How much time they have how far away he country is. Because
you might have somebody...let’s call them a scrambler and put them at category five.

The demanding type. Yet because of his job he’s now forced to live in Cambridge. And that means that it’s 250 miles to the next...acceptable...country...in his book. And that might be something that he can’t do very often. Whereas in his previous job he live in Penrith and went up the Dales every day.’

This idea of fluidity between casual and serious walking became a conceptual question in some cases. It was suggested that there could not be two ‘boxes’ which are completely separate, in which different individuals fall into:

‘Yes. It’s obviously very difficult to have a dividing line. The lines are very blurred. There’s a lot of overlap.’

It also transpired that there may well be a degree of mobility between groups. One person could engage in ‘casual’ and ‘serious’ walks at different times.

‘...one thing that we were finding was that it’s actually quite hard to stay with that category too far into the analysis. And it actually made more sense to look at it as casual versus serious walks. One particular person might do a very casual walk one day dog walking or just walking to the shops. And then at the weekend they’re doing a round of five Munros or something. Very much at the serious end. And they’re the same person. So analytically that’s quite a challenge.’

Another perspective arising from the interviews is the use of the terms ‘casual’ and ‘serious’ to differentiate walks, indicating relative difficulty, rather than the individuals undertaking them.

‘With serious walking, yes it’s something that’s a part of a person’s life. They plan for it, they equip for it, they build part of their life around it. They budget for travel to places in which they want to walk. Or whether they already live there. It’s something that’s an in built part of their life. But the casual walk is something that only happens because they wanted to be somewhere.’

Another perspective or an individual might develop an interest in walking which progressed from being ‘casual’ to ‘serious’.
‘Yes I’ve met people who come out on a charity walk. Never really walked anywhere other than that in a local park. And it has changed their life completely. They enjoyed it so much that they’re off every weekend and turned into a serious walker now.’

In fact it was suggested by several interviewees that becoming a serious walker can be an aspirational movement, consciously undertaken to change one’s ‘recreational identity’.

‘I kept coming across bits of information about how a completely novice backpacker would buy a brand new shiny back pack. And then would come across really experienced back packers whose stuff was all worn and then they would purposefully rough up their equipment.’

This idea of progression suggests a casual-serious continuum rather than discrete groups, in which it might be difficult to pinpoint where exactly a walker changes from being casual to serious:

‘There’s definitely a spectrum that you can move along.’

The concept of ‘serious’ versus ‘casual’ may also be relative to the individual and location. For example, one day fell walks in the UK differ from challenging mountain walking in other countries, and therefore the perspective of the individual is significant.

‘No. I think if I look at a European market, the dynamic is very different. People who actually do mountaineering and climbing, there’s not so much... It’s not glamour. It’s something very much aspirational, in the sense of adventure. Here, it’s something with a bit more glamour, more Victorian in a sense.’

Thus, although many respondents could provide a number of definite defining characteristics which separated their idea of casual and serious walkers, there was caution in using the terms as concrete definitions. It is easy to generalise to an extent, but one must view the potential of using such categories as a useful framework for study, observation and to use practically in providing resources for walkers, rather than a distinct and closed division of people who walk. That also is the nature of segmentation in tourism.
5.3.6 Summary: Building a typology by exploring the grouping characteristics of walkers

The exploration of characteristics reflected the views of respondents that there are multiple levels of complexity at play in defining differences between groups of walkers. They range from the simple, demographic differences such as age or socio-economic differences, to the more intangible psychographic variables based on attitudes, motivations and personality traits. The attraction of walking as an activity also differs in complexity. Where health, relaxation and the outdoors are more simple and tangible motivations, deeper layers were uncovered which affect character-differences. The social aspects of walking were unpicked, and an activity-based culture explained by some respondents, alluding to a certain ‘type of person’ who walks, who are influenced in their attitudes, preferences and choices regarding their walking activity by their peers, walking companions, and the media. The discussion of more intangible motivations which differentiate walkers was dominated by the view of respondents that confidence is an important part of a segmentation structure and that an individual’s confidence level is intrinsically linked to physical, technical and navigational ability, and their past and present experiences of walking.

A further recurring theme in categorisation was the differentiation of casual and serious walkers. Respondents were able to collectively provide a picture of two groups who clearly differ in their relationship to walking and their collective attributes and behaviour, although further questions may be asked regarding where these categories meet or cross-over, whether they are really part of a continuum or whether the terms serious and casual can be applied to the individual walker of the walk itself.
5.4 Explaining route-choice

5.4.1 Introduction to the section

The analysis produced an array of themes relating to route-choice and preferences for location. They interlinked with the above themes relating to characteristics and groupings. It emerged that decisions of where to walk are based on a multiplicity of factors. Their interaction appears often complex and not always solely based on the conscious choices of individuals. These influences differ in importance and have varied effects on route-choice, depending on the individual and situation at the time of the walk. To an extent, preferences for location and route are interchangeable. For instance, a general area provides a visual appeal which might be desirable to the walker, characterised in the different routes within that area. An individual route may however have its own appeal. For example a low-level route may be chosen over a hill walk because of an individual’s ability to complete the route.
Table 5.7: Breakdown of themes relating to route-choice and preferences for locations to walk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial triggers</strong></td>
<td>Reason for choosing walk or route (Because of marketing / media, recommendation by other, friend, partner, functional purposes such as dog walk, expectations of a route-choice, popularity of route, attachment to place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions affecting preference</strong></td>
<td>Other considerations (Access and Rights of Way, changeability of external factors, flexibility to change route based on conditions, provision of information and interpretation, living in a ‘walking’ area, management and path conditions, proximity to amenities, seasonality and daylight hours, transport access, walkability, weather change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making (Group decisions, spontaneity or pre-planning, differences of opinion, serious walkers more decisive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal situation (Age, available free time, culture, relatives, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of location or route (Abroad, quiet, circular or linear, forests, hill walks, honey pot sites, long-distance trails, river walks, tourist areas, urban routes, valleys, well managed sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derived experience</strong></td>
<td>Sensory (Movement, visual attractiveness, landscapes, level of interest, particular character of location, manmade or natural features, level of signage, seasonal variations, rurality, comfort, adrenaline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotions (Achievement, challenge, distance, reaching the top of a summit, goals or targets, recounting feats later, switching off, spirituality, simplicity or oneness, inspiration, wilderness, looking for less obvious places, nostalgia and reliving past memories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other people (group experience, social experience, walking with children, being away from people, away from roads, interaction, meeting new people, solo or accompanied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental experience (Discovery, education, understanding nature, complexity of surroundings, local history, new places, learning more about walking companions, going further afield, interests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focal points (easily marked routes, water, views)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dislikes</strong></td>
<td>Physical features (Bogs, difficult surfaces, flat featureless landscapes, obstructions, poor management, lack of maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situational problems (Traffic, busy routes, weather, poor visibility, safety, poor transport provision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 Sensory / experiential elements

The perceived achievability of the walk was discussed by a number of respondents. Individuals are likely to assess their own ability and fitness, and the relative difficulty of the walk. This is important in the planning stage of choosing a route. Satisfaction can also be derived from the use of one’s initiative for route-finding. One respondent suggested that walkers often experience post-activity satisfaction as a ‘bath moment’, a metaphor for reflecting on their achievement once they are away from the walk and relaxed enough to remember the highlights.

‘Very much so, so the entertainment, the outcome comes by getting back...because someone once said to me: ‘What’s the best bit about walking and I said jokingly: ‘It’s the
bath afterwards, or the pub afterwards’...you know, when you’ve finished the walk you’ve got a sense of achievement.’

Tangible achievements can include reaching a summit, navigational objectives, or literally feeling tired afterwards. ‘Serious walkers’ value the challenge of the route, long distances and steep gradients, and in some cases the time undertaken (where walking becomes a sport). In some cases this extends to longer term goals by completing a checklist (for example, to walk all of the Scottish ‘Munros’).

Sensory and other experiential factors are widely important to choices and decision-making. The quality of visual attraction offered by routes can be conceived as an ‘overall’ quality such as a mountain-scape, or depend on individual elements such as water, tree cover or a specific point of interest, either natural or man-made. A variety of all such visual elements, was also thought of as the attraction of particular routes or locations:

‘We’ve got different expectations, and I think it’s great that we’ve got that whole variety, that mix of walks.’

Understanding a particular historical, environmental or cultural aspect of a certain route may also determine route-choice. Seasonal variations in the visual appearance of landscapes are also significant elements of location preference:

‘So it’s a closeness to nature, and how that changes through the seasons.’

‘We come to where the cottage is and we take a photograph of each of the four seasons’

One respondent also noted that visual preference extends to urban spaces, especially in tourist areas because it adds to the overall tourist experience. Tourists are most likely to also visit nearby towns and villages before or after walks. Personal safety and security is of concern to some walkers, both in rural and urban locations. One respondent made reference to the need to understand better the urban quality in the Lake District National Park to improve the tourist experience.
experience and build on the more attractive elements on offer in the surrounding natural environment.

‘We have a fantastic quality countryside, world class scenery, people who love to walk in it. And our towns...the public realm in our towns and villages in the national park is very poor.’

It is suggested that the urban environment is also of particular importance to staying visitors in towns and villages located in walking tourism destinations.

Other important parts of the experience reflect feelings of the need for comfort or safety, although for more serious walkers this may be traded off for risk and adventure as that adds to the overall experience. These aspects depend on context as much as anything. For more casual walkers comfort reflects elements such as being close to toilets, smooth path surfaces, shops and refreshments. Safety might be important for either casual or serious walkers in the sense that casual walkers want to feel safe and serious walkers acknowledge safety elements of more challenging and potentially dangerous routes, whilst also actively seeking risk and adventure. In some cases a specific purpose such as walking a dog, or finding somewhere to eat influence choice of route.

The degree of management on particular routes was a recurring theme. The range of tourist expectation encompasses a scale ranging from a wilderness experience within relatively untouched surroundings to heavily ‘manicured’ sites with gravel paths, and prominent facilities. Motivations for wilderness locations include the desire to travel lesser-frequented routes, avoid crowds of people and experience the tranquillity offered by more remote areas. Natural authenticity is a key element of the experience. The Lake District suffers excessive visitor pressure and serious erosion problems. The installation of step-like structures made of large stones (figure 5.3) to preserve the fells (part of the ‘Fix the Fells’ programme) has provoked mixed reaction. Some walkers are critical of the loss of technical hill walking elements and the
change in appearance. Circular walks are generally favoured and constitute the majority of all walks. Linear walks include public transport based walks and long-distance trails. The tourist experience is drawn from the adventure into the unknown. There is an enhanced feeling of progression provided by a linear route rather than a return to the start point.

Figure 5.3: Fix the Fells’ step-like structures to combat erosion in the heavily peopled Lake District Fells, available at www.markrichards.info

5.4.3 Practical and situational elements, and the decision chain

A question was raised over whether a decision chain exists for walkers when they choose their route. It surrounds whether decisions are purely based on experiential expectations or whether in some cases some there are situational factors at work. The interview findings suggest that potentially, a hierarchy of factors interact to determine the eventual route-choice. This interaction is partially subconscious and specific to individuals. To begin with there are obvious initial prompts including suggestions by friends or partners to walk a certain route or visit a location, previous experiences, or specific point of interest seen in books or other forms of
media. The Lake District has become a world-class tourist destination, showcased by the work of Alfred Wainwright’s walking guides and increasingly evokes a romanticism associated with the landscape and social heritage, and illustrated by the literary works of William Wordsworth, Beatrix Potter and others.

‘It’s the romance? It’s the names. People have heard the names. They want to do the walk. The Lake District has that. I don’t know if it’s happened over time – I never remember it being as focal in the World. There’s programs, books – it seems to have really taken off.....They’ll go and buy the stuff – they’ll have the maps, the Wainwright books, and all that kind of stuff.’

This pull factor can reflect a ‘sense of place’ and during the interviews was also attributed to other obvious tourist areas such as The Peak Districts, Cornwall, Snowdonia and Scotland, and additionally perhaps less obvious walking areas:

‘Everywhere’s got its magic. A lot of people like the North Pennines AONB, which is almost ignored by the world at large, but if you want to see wildlife in Northumbria, the wildlife is far better, and the geology is fascinating but not many people come with that.’

The draw of these areas to walkers is sometimes a product of popularity, but respondents also suggested the lack of popularity of quieter locations is precisely the reason why they are desirable.

In addition to pure experiential motivations, there are a series of ‘situational factors’ which affect route-choice, both before and during walks. Weather is an obvious factor. Rain, wind and cold temperatures can be a deterrent, but as uncovered in the previous section, some respondents suggested poor weather can form part of the holistic experience. Certain decision elements relate to practical considerations including: transport access to certain routes, the distance of the intended walk from a home or holiday base and the availability of information about how to access a particular walk.
Other situational factors are location specific. Uncertainty over access to certain rural routes was a recurring theme. This can be partially explained by relatively recent changes in the UK following the 2000 Countryside Rights of Way Act (see chapter 3). Confidence over access is partially associated with an individual’s level of experience and knowledge regarding the law on walking in certain places. Physical barriers such as stiles, farms, fences or roads are common in situ deterrents which also affect route-choice. More general dislikes include conflicts with other users such as horse riders or cyclists, encountering cattle, large amounts of litter on routes and having to negotiate barbed wire fences. Perceptions of these issues range from mild irritation to more major disturbance which can adversely influence overall satisfaction with the walking experience. Other problems, such as extremely poor surfaces, can completely stop the walk.

Wider factors in a decision chain can be specific to individuals or groups of walkers. Clearly, route-choices are made either by one individual or are based on the preferences and constraints of a number of people. One respondent suggested that although the balance of individual requirements determines the group dynamics with respect to route-choice, certain individuals may exert greater influence than others. The presence of children or adults with limited mobility within groups can also be important.

As stated earlier, when discussing serious and casual walkers, individual preferences are also determined by lifestyle factors such as available free time in the day, working hours and the proximity of a walker’s residence to suitable and desirable walking areas. These considerations will ultimately orchestrate any decision made on which walk will be taken and when. A further element relates to whether there is a specific purpose which needs to be fulfilled on a walk. Sometimes the main or subsidiary purposes of walks are more functional such as the need to exercise a dog. This tests conceptual boundaries of defining a walk for recreation or tourism, as it can be debated whether the walk is functional, for pleasure, or both. Several respondents emphasised the importance of deriving pleasure from functional walking. This is a conceptual
matter in that a walk may be thought of as functional to one person, yet to another their route may be chosen because even though the walk has to be taken for whatever reason, it may be a choice between the most convenient route to fulfil that purpose or selected to make it more enjoyable. In the end this must be considered a decision which is assessed differently by individuals.

5.4.4 Supply of Resources for walking and the Lake District context

By interviewing a set of people involved in supplying resources for walking it was possible to build a picture of how practitioners respond to perceived elements of demand. Walking is a fundamental part of the rural tourism product. Increasingly, walks are being documented, packaged and marketed. Printed material is often used to stimulate participation in walking, particularly for tourists to explore destinations. Often publicity will seek to link advertised walks in a tourist region to surrounding and nearby attractions. It was generally felt amongst respondents that ‘serious’ walkers required little in the way of marketing. Increasingly, walkers are using electronic sources of information. This is particularly the case for domestic day visitors and regular recreational walkers. The mediums include websites containing walks described by both designers and visitors to the sites, PDF route descriptions, downloadable routes for i-technology and GPS navigational equipment. The popularity of online forums devoted to walking suggests a significant community exists.

In more abstract terms, marketing for walking tourism areas often draws on the areas ‘sense of place’. The Lake District National Park has benefitted from the popularity of the Wainwright fell guides to such an extent that they can be considered as one of the key influences in contemporary popularity of the area:

‘I think one of the reasons why people come here. You mention Wainwright. Now it’s TV programs, Julia Bradbury.....They really do bring it to life....You can’t blame him. He’s the reason – part of the reason why it’s become so popular. There’s obviously lots of
other reasons. Increase in available time, increased mobility and so on. But the Lakes is just incredibly busy. Virtually all year round.’

It was suggested by some respondents that the brand appeal in established tourism areas results in a high proportion of ‘casual’ walkers on more infrequent walks. There is a subsequent issue regarding preservation of the natural environment and the physical effects of large numbers of walkers in one location. Destination management frequently involves integrating conservation by using route classification to keep larger numbers in well managed routes.

Sustainability was a prominent supply-related theme, and there was a significant focus on transport. In many cases, walkers will travel long distances for a particular walking experience and the private car is the dominant mode.

‘Because I’ve got to get in the car to go anywhere to walk. And so therefore I don’t bother, whereas I used to be able to walk into the countryside from the doorstep.’

This trend is based on habitual behaviour, although the underlying mental processes are complex. Prominent reasons for choosing the car as the main mode of transport for walks included living away from walking areas and the relative inconvenience associated with alternative modes. In the Lake District National Park a particular issue is the relatively poor provision for public transport to walking locations:

‘But we still hear grumbles that the public transport is not good enough, and to access walks...which I can sympathise with – they’re not particularly...especially in areas like Borrowdale, really rural areas.’

In tourist areas, particularly, pressure is exerted on natural settings by high car dependency amongst walkers. This complicated problem requires a multi-faceted solution, and in addition to ‘hard’ measures such as reduced parking space or increased fees, local authorities and other sustainable organisations have increased persuasive marketing to increase sustainable travel amongst tourists. This includes devising branded routes combining linear walks with public transport and leaflet or poster campaigns to promote the health and well-being benefits
associated with walking and cycling. Respondents consider that there is a higher likelihood of persuading certain segments of society who are more susceptible to these message. The discourse suggests that these groups of people include older people, ‘casual’ walkers, and families.

‘Well it’s quite useful. It’s all about getting people out of cars. So it’s more about public transport. But I think it has a similar message for walkers, and it shows you that group that’s at tipping point almost and that’s leisure walkers, essentially. Youngish families. So they’re the type of people you’re most likely to get on public transport. Not the super eager mountain walkers who know what they are going to do….I think you get a lot of people who have made the connection, that walking and the environment are linked so they actively get on buses, but I still think there’s a long way to go.’

An additional supply-related theme surrounded the role of local businesses and the interface between demand and supply. Walkers, like any other tourist, are important to retail, attractions and food and drink providers. Accommodation is particularly relevant for the long-distance walking market, who complete trails and require accommodation at each day-stage.

Some accommodation providers see the one-night stay as restrictive and enforce a requirement to stay two nights, particularly in busier tourist areas. To retain the custom of long-distance walkers, some providers will offer transport from the end of the second ‘leg’ and back to the start of the third to ensure a second night. Additionally, walking event organisers use walking to spread tourism into midweeks and off-season to benefit local business.
5.4.5 Summary of the section: the factors which affect route-choice

The discussions on route-choice elicited a greater complexity in the process, than the explorations into segmentation of walkers. As such, when considering route-choice, the factors involved in segmentation have their own influence. For example, a lot of the findings on route-choice were directly related to which walks were preferable to certain segments of walkers. To further increase the level of intricacy perceived by respondents, there are also conceptual issues over where the decision over choice of route is made by an individual, a group, or a specific combination within a group. A distinction must also be made over firstly a location to walk, for example, a specific valley or area; and secondly, a precise route. In some cases the decision to decide on one is dependent on the other.

The discussion illustrated the importance of achievability in route-choice, which again reflects individual characteristics such as ability, experience, or personal motivations. Sensory experiences relating to the landscape, historic and cultural elements of the route and in some cases landmarks or specific points of interest could be considered as immediate motivations to select a route before other issues such as situational factors are considered. Additionally, the authenticity of the landscape has an influence, and there are differences between the expectations of individuals in terms of whether natural or managed routes are favoured. Perceptions of functionality in walking and comparisons between the level of recreational value in urban or rural locations remain aspects for conceptual debate.

Thus, it is assumed that for any particular walk there is a hierarchy of factors at play, which interact to determine the eventual choice of route. If this choice is purely based on experiential expectations, then the choice may be easier to predict. However a number of situational factors also have influence. They may be external to the walk, such as available free time, proximity of one’s home or holiday base to suitable walking areas, or other lifestyle aspects such as job role; or in situ, based on physical barriers on the walk such as access or management. The
composition of the group (for example, the presence of young children), is also instrumental in the eventual choice of route.

Working in tandem with the factors from the ‘demand’ perspective of walkers, there are also ‘supply’ influences framing route options. They include some management elements which affect the level of ‘wilderness’ on offer to more serious walkers, or the comfort and access to amenities which is perhaps favoured by more casual walkers. Also important are the provision of information, mapping, management policy and the role of local accommodation, attraction and food and drink businesses play in the flow of walking tourists on particular routes and in certain locations. Transport and sustainable tourism policy are increasingly influential in areas such as the Lake District in determining the numbers and type of people who can or choose to access walking locations. The factors discussed here will be combined in the discussion in the next chapter which seeks to draw together segmentation and route-choice to posit a design for quantitative stage of research.

5.5 Conclusions from the first stage of primary data collection

The purpose of this research exercise was to build a theoretical framework to categorise walkers and draw out factors which determine route-choice for walking. Grounded theory interviews could be considered as an independent piece of research in itself. An exploration of the walking world has been undertaken, which is thorough in terms of the respondents’ individual interface with the market. It is a perspective of the walking world from the suppliers of resources, but as many of them are walkers themselves they are part of the fabric. It is also suggested that they became part of this research itself, being vested in many of the questions that arose. An overall picture of the study focus has been brought together by researcher and the researched, although because of the many different perspectives from each individual respondent, the range of observations on each element of study is broad. This leads to further questions such as: ‘Can pleasure be derived from functional walking?’, ‘Is there a typology?’, ‘Does the pace of walking
set it apart from other modes of travel or activity in terms of the derived experience? and so on.

Walking is a complicated activity to study if one looks at the reasons why people partake. General interests in the surroundings, destinations, people mix with the desire for social experiences, healthy living, challenging oneself, and even sport if the more extreme forms of walking are considered. The result is a different set of motivations for everyone and hence a different experience sought.

Grouping people becomes more complicated when a closer look is taken at their characteristics. On the surface, gender, age and interests make more simple and concrete starting points. However, after hours of discussion with experts a theme of confidence was at the core of many of their observations of aspects relating to walkers and walking. Confidence and experience of walking are closely related, and looking forward to future study, one must consider that as confidence is rather hard to measure in an individual, then their level of experience must be looked at. Superimposing the categories of casual and serious walkers over other categories draws these ideas together into a form of continuum which also encompasses behavioural traits such as information sought, preferences on routes, and the theory that walkers may progress up (or down) the scale, based on their confidence. Navigation is also affected, ranging from maps, books and guides (serious walkers, high confidence) to leaflets and guided walks (casual, less confident).

Using ‘casual’ and ‘serious’ to describe walkers was a commonality amongst the respondents. For a serious walker, walking is an identity or way of life, rather than for other tourists, who are considered more casual in their interests, an activity undertaken on holiday or day trip. The concepts of ownership of an activity and autonomy in terms of being away from the masses also sit close to serious walking. There was some consensus over the existence of two discrete
groups, but other divergences of opinion when the exact nature of this was discussed. It becomes a more philosophical question about whether to look for separate groups or accept that everybody is slightly unique in their walking habits, attitudes and characteristics.

Route-choice and preference for location are also multidimensional concepts. Walkers’ characteristics are intrinsically linked to uncovering the decisions they make. The visual preferences of each walker, variety of scenery and landscape in the mind’s eye of the decision maker provide the basis for route-choice decisions, layered over the needs of the group, the circumstances and expectations on the day and in life in general. For each walk, there is a decision chain to unravel, and some elements will dominate that decision more than others.

So what are the questions to be asked going forward? The findings of this stage of data collection can to an extent drive the next stage, as chronologically, this research was carried out first. But some of the aims, approach, and findings from stage one differ as stage two seeks to look at the walkers rather than the suppliers. The two stages must also be considered complimentary, yet distinct. The next chapter details the quantitative approach to investigating walkers and route-choice.
Chapter 6

Survey results:

Segmentation of recreational walkers in the English Lake District

6.1 Introduction to the chapter

The previous chapter discussed in detail the findings of the grounded theory interviews with walking professionals. The findings provided a few conceptual ideas to take forward:

- that walkers differ in characteristics;
- grouping walkers is complicated and involves the interaction of a number of factors;
- confidence plays a role in differentiating individuals and their actions with regards to walking;
- and route choice is dependent on a balance of different factors.

This chapter will detail how these ideas fed into the survey design in the second stage of data collection. The significant focus of analysis is the characterisation and segmentation of walkers, based on the results of a year-long survey questionnaire of recreational walkers in the Lake District.

It is necessary to begin by examining the findings of the interviews once again, and explain in depth how they informed the research questions used in the design of the survey questionnaire. Section 6.2 aims to bridge the gap between both pieces of research and explain the thought process of the researcher upon analysing the interviews and concurrently designing the questionnaire. The details of the survey return are displayed in section 6.3. Section 6.4 will then give an in-depth account of the survey analysis process on segmenting walkers, from the characteristics of the sample, to the further analysis process which resulted in conclusions being
made on the existence of a typology. This part of the research will then be summarised in section 6.5, leading on to the next chapter in which the route choice analysis will be addressed.

6.2 Building the survey from the findings of the interviews

The first stage interviews identified a number of characteristics which walkers display, and which can be tested in terms of their use for grouping recreational walkers. In addition, a range of factors which influence route choice were brought to light. Whilst both segmentation and route choice were identified as complex processes, and a number of conceptual questions were also raised, the analysis provided a set of parameters to construct the research design for the second stage of research. An in-depth account of how the interviews linked to the survey design is provided in the appendices. This section will draw these factor-groups and characteristics together in a meaningful way, in order to structure the approach to the design of the survey of recreational walkers.

6.2.1 Development of a conceptual model

The fundamental elements can be reduced to three: the walker, the route, and the choice (that the walker makes in choosing the route). In the case of accompanied walks, walking partners also have an influence on any decision made. Before the choice of route is made, a walker has been subject to a number of influences which, to some extent, all affect the choice made. Using the main elements of the interview findings, figure 6.1 (below) seeks to order the key factors which define groups of walking tourists, and affect route-choice in a walking trip. They represent individual characteristics (demographics) and socio-economic characteristics, which may affect route-choice. They also encompass the mental and physical characteristics of the individual which determine the type of experience they seek when choosing a walk.
Ability is based firstly on physical condition, or perhaps more accurately an individual’s own perception of their personal level of fitness and ability to complete a route. Secondly it is based on navigational ability, drawn from previous experience. Based on the interview findings, this is considered as the main combination of attributes which determines an individual’s level of confidence. The analysis also identified other ‘non-walking’ influences on confidence: a ‘natural level of confidence’ (meaning, each individual has to some degree a distinct level of confidence), which can also be determined by previous life experiences and events. These will have indirectly affected what for simplicity’s sake will be defined here as ‘walking confidence’. Thus, in the
conscious choice of a walking route, the individual will predominantly be considering their own ability to complete the route.

In addition to individual confidence and self-analysed ability, the choice of route is dictated by preferences for a particular experience. An individual will consider any other barriers which may prevent them from certain choices, either relating to themselves (such as available time to commit to completing the walk) or the location itself (transport, access, weather etc.). At this point, it can be presumed that the individual will have all the necessary information ready to decide on the level of risk or challenge firstly that they desire from this particular trip, and secondly, that can be feasibly achieved given the circumstances. This process is applicable to solo or group walking, with the choice either determined by the individual, or the individual within the group (this assumes that it is the individual’s choice to walk with the group and follow the same decision making process).

The route or location is then decided upon using these choice sets. One extra element has been added to the model, place attachment. This is included because each walking experience has some influence on the cumulative experience of walkers and will be an element which may affect future trips. There will also be ‘non-walking’ influences on place attachment, perhaps a certain nostalgia for a location, and a need to return there to walk.

The model posited above is simplistic in some senses, but conveys the main elements drawn out from the research. It can at this stage be accepted as a realistic starting point in representation of the choice process. In order to construct a research instrument which reflects the more complex elements surrounding both the segmentation of walkers and route choice, the individual components must be broken down further.
6.2.2 Building the research instrument

Figure 6.2 seeks to draw the main elements from figure 6.1, and other factors highlighted in the literature review and interviews together in a more practical way in order to achieve the two main research goals: (a) the typology of walkers and (b) the model of route choice.
Figure 6.2: Relationships between grouping factors and route choice – preparation for the survey
The first process, constructing the typology, occupies the top two thirds of the diagram visually. This framework is based on past and present factors on the vertical dimension and the characteristics of walkers and outside influences on the horizontal. These characteristics are further divided on both dimensions into ‘walking’ and ‘general’ (non-walking). The model therefore includes the influences of historical walking experiences and their cumulative influence on current walking preferences and behaviour. In the second stage survey, the questions were designed to ascertain past and current influences in this sense:

- **Past influences**: introduction to walking (with family as a child, at school, college / university, walking groups, as an adult with friends or colleagues)

- **Present walking-related attributes**: (gauged on a 5 point Likert scale) confidence and ability (being an ‘experienced’ walker), ‘seriousness’ (‘I am a serious walker’) or ‘casualness’ (‘Walking is a casual interest of mine’), navigational ability (map-reading)

- **Demographic characteristics**: age, gender, occupation, postcode

- **Current walking attitudes and behaviour**:
  - types and frequency of walks undertaken in the last 28 days / last year: short stroll (1 hour or less), half day walk (1-4 hours), full day walk (4 or more hours), more than one day, circular, linear, hill, low level, urban, organised group walk and walking holiday.
  - navigational or information preferences: map and compass, route card, leaflet, guide books, GIS, internet), gear preferences (walking equipment, footwear)
  - preferences, gaged on 5 point Likert scale
    - Goal-seeking (‘Walking, for me, is about achieving goals’)
    - Comfort-seeking (‘Comfort is important whilst walking’)
    - Discovery-seeking (‘Discovery and learning about surroundings is important when I walk’)
    - Weather-resilience (‘I don’t mind some poor weather when walking’)  
    - Nostalgia-seeking (‘Today’s walk helped me re-live past memories’)
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Wilderness-seeking (‘I like to look for less obvious places when walking’)

Solo / pair / group walking preferred

- attitudes
  - Utility (‘I take pleasure from my utility walking trips (such as walking to work or dog walking’))
  - Pace (‘The pace of walking allows me to see more detail than other modes (such as cycling or car travel’))
  - Environmental awareness (‘I have a strong interest in conserving the natural environment’)
  - Desire to walk more: (‘I would like to walk more’)

- Situational variables (5-point Likert-scale)
  - Walking area (‘I live in a walking area’)
  - Limitations to walking (‘My chances to walk for recreation are limited’)
  - Mood/energy (‘The walks I choose are dependent on my mood and energy levels’)

The second process, the model of route choice assumes that the typology will demonstrate particular preferences for walks attributed to different sets of walkers. The questions relating to this in the second stage survey were based on the walk undertaken on the day of the survey. The walker and the walking location are the central elements. The walker has a set of preferences which manifest their expectations of the day’s walk which are based on the characteristics of the location and route they choose. Situational factors on the day are an additional influence. The questions which form the route-choice element of the survey are grouped as follows:

- **Walk characteristics:** duration, distance, difficulty, hill or low level, circular or linear
- **Location characteristics:** remoteness, transport accessibility, area in the National Park
Walker’s preferences:

- **Situational factors**: weather, time of week, time of year, on holiday or walking holiday, transport mode, distance from home or holiday base
- **Group characteristics**: With friends, solo or organised group, group composition (number of males / females / adults / children), group size, decision maker in the group
- **Logistical factors**: transport mode, planning and information
- **Motivations and preferences**: scenery, completing section of a long-distance trail, point of interest, seen it in a guide, time spent with family and friends, local history, wildlife, photographic interest, exercise, general recreation, convenience, flexibility to change route, level of management (signage etc), amenities, path surface, well-managed paths, accessibility, knowledge of rights of way

The survey was implemented using questions which provided data for these variables. These data were the basis of the typology and the route choice model.

6.3 **Survey response details**

The survey was administered in 24 locations around the study area, The English Lake District National Park, over a period of 12 months in 2012. The survey sites were chosen to provide a balanced geographical spread, encapsulate both busier and less frequented areas, and reflect a mixture of different ‘types’ of walkers. The weather, tourist season and location of survey all had influences on the number of walkers seen by the researcher on certain days and thus also the number of surveys given out. This was clear from observations of the surveyor and conversations on the day between the researcher and tourists, regular walkers, car-park officers and other practitioners at survey sites in the National Park who knew from experience, how such variables would affect the number of walkers. Table 6.1 below outlines the survey sites and how
a representative weekday / weekend and seasonal balance of respondents was attained, plus
observations of the weather and temperature. To summarise, the objective of completing
surveys on weekdays and weekends for each calendar month was achieved, but the weather
and temperature was variable, even in the summer months. This impacted the response rates.

Table 6.1: Breakdown of survey sites, times and conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day type</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Precipitation</th>
<th>Cloud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grasmere Red Bank</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walna Scar Car Park, Coniston</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Very cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirlmere Reservoir</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Very heavy</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockhole Visitor Centre</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aira Force</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haweswater</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeon Ghyll Car park</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatoller</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elterwater</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasmere Red Bank</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasdale Head</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>Very heavy</td>
<td>Very overcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennridding (near visitor centre)</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>Showers</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whinlatter</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennerdale</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermere Car park</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Quite overcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarn Hows</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdale car parks</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Very heavy</td>
<td>Very overcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarn Hows and Coniston</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Very heavy</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere, Orrest Head and Brant Fell</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowdale</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Heavy Rain</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elterwater, Skelwith</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge and Loughrigg</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>Showers</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullswater</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Coniston, and Tilberthwaite</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Light showers</td>
<td>Quite overcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambleside, Rydal and Loughrigg</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Quite cold</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2: Breakdown of survey responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number seen</th>
<th>Number given out</th>
<th>Number received</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grasmere Red Bank</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walna Scar Car Park, Coniston</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirlmere Reservoir</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockhole Visitor Centre</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aira Force</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haweswater</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeon Ghyll Car park</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatoller</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elterwater</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasmere Red Bank</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasdale Head</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennridding (near visitor centre)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whinlatter</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennerdale</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermere Car park</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarn Hows</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdale car parks</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarn Hows and Coniston</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere, Orrest Head and Brant Fell</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowdale</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elterwater, Skelwith Bridge and Loughrigg</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullswater</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Coniston, Tilberthwaite etc</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambleside and Rydal</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 details the response rates. In total 518 survey questionnaires were received. As such the main indication of the footfall of walking locations on each survey day can be drawn from the number of walkers seen by the surveyor. They ranged from 14 at Ullswater, on a quiet November weekday to 522 at Elterwater on a hot Sunday in May. There was a degree of variation between sites in terms of response numbers, which can be explained in part by the situational variables detailed above. For example, the survey in September at Tarn Hows and Coniston was characterised by torrential rain and therefore no surveys were returned from that day.
It was important for the surveyor to engage with the respondents for at least a few seconds and build some kind of rapport, to ensure the highest chance of the survey being returned. At Brockhole in February, despite 144 surveys being issued, only 13 were returned (9% response rate). This was due to this being a busy site, where visitors were staying for short periods of the day, and walking was unlikely to be their main activity. Many people took surveys with the surveyor unable to engage in conversation longer than a few seconds with respondents.

The approach of the surveyor was to use car-parks as a base, primarily at the start and the end of the day and in between times, walk on the most frequented routes in the area, which intersect as many of the possible routes as could be achieved. At Wasdale Head, in July, the respondents were mostly in the middle section of a 24 hour 3 peaks challenge (Ben Nevis in Scotland, Scafell Pike in England, Snowdon in Wales) and therefore too preoccupied with the event (rather than recreational walking per se) to fill out a survey, hence the low return rate on that day. It is speculated that in the areas characterised by more people doing longer walks, the chances of engagement regarding the subject matter of the survey were higher. The overall average response rate was 31.5%, an acceptable return for a survey of this nature.

Table 6.3 below summarises responses by weekend / weekday and by month. Unsurprisingly, more respondents were seen at the weekend. However the response rate was better in the week. It is unclear why this is the case, although it might be suggested that people who walk on weekdays are more committed to walking as an activity and were therefore more interested in looking at the survey. The months of May and August saw very busy days with warm weather, at Elterwater (May), Buttermere and Tarn Hows (both August) which explains high numbers. In June and July, usually busy months, the weekend surveys were at Wasdale and Ennerdale in the Western Lakes which are quieter sites. The numbers were lower overall in the last four months as the weather was poor in general.
Table 6.3: Responses broken down by weekend / weekday and month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number seen</th>
<th>Number given out</th>
<th>Number received</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Univariate analysis: Characteristics of the sample

6.4.1 Sample demographics

A full analysis of each variable was conducted. Demographic distributions are displayed in table 6.4. The results indicated a sample which was weighted toward the older age groups with 72.9% between the ages of 45 and 74. This reflects comments recorded in the interview findings about walking generally being an activity for older people. The gender split is slightly weighted towards males. It is suspected that this was because the surveyor was male and therefore subconsciously engaged with males in the groups of people encountered slightly more often. The distribution of occupations reflects the older age groups a high number are retired. As such, the demographic balance of the sample is in keeping with the observations of the surveyor, and the expected population of walkers in the Lake District National Park, and more generally, the UK.
Table 6.4: Sample demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (n=508)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-74</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (n=500)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation (n=507)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part time</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.2 Walking activity

Table 6.5: Walking activity over the four weeks prior to being surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of walk</th>
<th>Mean number of walks in the last four weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short stroll (1 hour or less) (n=398)</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part day (1-4 hours) (n=420)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day walk (Over 4 hours) (n=389)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two day or more walk (n=315)</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill walking (n=395)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level walking (n=399)</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban recreational walking (n=337)</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk (n=358)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance trail (n=342)</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular walk (n=377)</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear walk (n=301)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday /short break</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=126)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of variables tested gave indications of the walking preferences in the sample. Table 6.5 details the walking activity of respondents over the past four weeks, before the day of the survey. Short strolls (categorised as walks lasting less than 1 hour) were the most frequent.
choice of walk. A mean of 12.5 short strolls in the time period suggested that on average, people undertake short walks frequently, approximately once every two days. In comparison longer walks were less frequent, reflecting the time constraints experienced by a proportion of the sample. A full day walk is on average undertaken less than once every two weeks and only a small percentage of people engage in walks longer than a full day.

Respondents reported more than twice as many low level walks in the previous 28 days than hill walks. Unsurprisingly, circular walks were a lot more frequent than linear. Urban walks are also, in comparison, undertaken frequently, whilst long distance trail walks are rare, which is in keeping with the small niche interested in this type of walking activity. These results reflect the range of different walks people are interested in and many respondents reported variable durations. The fact that these are only estimates must be taken into consideration, however. For example a frequent walker may not completely accurately recall the number of ‘short strolls’ they have undertaken in the time frame.

Table 6.6: Navigation preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigation type</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map and compass - design route by self</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=472)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide book (n=474)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet (n=462)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route card (n=442)</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet (n=443)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS or other technology (n=432)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan) (n=470)</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in table 6.6, the most important means of navigation was a map and compass, with almost half (42.2%) of the sample stating they used this often or always, although the most frequent answer was ‘occasionally’. A small minority of just over a quarter never used maps. More people overall used guide books (91.6%), but they mostly responded as using them for
navigation ‘occasionally’ or ‘often’

Walking leaflets were a more occasional means of navigation (75.7% occasional use or often). Route cards were ‘never’ used by more than half of the respondents. A number of people stated that their walks were chosen spontaneously, with no particular plan (65.1% occasionally or often). GPS is still widely ignored (81% never use it). The internet, however, appears to be a source which is being used at least occasionally to plan walks. Overall relatively low numbers of people use any kind of navigational aid always, and it is more likely that a combination of means are preferred. These results indicate that walks are characterised by a diversity of navigational aids.

Table 6.7: Solo or group walking preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solo or group walking</th>
<th>Solo (n=501)</th>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 shows that most people usually walk in a pair. A smaller number usually walk solo, or in a group larger than two people. In terms of other walking related material (table 6.8), equipment was important to the majority of people. This was especially the case with high specification footwear where, almost half of the sample scored 5 on a 5 point Likert Scale (5 being the highest level of agreement). High specification clothing was also important: 89.7% of respondents scored between 3 and 5 on the Likert Scale. Only a small minority of 14.7% scored between 3 and 5 when asked about the importance of buying walking-related reading material regularly (ie magazines). The use of footwear and clothing is therefore of some importance to almost the full range of walkers.
Table 6.8: Preference for walking related material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of walking-related material (Likert Scale: 1= not important; 5=very important)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High specification walking clothing (n=502)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High specification walking footwear (n=506)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying walking-related reading material regularly (ie magazines) (n=491)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although, in general, none of the gateways to walking scored high on the Likert scale, school (26.9%), joining a walking group (16.1%) and walking clubs at college or university (8.4%) were the lowest scoring origins, in terms of scores between 3-5 (table 6.9). Walking with family during childhood or with friends or work colleagues produced a more even split of responses across the Likert scale. This suggests that origins are perhaps more diverse and complicated than anticipated in the design of the survey.

Table 6.9: Gateways to recreational walking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of gateways to recreational walking (Likert Scale: 1= not important; 5=very important)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family took me walking a lot as a child (n=465)</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I went walking with school (n=446)</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined a walking club at college / university (n=429)</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined another walking club (ie Ramblers) (n=436)</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I started walking with friends / work colleagues (n=456)</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3 Preferences, motivations and attitudes on walking

A series of Likert scale questions sought to gauge individual walkers’ perceptions regarding the importance of certain motivations for walking, preferences, their level of experience (a proxy for confidence), and the relevance of their own feelings about walking and the relevance of
several situational factors on their walking behaviour. The results of this are in table 6.10 and table 6.11. There is a polarity between the distribution of scores for ‘experience’ (a mode of 5) and ‘casualness’ (a mode of 1), and curiously, ‘seriousness’ is centred on a mode of 3. At this point, the distribution across the 5 points for each of these categories suggests that the sample is characterised by a range of levels of interest in walking.

Table 6.10: Likert score results relating to statements on characteristics and motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement with motivational statements (Likert Scale: 1= not important; 5=very important)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence and experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (‘I am an experienced walker’) (n=489)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td><strong>34.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Seriousness’ (‘I am a serious walker’) (n=481)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td><strong>27.7%</strong></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Casualness’ (‘I am a casual walker’) (n=473)</td>
<td><strong>24.5%</strong></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivations and preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-seeking (‘Walking, for me, is about achieving goals’) (n=478)</td>
<td><strong>32.8%</strong></td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort-seeking (‘Comfort is important whilst walking’) (n=489)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td><strong>32.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery-seeking (‘Discovery and learning about surroundings is important when I walk’) (n=488)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td><strong>36.8%</strong></td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather-resilience (‘I don’t mind some poor weather when walking’) (n=492)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td><strong>35.0%</strong></td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia-seeking (‘Today’s walk helped me re-live past memories’) (n=477)</td>
<td><strong>41.3%</strong></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness-seeking (‘I like to look for less obvious places when walking’) (n=479)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td><strong>29.2%</strong></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motivation for comfort whilst walking is the highest average distribution, with 92.5% of the sample scoring between 3 and 5. Comfort could be construed in a number of ways: less experienced walkers perhaps see comfort as the walk not being strenuous, or instead; more serious walkers perceive comfort of walking boots and other clothing as of importance. Other motivations are more evenly split, such as discovery-seeking. This suggests a range of interest in this particular aspect of the experience. Nostalgia-seeking and goal-seeking generally score lower in the sample, indicating a small minority who find these motivations important. Weather
resilience and wilderness-seeking, conversely score relatively higher on the scale. They are, in this sense, considered more important elements of the walking experience overall.

Most people are in strong agreement that they would like to walk more (90% scored between 3-5). Additionally a majority of approximately 68% of respondents (scores of 4 or 5) believe walking to be a mode of transport which provides a heightened experience of the surroundings. There is a more polarised view of whether walking for utility is an enjoyable experience, however. This reflects the continuum of instrumental and intrinsic motivations for travel. The sample generally scored higher for ‘I live in a walking area’ and lower for ‘my chances to walk are limited’. This suggests that many people in the sample have the opportunity to walk, but it is unclear whether or not there is a relationship between a tendency for walking tourism and living in a walking area.

Table 6.11: Likert score results relating to statements on characteristics and motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement with motivational statements (Likert Scale: 1= not important; 5=very important)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong> (‘I take pleasure from my utility walking trips (such as walking to work or dog walking)’) (n=469)</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pace</strong> (‘The pace of walking allows me to see more detail than other modes (such as cycling or car travel)’) (n=488)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental awareness</strong> (‘I have a strong interest in conserving the natural environment’) (n=486)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to walk more</strong> (‘I would like to walk more’) (n=482)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking area</strong> (‘I live in a walking area’) (n=489)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations to walking</strong> (‘My chances to walk for recreation are limited’) (n=477)</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mood/energy</strong> (‘The walks I choose are dependent on my mood and energy levels’) (n=485)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Further analysis: assessing factors for grouping walkers

6.5.1 Principal Component Analysis

Table 6.12: Highest correlations between characteristics of walkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Seriousness’</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>‘Seriousness’</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Casualness’</td>
<td>-0.540</td>
<td>Motivation: wilderness-seeking</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: wilderness-seeking</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>Navigation: Map and compass</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Map and compass</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>‘Casualness’</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of footwear</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>Started walking with friends/colleagues</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: goal-seeking</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of clothing</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the variables based on characteristics, (demographic characteristics, walking preferences, activity and attitudinal data), a correlation matrix was produced as a pre-cursor to factor analysis. Table 6.12 shows the highest scoring correlated pairs of variables. ‘Seriousness’ (agreement with the statement ‘I am a serious walker’) and experience (‘I am an experienced walker’) were the highest correlated pair (0.7). Given the importance of confidence as discovered in the first stage of research, these are two of the most important variables reflecting the themes within the analysis of walking. It is has already been considered in chapter 5 that both of these attributes are a reflection of confidence, but their high correlation here also suggests they are similar characteristics, at least in the perceptions of respondents. The high negative correlation of both these attributes with ‘casualness’ (‘walking is a casual interest of mine’): highlights the potential polarisation of ‘casual’ and ‘serious’ walking / ‘casual’ and ‘serious’ walkers, also suggested in the findings of the interviews. The desire to seek out less obvious places and a preference for using a map and compass to design walks are attributes which correlate strongly with both ‘seriousness’ and experience. The correlation analysis also suggests that clothing, footwear and seeking out goals are aspects which characterise ‘serious walkers’, but not to the same extent ‘experienced walkers’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st variable</th>
<th>2nd variable</th>
<th>Correlation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lives in a walking area</td>
<td>Opportunities for walking are limited</td>
<td>-0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in a walking area</td>
<td>Finds pleasure in utility walking</td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of comfort whist walking</td>
<td>Importance of footwear</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: Discovery-seeking</td>
<td>Associates the pace with heightened experience (in comparison to other modes)</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: Discovery-seeking</td>
<td>Environmentally aware</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: Discovery-seeking</td>
<td>Desire to walk more</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates the pace with heightened experience (in comparison to other modes)</td>
<td>Environmentally aware</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood/energy affect likelihood of walking</td>
<td>‘Casualness’</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: wilderness-seeking</td>
<td>Navigation: Map and compass</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: wilderness-seeking</td>
<td>‘Casualness’</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally aware</td>
<td>Desire to walk more</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Map and compass</td>
<td>Importance of clothing</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Map and compass</td>
<td>Importance of footwear</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Guide</td>
<td>Navigation: Leaflet</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Leaflet</td>
<td>Navigation: Route card</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Internet</td>
<td>Navigation: GPS</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation: Internet</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of clothing</td>
<td>Importance of footwear</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were other high correlations between variables other than experience or seriousness, as shown in Table 6.13. Use of leaflets, guides and route-cards for navigation are associated with each other. The utilisation of GPS and the internet are correlated to a reasonable extent (0.379), but the use of the internet is negatively correlated with higher age groups (0.356). Another cluster of correlated variables includes motivations for: discovery (‘discovery and learning about surroundings is important when I walk’), the importance of pace (‘The pace of walking allows me to see more detail than other modes (such as cycling or car travel)’), the desire to walk more and a higher awareness for conserving the natural environment. They are all relatively highly positively correlated. These experiential elements are therefore related in the perceptions of walking tourists.
Some of the attributes associated with ‘serious’ and experienced walkers detailed above also correlate highly with each other: wilderness-seeking, using a map and compass and the importance of buying walking footwear and clothing. This further suggests that these characteristics are distinct to more serious walkers, as does the negative correlation between ‘casualness’ and wilderness seeking (-0.439).

Table 6.14: Details of Principal component analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of PCA</th>
<th>Variables removed (under 0.5 in the anti-image correlation matrix)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First stage of PCA</td>
<td>Lives in a walking area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO score: 0.578</td>
<td>Opportunities for walking are limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Sphericity: 0.000</td>
<td>Navigation: Leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navigation: Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mood/energy affect likelihood of walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navigation: GPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Started walking at college or university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second stage of PCA</td>
<td>Navigation: Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO score: 0.656</td>
<td>Navigation: Guide book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Sphericity: 0.000</td>
<td>Started walking with family / as a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Started walking at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third stage of PCA</td>
<td>Motivation: Discovery-seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO score: 0.7</td>
<td>Associates the pace with heightened experience (in comparison to other modes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Sphericity: 0.000</td>
<td>Importance of footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Started walking with friends / work colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Component Analysis (PCA), a type of factor analysis was then made using all characteristic variables. This method was selected to more rigorously test for patterns in the data, and used SPSS software package. The important statistics relating to the test procedure are detailed in table 6.14. As the initial correlation matrix contained more than two values above 0.3 and the sample size was well in excess of the necessary 150 cases, the use of this method was valid. All outlier cases were carefully removed from the dataset before the first round of PCA. The settings included displaying KMO scores (Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure), a measure of the distribution of values (Kaiser, 1974) Bartlett’s test for Sphericity (Bartlett, 1937), a test for
equal variances and an anti-image correlation matrix, a negative matrix of covariances and correlations, which indicates the adequacy of sampling (Field, 2000, p.456).

During three rounds of PCA, the KMO score exceeded 0.5 and the score for Bartlett’s test was 0.000 in all rounds: both are essential for a significant result (Gray and Kinnear, 2012, p.612; Hinton et. al., 2014, p.347). Using the anti-image correlation matrix, at each round, variables scoring less than 0.5 were removed, as they were not prominent enough in their overall relationship with other variables, and therefore considered as not suitable for factor analysis (see Field, 2000, p.456). After three rounds, the KMO score rose to 0.7, and no factors remained under 0.5. At the end of the PCA analysis the following factors useful to a model for cluster analysis remained: ‘seriousness’, experience, ‘casualness’, motivations for goal-seeking, weather-resilience, comfort-seeking, and wilderness-seeking, and navigation with a map and compass.

6.5.2 Cluster analysis: building a typology

Cluster analysis was employed on the nine variables remaining from the PCA process. The first stage of the process involved an exploratory Hierarchical Cluster Analysis. It used squared Euclidean distance (standard Euclidean is only suitable for ratio data), with between-groups linkages as the clustering method, which are complimentary to one another (Child, 2006, p.122). The initial analysis produced several outlier variables which were removed from the dataset. All cases which contained any missed entries for any of the nine variables were then removed leaving a dataset of 429. This produced five visible clusters on the SPSS dendrogram, the visual output, which shows the relationship between clusters and the distribution of each case. Two of the five clusters were comprised of only one case (one respondent) each and they were
removed resulting in a dataset of 427, and a second round of cluster analysis was employed, resulting in 3 clusters. The dendrogram at the three-cluster stage is shown in figure 6.3.
Figure 6.3: Dendrogram at 3 clusters
Of these three clusters two were large (247 cases in group 1 and 175 in group 2) and the third group contained only five respondents. On closer inspection (figure 6.4 and figure 6.5), this third group scored high on the Likert scale for both ‘seriousness’ and ‘casualness’.

Of the two large groups, group 1 demonstrated low Likert scores for ‘seriousness’ (59.1% at 1 or 2) and ‘goal-seeking’ (69.3% at 1 or 2, see figure 6.6) and high scores for casualness (57.9% at 4...
or 5). Group 2, however showed scores which contrasted those of group 1: high scores for seriousness (80.5% at 4 or 5) and higher scores for wilderness-seeking (Group 2 included 70.9% at 4 or 5, whilst 73.8% of the respondents in group 1 scored 1, 2 or 3; see figure 6.7). Group 2 also demonstrated a more even distribution for ‘goal-seeking’ and a low score for ‘casualness’ (88.6% at 1 or 2).

Figure 6.6: Comparisons of cluster-groups for goal seeking whilst walking
Thus, a picture began to emerge suggesting distinct groups of casual and serious walkers, with some clear differences between the two main groups in terms of their seriousness vs their casualness in their approach to walking. A decision had to be made regarding the third group.

Table 6.15: Profile of cluster groups using selected motivational and characteristic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Likert score of agreement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (n=247)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (n=175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (n=247)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (n=175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (n=247)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (n=175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (n=247)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (n=175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>36 (20.6%)</td>
<td>68 (38.9%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (n=247)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>95 (38.5%)</td>
<td>45 (18.2%)</td>
<td>20 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (n=175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (3.4%)</td>
<td>15 (8.6%)</td>
<td>30 (17.1%)</td>
<td>68 (38.9%)</td>
<td>56 (32.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A one way Anova was used to ascertain differences in characteristics between the clusters (table 6.15). There was significance in the differences between groups based on the test variables (seriousness, casualness, goal-seeking, weather resilience and wilderness-seeking). However, a post-hoc comparison was required to establish which groups were significantly different to one another (detailed in table 6.16). Comparison between the condition means of groups 1-2 was significant for all five test variables. For comparison between group 3 and either of the other two, the level of significance was erratic and varied in each test. Whilst a small niche of people may exist with different motivational and characteristic attributes, it was decided that group 3 be removed, as further analysis using a group of only five people was unmanageable, and the respondents which made up this group were most likely outliers.

A third round of cluster analysis was therefore employed, using the two remaining groups (422 respondents). The switch to two clusters changed the distribution between the two groups of the sample: group 1 now consisted of 222 respondents (-25) and group 2, 200 (+25). It was unclear whether these respondents were on the margins between groups based on their distance from cluster means, and therefore confirmatory cluster analysis (K-means cluster analysis) was used to ascertain which cluster solution was the most appropriate. K-means

### Table 6.16: One-Way ANOVA and Tukey Test to assess direction of condition means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-way ANOVA</th>
<th>Tukey Test: Post-Hoc comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness</td>
<td>267.081</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualness</td>
<td>258.849</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-seeking</td>
<td>19.039</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather resilience</td>
<td>32.482</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness seeking</td>
<td>50.699</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
analyses work to *maximise the degree of association between objects in the same cluster and minimise the associations between objects in different clusters*, meaning that variability within clusters is minimised, whilst between clusters it is maximised (Samuelsen et al., 2013, p.305).

As the change in sample balance had occurred between the analysis resulting in 3 clusters to the analysis resulting in 2 clusters, the K-means analysis was operated on both samples (‘Sample A’ with 3 clusters and 427 respondents and ‘Sample B’ with 2 clusters and 422 respondents). The K-means method differs from the exploratory hierarchical clustering method in the sense that a pre-defined number of clusters is used. The results are below, in table 6.17.

### Table 6.17: K-means cluster analysis using 2 and 3 cluster solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-cluster solution</th>
<th>Three-cluster solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases in final cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of K-mean analysis iterations</td>
<td>7 Sig 0.000*** (final)</td>
<td>10+ Failed to converge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum distance between initial cluster centres</td>
<td>8.425</td>
<td>6.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the K-means analysis favour the two-cluster solution. The distribution of cases within groups using the three-cluster solution, varies widely between both sets of analysis, and the clusters did not converge after ten iterations. For the two-cluster solution, the final distribution was very similar to the analysis using the hierarchical method (A ratio of 222:200 for hierarchical clustering and 220:202 for K-means), and the centres converged after seven iterations. Using the two-step function in SPSS, a final verification showed the two-cluster solution to be of higher quality than the three-cluster solution.

Now that the two-cluster solution was established, further analysis was performed on all characteristic-based variables to ascertain significant differences between the clusters. Due to the nature of dependent variables, in most cases this involved a t-test to analyse continuous
variables. In several cases categorical variables necessitated a chi-square or ordinal variables a non-parametric test (Mann-Whitney U). These bivariate analyses on each variable are outlined in the next section, and they characterise the two cluster-groups in more depth.

6.5.3 Exploring the 2 cluster solution

6.5.3.1 The walking activity of serious and casual walkers

Table 6.18 (below) reveals the general walking activity of each group. At this stage, the nature of differences between characteristics of the two groups suggests that it is appropriate to provisionally name group 1 ‘Casual walkers’ and group 2 ‘Serious walkers’, for the purposes of this discussion. In terms of frequency of walks within the past four weeks there were significant differences for part-day walks, day walks, hill walks and organised group walks. In all these cases the means signify a greater participation in these types of walk by serious walkers. On the basis of this evidence, serious walkers engage in an average of almost two more part day walks and more than twice as many full day walks per 28 days than casual walkers. They reported more than twice as many hill walks than casual walkers and considerably more group walks, although this last measurement demonstrated low average number of walks for both groups, reinforcing the evidence that organised groups are a small niche of the whole walking market.
Table 6.18: t-test results to ascertain significant differences in walking activity between casual (group 1) and serious (group 2) walkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of walk in the past 4 weeks</th>
<th>Mean frequency (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short stroll (1 hour or less)</td>
<td>12.22 (0.904)</td>
<td>12.41 (0.919)</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part day (1-4 hours)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.292)</td>
<td>5.10 (0.570)</td>
<td>-2.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day walk (Over 4 hours)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.164)</td>
<td>2.75 (0.271)</td>
<td>-5.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two day or more walk</td>
<td>0.09 (0.065)</td>
<td>0.016 (0.040)</td>
<td>-0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill walking</td>
<td>2.00 (0.238)</td>
<td>4.08 (0.369)</td>
<td>-4.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level walking</td>
<td>7.37 (0.698)</td>
<td>7.61 (0.759)</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban recreational walking</td>
<td>7.23 (1.001)</td>
<td>6.93 (0.810)</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>0.24 (0.061)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.238)</td>
<td>-2.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance trail</td>
<td>0.37 (0.113)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.118)</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular walk</td>
<td>8.11 (0.801)</td>
<td>9.37 (0.901)</td>
<td>-1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear walk</td>
<td>2.76 (0.539)</td>
<td>2.47 (0.464)</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday / short break</td>
<td>0.84 (0.144)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.099)</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences were found between the two cluster-groups for any of the other types of walk analysed: ‘short strolls’, low level walks, circular or linear walks, or urban walks. In the case of walking holidays or long-distance trails, although there are no significant differences, small numbers of participation in any case may explain the lack of difference detected in the analysis – even the most serious of walkers are unlikely to be able to complete walks of this kind to a high frequency in a four week period. It could be speculated that people who engage in these walks represent smaller niches which would require further analysis and a more detailed line of questioning to ascertain if they form a discrete group of their own or not.

6.5.3.2 The general walking preferences of serious and casual walkers

The results of the t-test for more general walking preferences are detailed in table 6.19. A significant difference exists between the two groups for use of a map and compass. This is illustrated by a mean of almost 1 Likert point more for serious walkers than for casual walkers.

---

2 In the case of all variables marked with +, Levene’s test for variance adjusted the sample for variability, a function of the t-test procedure in SPSS (Hinton et al., 2014).
GPS is another mode of navigation which statistically was proven more important for serious walkers, although the difference between groups was not as pronounced, as both groups demonstrated a relatively low level of preference. By comparison, leaflets and to a lesser extent route cards, were statistically valued as more important navigational aids for casual walkers. The internet is a comparatively neutral source of information, it seems, as there are almost identical means and standard deviation for both groups. More serious walkers put more interest in the importance of clothing, footwear and acquiring other walking-related material. The difference was most pronounced for clothing, with serious walkers on average scoring one Likert-point higher than casual walkers. Both groups demonstrated strong agreement about the importance of good footwear, and both groups relatively low agreement on magazines and books, but in all cases there was a significant likelihood of serious walkers favouring the acquisition of walking-related equipment.
Table 6.19: t-test results to ascertain significant differences in walking preferences between casual (group 1) and serious (group 2) walkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigational preferences</th>
<th>Mean Likert score (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map and compass - design route by self</td>
<td>1.79 (0.055)</td>
<td>2.72 (0.061)</td>
<td>-11.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide book</td>
<td>2.36 (0.049)</td>
<td>2.46 (0.048)</td>
<td>-1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>2.15 (0.050)</td>
<td>1.94 (0.047)</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route card</td>
<td>1.67 (0.053)</td>
<td>1.52 (0.051)</td>
<td>2.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>1.82 (0.052)</td>
<td>1.82 (0.060)</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS or other technology</td>
<td>1.17 (0.035)</td>
<td>1.44 (0.059)</td>
<td>-3.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>2.06 (0.056)</td>
<td>1.93 (0.060)</td>
<td>1.578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of gateway to walking (5 pt Likert)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of gateway to walking (5 pt Likert)</th>
<th>Mean Likert score (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family took me walking a lot as a child</td>
<td>2.80 (1.106)</td>
<td>2.91 (1.118)</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I went walking with school</td>
<td>1.83 (0.082)</td>
<td>1.94 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined a walking club at college / university</td>
<td>1.28 (0.059)</td>
<td>1.31 (0.069)</td>
<td>-0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined another walking club (ie Ramblers)</td>
<td>1.37 (0.067)</td>
<td>1.66 (0.092)</td>
<td>-2.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I started walking with friends / work colleagues</td>
<td>2.87 (0.113)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.122)</td>
<td>-2.331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of walking-related material (5 pt Likert)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of walking-related material (5 pt Likert)</th>
<th>Mean Likert score (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High specification walking clothing</td>
<td>2.97 (0.086)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.082)</td>
<td>-6.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High specification walking footwear</td>
<td>3.78 (0.081)</td>
<td>4.33 (0.063)</td>
<td>-5.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying walking-related reading material regularly (ie magazines)</td>
<td>1.41 (0.054)</td>
<td>1.75 (0.078)</td>
<td>-3.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The origin of people’s walking participation appears to not be differentiated significantly between casual or serious walkers; in terms of childhood walking with family, at school, college or later at university. In each case there were no specific indications that a greater participation in walking at any of those stages of life, has any relevance to whether an individual is part of the serious or the casual group. However, starting to walk later in life, with work colleagues or friends, or as part of a walking group are more highly associated with serious walkers. This is most likely a reflection of the greater intention of adults to make their own choices on serious participation in recreational walking.

3 All cases marked by + adjusted in SPSS, following Levene’s test for variance.
6.5.3.3 The walking related attitudes, characteristics and preferences of serious and casual walkers

Table 6.20: t-test results to ascertain significant differences in attitudes, motivations and characteristics, between casual (group 1) and serious (group 2) walkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence and ability (5 pt Likert)</th>
<th>Mean Likert score (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2.84 (0.068)</td>
<td>-21.529</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Seriousness’</td>
<td>2.16 (0.057)</td>
<td>-21.718</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Casualness’</td>
<td>3.53 (0.071)</td>
<td>14.497</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations and preferences</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal-seeking (‘Walking, for me, is about achieving goals’)</td>
<td>1.79 (0.061)</td>
<td>-7.866</td>
<td>0.000***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort-seeking (‘Comfort is important whilst walking’)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.061)</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>0.226+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery-seeking (‘Discovery and learning about surroundings is important when I walk’)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.065)</td>
<td>-1.805</td>
<td>0.072+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather-resilience (‘I don’t mind some poor weather when walking’)</td>
<td>3.32 (0.071)</td>
<td>-7.877</td>
<td>0.000***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia-seeking (‘Today’s walk helped me re-live past memories’)</td>
<td>2.28 (0.970)</td>
<td>-1.481</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness-seeking (‘I like to look for less obvious places when walking’)</td>
<td>2.83 (0.075)</td>
<td>-8.821</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility (‘I take pleasure from my utility walking trips (such as walking to work or dog walking)’)</td>
<td>2.85 (0.101)</td>
<td>-2.056</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace (‘The pace of walking allows me to see more detail than other modes (such as cycling or car travel)’)</td>
<td>3.76 (0.082)</td>
<td>-2.519</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental awareness (‘I have a strong interest in conserving the natural environment’)</td>
<td>3.51 (0.077)</td>
<td>-4.038</td>
<td>0.000***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to walk more: (‘I would like to walk more’)</td>
<td>3.91 (0.074)</td>
<td>-1.452</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking area (‘I live in a walking area’)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.091)</td>
<td>-1.921</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations to walking (‘My chances to walk for recreation are limited’)</td>
<td>2.07 (0.084)</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood/energy (‘The walks I choose are dependent on my mood and energy levels’)</td>
<td>3.46 (0.078)</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences were found in around half of the motivational and attitudinal variables tested, shown in table 6.20. The differences were characterised by higher average Likert scores

---

4 All cases marked by + were adjusted in SPSS, following Levene’s test for variance
for serious walkers in their level of experience, ‘seriousness’, goal-seeking, weather-resilience and wilderness-seeking. This pattern of distribution is in accordance with the differences between groups in terms of their responses to these questions, which were uncovered following the cluster analysis in the previous section. It further reinforces the emerging picture of the qualities which characterise serious walkers, and differentiates them from casual walkers.

More interesting, and perhaps more unexpected, are the significant differences reported in table 6.20 for certain attitudes. Serious walkers demonstrated higher and statistically different Likert scores for taking pleasure in utility trips, taking more interest in the natural environment and in agreement that the pace of walking is suited to a more immersive experience within surroundings. This suggests a heightened interest in walking locations, surroundings and a deeper contemplation in finding meaning in an activity in which they have a serious interest.

6.5.3.4 Demographic information and group preferences of serious and casual walkers

Table 6.21: Chi-Square results: categorical variable analysis of the 2-cluster solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Between groups Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo / group walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.836</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>12.063</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>4.978</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part time</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 6.21, categorical variables are assessed for the strength of their relationship to the two cluster groups. The results suggest that there is no statistical difference between the two groups
for gender imbalance in the sample. According to the data, males make up a larger proportion of the serious group (almost two thirds) whilst females make up a larger proportion of the casual group (but in general this group is more evenly split). The reasons for this are unclear at this stage. The researcher’s observations during the survey do not explain the large imbalance in group 2. Table 6.22 details an analysis of age, which is treated here as an ordinal variable on the basis that it is made up of age groups which increase, but not in consistent increments, using a non-parametric test. Although there are some compositional differences between groups (most notably the 25-34 group), the p-value of 0.284 shows it to not be a significant factor in differentiating the two groups. Figure 6.8 shows that, in general the age distribution is similar between the groups.

Table 6.22: Mann-Whitney U test: age and the 2-cluster solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Between groups Percentage Group 1</th>
<th>Between groups Percentage Group 2</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Z-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20692.5</td>
<td>-1.071</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5.4 Summary of segmentation analysis on recreational walkers

The sample used for segmentation of walkers reflected detailed information on the walking habits, characteristics, preferences, motivations and attitudes of 518 individuals. Factor analysis (PCA) was carried out on all variables relating to characteristics of walkers. After three rounds, which incrementally removed the least powerful factors, nine variables remained for further analysis to group walkers. They included ‘seriousness’ a measure of the Likert-scale question ‘I am a serious walker’ and ‘casualness’, derived from the question ‘walking is a casual interest of mine’. Using a map and compass for navigation, and several motivational variables were also included.

Cluster analysis was found to be unsuitable at five and three factor solutions, and the final chosen solution involved two clusters. Due to the differences between these groups on several of the variables they were named ‘Casual walkers’ and ‘serious walkers’. The two groups were analysed for significant differences in a number of attributes relating to walking. This allowed an insight into how the groups differed, and also where there was no significant difference. The characteristics of the two groups can be summarised as follows:

Figure 6.8: Age distribution between two cluster groups

![Age distribution of cluster groups](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivations, preferences and experience

- Serious walkers were more experienced, more likely to seek goals when walking, more likely to seek less-obvious places to walk and less affected by poor weather.

- Motivations for seeking comfort, discovery and nostalgia were not significantly different between groups. Preferences for walking solo, as a pair or in a group were also not significantly different.

Attitudes

- Serious walkers were more likely to derive pleasure from utility walks, and more likely to see the pace of walking as a mode of travel as important for seeing surroundings. The analysis showed, that in comparison with casual walkers, they perceived themselves to be more environmentally aware.

- Both groups were similar in their responses on living in a walking area, being limited for walking opportunities and wanting to walk more.

Navigation

- Serious walkers placed greater importance on the use of a map and compass as a navigational mode for walking, whilst casual walkers valued leaflets or route cards.

- The internet and guide books, as forms of navigation, were not specific to either group.

Characteristics

- There were more males in the serious group than females. Although more equal in proportion, the casual group showed a significantly different gender composition, with a higher number of females than males

- Age and occupation were not significantly different between groups.
Walking activity

- Serious walkers engaged statistically in more part day walks, day walks, hill walks and organised group walks than casual walkers.

- In terms of all other types of walk, including short strolls, urban walks and long distance walks, no significant difference was found between groups.

Engagement with walking

- Serious walkers saw more importance in walking clothing, footwear and buying walking related material, such as magazines. When asked about their introduction to walking, the only triggers in which significant differences were found to be relevant were: beginning to walk with friends and family or joining a walking group. In both cases these entry points to walking were more relevant to the serious group.

- Walking as a child with family, at school, college or university were found not to be significantly more relevant to either group as an introduction to walking for recreation.

Overall, these findings appear to say more about what serious walkers are or how they behave, rather than provide a picture of casual walkers. The findings do say that in many cases, casual walkers simply scored lower than serious walkers on a number of counts. There are significant differences between the groups, which reflect the ideas generated in the first stage interviews on how practitioners saw distinctions which separated people as ‘serious’ and ‘casual’ in their approach to walking as an activity, such as experience, the desire to seek out less important places to walk, equipment preferences and the regular walking activity in which each group engages in. There were also a number of variables tested which showed no significant differences between groups, and thus the impact of this exercise is that it is now known which dimensions are useful for differentiating walkers in this way, and which are not. The
segmentation process has therefore been successful in terms of building up an initial picture, which can be built upon in the next part of the survey analysis, detailed in the next chapter.

6.6 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has continued from the interviews, by firstly detailing the process which involved using their key findings, to construct a survey questionnaire, aimed at understanding walkers; their characteristics, motivations, and preferences; exploring segmentation of walkers; and determining the processes influencing route-choice. It involved building a conceptual model which drew from the interviewees’ observations, thoughts and knowledge of the recreational walking market, to lay out the most important variables underpinning the characteristics of and differences between certain walkers and their choice-making in terms of the walks they undertake. If the focus of the first stage of primary data collection was to provide the supply side’s view, the second was an insight into the demand perspective of walking. This involved 24 survey days throughout all months of the year, through all seasons, conditions, and contexts which surround recreational walking in the National Park area.

The sample characteristics indicated that generally, respondents were older, and a considerable proportion were retired, or not working full-time. These elements are in line with the observations of the surveyor, and the interview findings. The trend overall was towards a higher frequency of shorter walks, circular and low level walks, and a high number of urban walks, although as these figures were estimates from the previous four weeks, it stands to reason that shorter or ‘easier’ walks are more likely to be conducted more often. Map and compass was the most important form of information for navigation, although others were used to lesser frequency, including guide books and leaflets. The internet was also a prominent form of information. Walking in a pair was by far the most frequent group composition, in comparison to solo or group walking.
The dataset was extensive therefore, and provided a means to explore deeply a range of walker-related variables and thus was a solid basis for segmentation. The univariate analysis described a balanced dataset encompassing a range of preferences for walking, and a mix of experienced and occasional walkers. The segmentation process eventually produced two groups or ‘types’ of walker: serious and casual, who display differing walking habits, attitudes, motivations and attributes. In many areas the descriptions of the two groups provided by the quantitative analysis aligned to the observations of the expert practitioners detailed in the previous chapter.

The subsequent bivariate exploration was able to provide a profile of each group. This process showed perhaps more about serious walkers in this sense. They prefer longer, more difficult walks, are more likely to seek goals, use maps, brave harsh weather conditions and venture into the wilderness. Although there was a slight gender imbalance, age and occupation were not significant to either group, as were a number of the other variables tested, such as having opportunities to walk, wanting to walk more, using the internet to find their walks and walking in urban areas.

At this point in the thesis, the survey stage of data collection has addressed one of its two main aims, by exploring segmentation and identifying two groups of walkers. The analysis now moves on to understand the other principal aim of the thesis, the explanation of route choice. The discussion on segmentation will be resurrected later in the thesis, when all results are explored in conjunction with the literature in chapter 8. Before that, chapter 7 will complete the reporting of the survey results, by making an in-depth analysis of route-choice.
Chapter 7

Survey results

Route-choice by recreational walkers in the English Lake District

7.1 Introduction to the chapter

The previous two chapters provided an array of qualitative and quantitative findings. An extensive account of the grounded theory interviews identified a range of themes on the characteristics and choices of recreational walkers. It also provided a theoretical foundation to design a second stage of primary data collection, part of which was reported in chapter 6. The first section of chapter 6 described the process in which the interview findings from the first stage of the research were used to build the survey questionnaire which had two principal aims: (a) identifying segments of walkers; and (b) examining route-choice.

The remaining sections of chapter 6 detailed the results of the analysis of the first of these two aims. The survey sample was described and comprised 518 respondents, demonstrating a variety of levels of walking experience and a range of preferences for different walks, motivations and attitudes towards walking. The cluster analysis of this sample used 422 valid cases to result in a two-cluster solution: two rather different groups of walkers who could be described as either being ‘casual’ or ‘serious’ about walking, depending on how they thought about and approached the activity.

This chapter will follow directly on from the last by providing an account of the second part of the analysis of the survey, which fulfils the remaining objective of the thesis by understanding
route-choice. Route-choice has already been identified by the experts in chapter 5 as being a complex and not altogether explainable process; dependent on a range of different factors relating to individual walkers’ perceptions, situational influences and group dynamics; which are partially intangible and unique to the landscape. A model of route-choice depends upon examining the most prominent factors influencing the walking decisions made. Some of these factors relate to walkers and their personal characteristics. The serious and casual distinction will be tested again in the early part of the chapter (section 7.3), this time by understanding the route-choice decisions made by each group on the day of the survey. A number of variables relating to the walk chosen on the survey day, the conditions such as weather and time of year, and the motivations underpinning the route-choice decision were available from the resultant data of the survey questionnaire. They are described in a univariate analysis in section 7.2. Following these analyses, an in-depth exploration will be conducted on the effects of selected variables from the available data on a series of route-choice indicators (section 7.4). The chapter and the analysis on route-choice will be summarised in section 7.5.

7.2 Univariate analysis: route data from the day of survey

7.2.1 Walk details

Data was collected regarding the particular walk which respondents were undertaking when they were surveyed. Table 7.1 (below) details the characteristics of walks taken. The majority of all walkers (70.7%) were on short walks of 4 hours or less, with a further 25% undertaking day walks. The small percentage of people undertaking long distance walks is consistent with the usual proportions of people in that particular niche. Respondents were also asked to provide an estimated duration and distance of their walk. Only small proportions of people reported taking very short walks (under 2 miles) or long walks (over 8 miles). The average distance walked on the day of the survey, as reported by the sample was roughly in the middle of this range (5.5
miles). As the most frequently stated distance was lower than this, 4 miles, a small number of longer walks may affect the overall range.

Table 7.1: Characteristics of respondents’ walks on the day of survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration (n=504)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short stroll (1 hour or less)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day walk (1-4 hours)</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day walk (Over 4 hours)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of longer distance walk (more than one day)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Duration (n=463)</th>
<th>3 hours 27 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance (n=463)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 miles</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 4.9 miles</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9.9 miles</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 miles or over</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Distance</td>
<td>5.5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median distance</td>
<td>3 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty (Self-reported) 1-10 (n=482)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (3 or under)</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (4-6)</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard (7-10)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean difficulty</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circular / linear (n=481)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hill / low level (n=458)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duration was another reported route-choice variable, which many people can estimate more easily than distance. As a measurement duration may not always give an accurate indication of distance, taking into account stops on the walk or the pace of walking. The analysis found that most people walked between 1 and 4 hours, with the overall average being approximately 3.5 hours. This finding is in line with the results of the exclusive question on whether the walk was a short stroll, part-day walk or longer. Respondents were also asked to rate the difficulty of their walk. On average, respondents didn’t rate their walks as severe, reflected by the low mean of 3.7/10. The process of rating the difficulty of a walk is individually unique; whereas one walker might perceive a long walk as not strenuous another may class a shorter walk as strenuous.
There was almost an even split of people undertaking hill or low level walks. Some caution also surrounds respondents’ perceptions of what is a hill or low level walk. The Lake District is distinct in its terrain and topography, and the path network offers both options. The majority of people undertake circular walks. A comment from the interviews suggested that the figure should be higher ('99% of all walks are circular'). The use of public transport or sections of long distance walks are usually the most likely reasons for undertaking linear walks, but they can be undertaken by the use of a private car dropping off and picking up walkers at either end of the route.

7.2.2 Group dynamics

Table 7.2 details the make-up of groups captured on the day of the survey. A high number of the groups contained one or two adult males or females. Group composition generally reflected couples, families and groups of more than one family walking together. A small number of respondents overall reported children as part of their group. The most frequently reported group size was two and the sample mean group size 4.2. They were most often groups of one male and one female adult, but there were also a smaller number of groups comprising two or more adults of the same gender. Groups with children most often reported two children. These findings are in keeping with the observations of the researcher on the days the survey was undertaken.
Table 7.2: Summary of group composition: gender and adults / children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group size</th>
<th>Adult male (n=464)</th>
<th>Adult female (n=445)</th>
<th>Child male (n=38)</th>
<th>Child female (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority of respondents were walking with friends and family (table 7.3). Of the small percentage who walked in an organised group, the Rambler’s, U3A, and the 24 hour 3 peaks challenge (from the Wasdale survey) were mentioned most often. The remainder of the sample, another small niche, were walking solo.

Table 7.3: Group composition: solo, group, friends or family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solo or group (n=514)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it was possible that respondents may have used more than one means of decision making, the most frequently cited route-choice decision was a ‘joint decision’, constituting almost half of the sample (table 7.4). Over a quarter stated the decision to choose the route was ‘myself’. It might be the case that these people were the dominant person in the group and more likely to be the person who filled out the form, although the surveyor aimed to give surveys

---

5 http://www.ramblers.org.uk/
6 http://www.u3a.org.uk/
7 Snowdon, Scafell Pike, Ben Nevis (http://www.threepeakschallenge.uk/national-three-peaks-challenge)
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to all people in the party where possible. As this was an exclusive question, the data will not reflect situations where other options played a part in the decision to choose the route.

Table 7.4: Decision maker within the group (route-choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision maker (n=508)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint decision</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no plan)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.3 Transport, holiday context and walk purpose

Finally, some information about the situation of respondents on the day, transport, and purpose of or motivations for the walk was recorded by the survey. Most started their day from the holiday base (table 7.5). Car was the dominant mode. As there were a large number of respondents travelling from their accommodation, which it can be assumed in most cases is within or near to the National Park, distances are likely to be shorter for staying tourists. The remainder are considered as day tourists.

Table 7.5: Transport and holiday context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles travelled</th>
<th>Car (n=368)</th>
<th>Bus (n=16)</th>
<th>Train (n=3)</th>
<th>Other (n=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>91 (23.65%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>95 (24.6%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>88 (22.8%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>26 (6.7%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>9 (2.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>20 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>40 (10.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100</td>
<td>17 (4.4%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>91 (23.65%)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where started from (n=335)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday base</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Percentages only given for car, as other modes were only used by very small numbers. Actual numbers given for bus, train and ‘other’*
A number of Likert scale questions ascertained the importance of certain factors in the choice of route (table 7.6). In terms of the variables in which answers were mainly 4 or 5; scenery (86.7% scoring 4 or 5), exercise (72.4%), and the company of family and friends (60.8%) were considered by the sample as the most important reasons for choosing a particular route. The interview findings from stage one of the research support this, as these motivations for walking are considered universal. Other motivations were considered important to a lesser extent, scoring mainly 3 or 4, but still overall still scoring highly: convenience (51.4% scoring 3 or 4), and accessibility (51.1%). The sample was split regarding the significance of other preferences. Wildlife, photography and well-managed paths displayed modal values of 3 with relatively even distributions for other scores. Flexibility, management, knowing where rights of way are, proximity to amenities, signage and path surface had modal values of 1, but still had some considerable proportion of scoring across the rest of the scale. These motivations may be crucial in understanding the cluster-groups further, explaining the split in the sample, and will be revisited in the next section. Reaching particular points of interest (ie a landmark), noticing the particular walk in a guide, magazine or website, local history and completing national trails were widely regarded of lesser importance. These factors can be considered as either subsidiary motivations or niche interests.
Table 7.6: Motivations and situational factors on the walk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of walk</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenery (n=502)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing a section of a national trail (n=416)</td>
<td><strong>84.1%</strong></td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of interest (n=408)</td>
<td><strong>43.4%</strong></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent with family or friends (n=433)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td><strong>37.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local history (n=413)</td>
<td><strong>52.3%</strong></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife (n=439)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td><strong>29.6%</strong></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic interest (n=439)</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td><strong>26.2%</strong></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen it in a guide, magazine or website (n=400)</td>
<td><strong>59.5%</strong></td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise (n=495)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td><strong>45.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General recreation (n=463)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td><strong>38.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience (n=436)</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td><strong>29.6%</strong></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to change route if needed (n=443)</td>
<td><strong>25.1%</strong></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (good paths, signs etc) (n=437)</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to amenities (toilets, refreshments, etc.) (n=441)</td>
<td><strong>37.2%</strong></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth /even path surface (n=455)</td>
<td><strong>40.0%</strong></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well managed paths (n=465)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td><strong>29.2%</strong></td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (n=458)</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td><strong>29.0%</strong></td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing where rights of way are (n=450)</td>
<td><strong>27.0%</strong></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Further analysis: do the cluster-groups differ in their choice of route?

7.3.1 Choices of cluster-groups in terms of route characteristics on the day of survey

Table 7.7: Relationship between cluster-groups and type of walk undertaken on survey day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of walk</th>
<th>Between groups</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short stroll (1 hour or less)</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day walk (1-4 hours)</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day walk (Over 4 hours)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of longer distance walk (more than one day)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A bivariate analysis was conducted using the cluster-groupings as the independent variable. Table 7.7 contains the results of the analysis on the ordinal variable relating to the type of walk, based on walk length. Using a non-parametric test for two independent samples, the difference between the choices made by cluster-groups regarding the type of walk chosen was found to be significant. Casual walkers more likely to engage in shorter walks (83.8% under a half day), and serious walkers engaged in longer walks (46.5% walking for over four hours). These relationships support the results in the previous section on walks undertaken by each group in the four weeks prior to the survey. It is assumed that the snapshot provided here broadly matches the general walking habits of casual and serious walkers. The relatively substantial sample size of 518 further reinforces the rigour of this claim. Although not a direct comparison, the earlier question on walks undertaken in the past four weeks showed that serious walkers engaged on average in significantly more part-day and full day walks (table 6.18, section 6.5.3.1). It also showed that serious walkers undertake more walks overall.
Table 7.8 Choices of different walk types by cluster-groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk Type</th>
<th>Between groups</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 (%)</td>
<td>Group 2 (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hill / low level walk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill walk</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>23.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-level walk</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circular / linear walk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking holiday / on holiday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a walking holiday</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>16.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking whilst on holiday</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.8 shows the chi-square analysis on walk types. Serious walkers were statistically more likely to engage in hill walks; the distribution of hill vs low level walks is almost a mirror opposite of that for casual walkers. This finding is in agreement with the significant differences found in the analysis of walks undertaken in the past four weeks (table 6.18, section 6.5.3.1). As seen in the earlier analysis, circular or linear walks showed no remarkable differences between the groups, confirming that it is not a significant differentiator, as most walks are circular. Additionally, casual walkers were more likely to be walking whilst on holiday and less likely to be on a walking holiday than serious walkers. This reflects the line of thinking that for serious walkers the main holiday focus is most likely to be the activity, whilst for casual walkers, the holiday is more generally the focus, with walking a recreational activity undertaken during the period of time spent away.

Table 7.9: Distance, duration and difficulty of walks undertaken by the cluster-groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Mean (SE) Group 1</th>
<th>Mean (SE) Group 2</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate length of walk (in miles)</strong></td>
<td>4.485 (0.229)</td>
<td>7.375 (0.587)</td>
<td>-4.575</td>
<td>0.000****+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration (Hours)</strong></td>
<td>2.921 (0.125)</td>
<td>4.099 (0.163)</td>
<td>-3.492</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulty rating (self rating out of 10)</strong></td>
<td>3.28 (0.149)</td>
<td>4.36 (0.156)</td>
<td>-4.992</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variables marked with + were adjusted within SPSS analysis following Levene’s test for variance
T-test results demonstrate differences in the walking activity between the two clusters on the day of the survey (Table 7.9). In agreement with many of the findings thus far, serious walkers walked for longer distances (an average difference of almost 3 miles), longer durations (more than an hour on average) and also considered their walks to be of greater difficulty (the difficulty rating out of ten being at least 1 value higher on average). In all of these cases, significance was strong. Therefore in pure physical dimensions, serious walkers undertake more difficult walks.

7.3.2 The group dynamics, travel and tourism context of cluster-groups

Table 7.10: Differences between cluster-groups in terms of walking companions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking companions</th>
<th>Between groups Percentage</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>21.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends and family</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square analysis of walking companions in table 7.10 shows that casual walkers were most likely to walk in pairs. Serious walkers were more likely to walk solo or as part of a group. In comparison with the earlier overall analysis (section 7.2.2, table 7.3), figure 7.1 shows that the niches of organised group and solo are somewhat more pronounced for serious walkers, and very small for casual walkers.
Figure 7.1: Group walking status of cluster-groups in comparison to overall sample

![Figure 7.1: Group walking status of cluster-groups in comparison to overall sample](image)

Table 7.11: Group composition comparison between cluster-groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group composition</th>
<th>Mean (SE) Group 1</th>
<th>Mean (SE) Group 2</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults (all)</td>
<td>2.75 (0.125)</td>
<td>2.84 (0.180)</td>
<td>-0.383</td>
<td>0.702+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult males</td>
<td>1.45 (0.123)</td>
<td>1.67 (0.152)</td>
<td>-1.793</td>
<td>0.074+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult females</td>
<td>1.43 (0.141)</td>
<td>1.53 (0.145)</td>
<td>-0.814</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.91 (0.148)</td>
<td>1.20 (0.196)</td>
<td>-1.183</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>2.95 (0.083)</td>
<td>3.03 (0.105)</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>0.737+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no striking differences between groups in terms of their composition on the day of the survey, except that serious walkers had on average more adult males. The number of adults, adult females or children within groups were not significantly different between groups. This finding backs up the gender imbalance towards males (section 6.5.3.4, table 6.2.1) within the serious walker segment. Group size overall, was also not found to be statistically different between the cluster-groups.

---
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Table 7.12: Relationship of cluster-groups with other descriptive elements of the walk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Between groups</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>10.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in the party</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint decision</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no plan)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences between cluster-groups found for the question on decision making (‘who made the decision to choose the route on the day of the survey’, shown in table 7.12). A closer inspection in figure 7.2 shows that; cluster-groups were equal in terms of most of the possible decision-makers, there are small differences for joint decision (more likely for casual walkers) and ‘myself’ (more likely for serious walkers).

Figure 7.2: Comparison between cluster-groups for decision maker on the day of the survey
Table 7.13: t-test results comparing cluster-groups’ mileage by car to reach their walk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance travelled (car)</th>
<th>Mean (SE) Group 1</th>
<th>Mean (SE) Group 2</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.576 (2.919)</td>
<td>36.147 (5.130)</td>
<td>-2.299</td>
<td>0.022*+11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of distance by car travel, table 7.13 indicates that serious walkers more likely to travel longer distances by car. Given that there was only enough available data for car travellers, and that other variables such as being on holiday might come into play, this finding should be treated with caution. If taken at face value, it suggests that serious walkers would travel further because of their dedication to find suitable locations to walk.

Table 7.14: Comparison between cluster-groups for day and staying visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day started from home / holiday base</th>
<th>Between groups Percentage</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>2.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday base</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.14 shows that there is a slight difference between groups in terms of where the day’s travel started from. This measure separates the two groups as being day or staying visitors, and although most visitors overall were on holiday, serious walkers were slightly more likely to be travelling from home on the day.

11 Variables marked with + were adjusted in SPSS following Levene’s test for variance
7.3.3 Analysis of the time of year cluster-groups were walking in the Lake District

Table 7.15: When the cluster groups walked during the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Between groups</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend / Weekday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>6.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday / Term time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>7.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term-time</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.15 makes a temporal analysis of the two groups broken down by the days and time of year they were surveyed. When broken down in months, there were no significant differences between the groups. Because of the variable weather conditions in the study area, particularly during the ‘survey year’ of 2012, the data was aggregated firstly into seasons and then differentiated by whether their recorded walk fell into holidays or term time. Using the assumption that the seasons are determined meteorologically\(^{12}\), again, no significant differences could be found, indicating that the composition of walker segments is not specific to any particular time of year. However, in the analysis on walks undertaken at different times of the year.

\(^{12}\) Winter begins on the 1\(^{st}\) December, Spring 1\(^{st}\) March, Summer 1\(^{st}\) June and Autumn 1\(^{st}\) September
week, serious walkers were statistically more likely to walk at weekends (almost twice as likely).

The walks recorded by casual walkers were almost evenly split between weekends and weekdays. It is unclear why this is the case, as in the earlier analysis, no significant differences were found between the groups on their occupation. Available free time, therefore, may not be the main reason for serious walkers being more likely to walk at weekends. Finally a further analysis was made by breaking the sample down into term-time walks or walks during school holidays. Using the holiday schedules in the local area a significant difference was found between groups: although both clusters were more likely to walk during holidays, this pattern was more pronounced for serious walkers.

7.3.4: Motivations and journey purposes on the day of the survey: cluster-group comparison

Table 7.16: t-test results for journey purpose and motivation-based route-choice variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of walk purposes</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery</td>
<td>4.33 (0.063)</td>
<td>4.38 (0.065)</td>
<td>-0.540</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing a section of a national trail</td>
<td>1.34 (0.064)</td>
<td>1.34 (0.073)</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of interest</td>
<td>2.48 (0.115)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.126)</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen it in a guide, magazine or website</td>
<td>2.08 (0.095)</td>
<td>1.72 (0.096)</td>
<td>2.716</td>
<td>0.007***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent with family or friends</td>
<td>3.71 (0.100)</td>
<td>3.27 (0.118)</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>0.005**+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local history</td>
<td>1.82 (0.075)</td>
<td>1.89 (0.091)</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>2.70 (0.090)</td>
<td>2.84 (0.097)</td>
<td>-1.010</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic interest</td>
<td>2.84 (0.099)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.101)</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>3.97 (0.070)</td>
<td>4.07 (0.081)</td>
<td>-0.884</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General recreation</td>
<td>3.89 (0.074)</td>
<td>3.87 (0.086)</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>3.15 (0.090)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.098)</td>
<td>3.029</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to change route if needed</td>
<td>2.64 (0.099)</td>
<td>3.04 (0.099)</td>
<td>-2.874</td>
<td>0.004***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (good paths, signs etc)</td>
<td>2.83 (0.098)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.108)</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to amenities (toilets, refreshments, etc.)</td>
<td>2.61 (0.096)</td>
<td>2.01 (0.100)</td>
<td>4.374</td>
<td>0.000***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth /even path surface</td>
<td>2.37 (0.082)</td>
<td>1.86 (0.085)</td>
<td>4.240</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well managed paths</td>
<td>2.90 (0.083)</td>
<td>2.41 (0.096)</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>0.000***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>2.90 (0.089)</td>
<td>2.85 (0.102)</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing where rights of way are</td>
<td>2.63 (0.089)</td>
<td>2.70 (0.111)</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.16 details the t-test results of Likert-scale questions on the importance of a set of motivations and journey purposes for the walk on the day of the survey. A picture was built up over differences between the cluster groups in preferences; and the value of a series of elements which underpinned the choice of the particular walk they had recorded in the survey. Dealing first with those variables in which there were no significant differences; it appears that ‘non-walking’ motivations such as local history, photography and wildlife are not group-specific, and presumably dependent on the interests of the individual. Similarly, exercise, general recreation, the scenery and wanting to see certain points of interest on the walk are confirmed as universal motivations, reinforcing earlier findings from both the interviews and survey. Completing a section of a long-distance trail is not a motivation specific to one group, but the niche nature of this motivation may explain this finding; that is, only a small number of people would consider it important, and this would not be detected in the overall sample. Accessibility and knowing about Rights of Way were also not significantly different between the clusters.

In terms of the variables in which significant differences were detected, this analysis was more explanatory of casual walkers, in contrast to the previous analysis of the groups’ general walking behaviour, which highlighted more about the specific attributes of serious walkers. Casual walkers scored statistically higher means on the Likert-scale in a number of areas. Some of these reflected the characteristics discussed earlier of ‘comfort-seeking’, and being less likely to look for quieter routes than serious walkers. Management elements such as path management, smooth path surfaces, signage, and the closeness of amenities such as toilets or refreshments were more important to casual walkers. Also, in all these analyses, casual walkers were medium-high on average on the Likert scale, whilst serious walkers were towards the lower end of the scale. This suggests a picture that casual walkers are drawn more to managed sites, whilst serious walkers prefer to be away from these places (and into sites with more of a wilderness element).
Casual walkers were also more likely to choose routes based on ‘convenience’. It can be interpreted that casual walkers are more interested in walking as a means of engaging in recreation if it is convenient, rather than because they feel the need to be walking as the most important form of recreation. Casual walkers also significantly scored higher than serious walkers for ‘Seen it in a guide, magazine or website’, a question referring to why they chose their particular route on the day. It can be suggested that they are more susceptible to the influence of marketing in that choice, or that serious walkers have already decided upon the routes they were undertaking, without being affected by magazines.

Casual walkers were more favourable to motivations of ‘time spent with friends or family’ as a motivation, suggesting that the social element is more important for this group. The only significantly different motivational variable was in which serious walkers scored higher was ‘flexibility to change the route if needed’. This reflects some of the comments from the first stage of research, in which interviewees suggested that one characteristic of more dedicated and experienced walkers was being able to pre-empt weather changes or other circumstances which necessitate a change of route.

Thus, some concrete trends were ascertained which determine route-choice for the two defined cluster groups. Dimensions including distance, time of walk, difficulty, type of walk and purposes of walks have been shown as significant separators of casual and serious walkers. It is therefore possible to suggest a theoretical model for each group, which outlines at least some of their preference during a walk for recreation or tourism. The considerations of this process and the eventual model will be presented in the next chapter.
7.4 Developing a route-choice model

To determine route-choice for the overall sample, a number of different indicator variables were available from the dataset. As the cluster analysis had already been finalised, and the route-choice preferences of the two cluster groups determined, the original dataset was used (n=518). Appropriate statistical tests were performed, based on the nature of the variables, a mixture of nominal, ordinal and continuous. The bivariate analysis of each pair of variables omitted any cases in which one or more value were missing.

Route-choice is dependent on a number of different types of indicator. Of the available data, the following variables relating to choice were considered in the analysis:

- Difficulty (a value between 1-10)
- Distance (in miles)
- Duration (in minutes)
- Whether the walk was a hill or a low level walk
- When people choose to walk: seasonality, term or holiday, weekend or weekday
- The effect of the weather when walking: cloud cover, temperature, and precipitation
- The remoteness of the walk and the distance one travelled to access it.
- The effect of the decision maker: are any route decisions significantly different because of who makes the decision?
- Group size, demographics and composition

Some caveats were taken into account by this choice. Difficulty was assessed uniquely by each individual, and therefore based on their own personal view of the walk they experienced.
Distance and duration were estimates, and a hill or level walk may be categorised differently in the minds of one individual to another. Other route-choice variables of interest were time of day, week or year in which people walked, and the effect of weather. In the case of weather, there was no accurate or precise historic data available for the sites and days of the survey, and therefore the researcher’s judgment on the day was used. The categories were converted into ordinal scales as follows:

- **Clouds:** Clear=1; Quite cloudy=2; Cloudy=3; Overcast=4
- **Temperature:** Cold=1; Quite cold=2; Fair=3; Warm=4; Hot=5
- **Rain:** None=1; Light showers=2; Showers=3; Heavy rain=4; Very heavy rain=5

‘Remoteness’ was of interest in the analysis, because: firstly, some of the sites were more remote than others; and secondly earlier findings had shown variations between groups on choosing less obvious routes, away from lots of people. The difficulty was in defining exactly how to measure the remoteness of a walking start-point. The nature of the data dictated that there was no exact fit in terms of pinning down the remoteness of a route, but three potential indicators were measured for each case. The first of these was the distance of the survey site from the nearest significant settlement. The criteria for this indicator was that the settlement should be over 5,000 in population, connected by a main road, and have a significant number of amenities, town centre, accommodation and parking. Keswick, at just over 5,000 population, in this sense, represented a cut-off point.

A second indicator, the distance from a smaller settlement was also tested. Many of the walks were close to smaller places with at least one shop, a few parking areas, accommodation and so on. For example Seatoller car park is close to some small hamlets and villages within a mile or so, but the nearest town is Keswick, just over 8 miles away. A third indicator aimed to look at remoteness on a slightly wider scale. For a lot of the sample, and particularly any day visitors
travelling from outside of the region, accessing some parts of the Lake District is more straightforward than other parts. For example, Windermere is accessed from a major A-road, connecting to the only motorway in the region (the M6) which connects the South of Scotland to the South Midlands of England. From the motorway, Windermere is a fairly short drive of just over 20 minutes. Alternatively, Wasdale and Ennerdale are situated on the far side of the Lake District, a lot further from the motorway, and roads have to circumnavigate the National Park area to access them. Both valleys are over an hour’s drive after leaving the M6. Therefore ‘distance from the M6’ was also calculated as a measurement of remoteness for each case.
7.4.1 Which factors influence the difficulty of the walk chosen?

Table 7.17: The effects of route-choice and demographic variables on difficulty of the walk chosen: t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term(^1) or holiday(^2) (n=482)</td>
<td>4.04 (0.220)</td>
<td>2.94 (0.135)</td>
<td>5.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday(^1) or weekend(^2) (n=482)</td>
<td>3.57 (0.254)</td>
<td>3.93 (0.234)</td>
<td>-1.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill(^1) or low level(^2) walk (n=429)</td>
<td>5.43 (0.319)</td>
<td>2.22 (0.198)</td>
<td>21.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday(^1) or walk whilst on holiday(^2) (n=320)</td>
<td>4.90 (0.451)</td>
<td>3.04 (0.244)</td>
<td>7.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male(^1) or female(^2) (n=468)</td>
<td>3.87 (0.245)</td>
<td>2.12 (0.237)</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) Variables marked with + were adjusted in SPSS following Levene’s test for variance
Table 7.18: The effects of route-choice, demographic and situational variables on difficulty of the walk chosen: Correlations and ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=475)</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
<td>Duration (n=442)</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=482)</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>Distance (n=409)</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds (n=482)</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>Number of adult males (n=392)</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=482)</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>Number of adult females (n=382)</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One-way ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companions (n=481)</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>3.90 (0.330)</td>
<td>9.842</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>3.65 (0.108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>5.77 (0.416)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tukey Test, significant differences between means**

- ‘With friends and family’ vs ‘Organised group’ Mean difference: -2.118 0.000***
- ‘Organised group’ vs ‘Solo’ Mean difference: 1.868 0.004***

**Occupation (n=507)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3.57 (0.162)</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2.50 (0.500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>4.12 (0.169)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>3.32 (0.243)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>3.07 (0.438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.44 (0.447)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tukey test showed no significant differences between means of different groups**

**Decision-maker (n=475)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>3.66 (0.205)</td>
<td>2.916</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>3.90 (0.308)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>3.58 (0.147)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>5.58 (0.358)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>3.40 (0.733)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>4.39 (0.294)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tukey Test, significant differences between means**

- ‘Myself’ vs ‘Walking group leader’ Mean difference: -1.927 0.046*  
- ‘Joint Decision’ vs ‘Walking group leader’: -2.000 0.028*

Tables 7.17 and 7.18 provide an overview of the relationship of a number of variables with the difficulty of the walk. The analyses under focus here are based on the premise that:

The difficulty of the walk chosen is influenced by variables relating to:

- the time of the walk,
- weather,
- duration, distance or gradient
Term time walks were on average more difficult. There was no significant difference between the difficulty of walks undertaken on weekdays or weekend, although this analysis did show a slightly higher difficulty at weekends. Walking holidays involved higher difficulties than walks taken whilst on holiday (almost two points higher on average in terms of difficulty). This indicates the more serious nature of walking when it is the main focus of the holiday.

Unsurprisingly, hill walks were considerably more difficult than low-level walks. Significant correlations were found between difficulty and duration (0.461) and difficulty and distance (0.383). These correlations are relatively high, and suggest that the influence of gradient works in combination with duration and distance on how difficulty is perceived by walkers. The exact relationship between each is unclear at this stage. There were low correlations with weather related variables, the highest of -0.203 suggested a negative relationship of perceived difficulty with temperature of the walk on the day. The nature of causality could be considered in the sense that 20.3% of perceived difficulty can be explained by low temperature. However an alternative assumption might be, that on the very hot days, people avoid the most difficult walks.

Organised group walking was found to be significantly different to solo walking and walking with friends and family. Post-hoc tests confirmed mean differences: between group walking and walking with friends and family and between group walking and walking solo. Although this finding makes group walking stand out, potential scepticism may draw to the fact that, in the
overall sample, only 4.9% (25 individuals) were walking in an organised group (see the earlier section, 7.2.2).

There are, if rather low, positive correlations between both number of adult males and number of adult females with perceived difficulty. It is not clear why but, this supports an idea that larger ‘groups’ engage in more difficult walks. Gender does not have a significant influence on difficulty, however. Age has a very low negative correlation, although significant, and therefore cannot be considered as any real influence on difficulty. Occupation is also significantly related to difficulty, but post-hoc tests did not identify which groups were different. The decision maker on the day had a significant influence, and the post-hoc test supported the theory of group walking being more difficult: ‘walking group leader’, as a decision maker, was significantly different to ‘myself’ by two mean difficulty units; and also to ‘joint decision’ by a similar margin.

Thus, these analyses showed that perceived difficulty of the walk chosen on the day varied based on a range of factors. Gradient, distance and duration are important causal variables, and group composition and decision making are also significant: organised walking in particular appears to increase difficulty. Demographic differences of the respondent do not seem significant, nor do most weather-related conditions, bar a slight influence of low temperatures causing a walk to be perceived as more difficult.


7.4.2 Which factors influence the duration of the walk chosen?

Table 7.19: The effects of route-choice and demographic variables on duration of the walk chosen: t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean duration (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term(^1) or holiday(^2) (n=468)</td>
<td>3h35m</td>
<td>214.936(^{15}) (10.227)</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2h48m</td>
<td>181.387 (19.047)</td>
<td>-4.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday(^1) or weekend(^2) (n=468)</td>
<td>3h01m</td>
<td>163.176 (6.891)</td>
<td>-21.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4h47m</td>
<td>242.632 (15.042)</td>
<td>-4.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill(^1) or low level(^2) walk (n=421)</td>
<td>2h23m</td>
<td>142.912 (5.422)</td>
<td>-4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4h51m</td>
<td>142.912 (5.422)</td>
<td>-4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday(^1) or walk whilst on holiday(^2) (n=317)</td>
<td>3h18</td>
<td>290.660 (28.806)</td>
<td>-0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3h46m</td>
<td>163.807 (8.458)</td>
<td>-0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male(^1) or female(^2) (n=454)</td>
<td>3h35m</td>
<td>198.281 (8.780)</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3h46m</td>
<td>206.214 (12.932)</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 7.19 and 7.20 show the results of an investigation into whether duration, as an alternative measure of difficulty, is affected by a number of variables. The analyses relate to the following ideas:

Duration of walk chosen by respondents is affected by:

- the time in which the walk is undertaken
- distance or gradient
- demographic differences between individuals completing the survey
- aspects relating to the group and context
- the weather
- the decision maker

---

\(^{15}\) Calculated in minutes

\(^{16}\) Variables marked with + adjusted by SPSS following Levene’s test for variance
Table 7.20: The effects of route-choice, demographic and situational variables on duration of the walk chosen: Correlations and ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearsons’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=461)</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>Distance (n=400)</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=475)</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>Number of adult males (n=425)</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds (n=468)</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>Number of adult females (n=417)</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=468)</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Group size (n=455)</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companions (n=466)</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>3h35m; 215.324 (18.228)</td>
<td>7.822</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>3h18m; 197.578 (9.382)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>5h58m; 357.500 (65.705)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means

‘Solo’ vs ‘Organised group walk’ Mean difference: -159.922

Occupation (n=507)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3h06m; 186.803 (7.393)</td>
<td>3.748</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>1h15m; 75.000 (45.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>3h57m; 237.381 (15.796)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>2h44m; 163.500 (11.865)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>2h34m; 154.000 (21.883)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2h35m; 155.625 (24.528)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means

‘Retired’ vs ‘Working full time’ Mean difference: -50.578

Decision-maker (n=461)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>3h11m; 190.760 (9.986)</td>
<td>5.527</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>2h44m; 163.854 (15.134)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>3h43m; 203.246 (11.123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>7h29m; 428.571 (171.457)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>2h01m; 121.111 (31.245)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means

‘Myself’ vs ‘Walking group leader’ Mean Difference: -237.811

Decision-maker (n=461)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>4h20m; 259.898 (37.838)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the earlier analysis on perceived difficulty, duration of walk chosen is not significantly affected by whether the walk was planned for term time or holiday but is significantly longer at weekends (average 4 hours, 2 minutes) than on weekdays (average 2 hours, 48 minutes). In order to explain this, one must consider that at weekends, the whole range of people are
walking; whilst on weekdays, there are a mix of people on holiday, retired and people who might be restricted by time constraints such as part-time or full-time work, who may reduce the overall average duration of walks, as they are limited to a shorter timescale. Another factor, to explain why difficulty was the same at any point in the week, if we remember that in the previous section (7.4.1), that demographic differences such as occupation and age were not significant when predicting difficulty, then available free time does not come to play.

Walks that were part of a walking holiday showed significantly longer durations than walks taken whilst on holiday, on average more than two hours longer. Gender did not significantly affect duration. The correlation between duration and age was very low. Weather variables do not appear to affect the timescale of walks. However, occupation was significantly effectual. This was explained as full-time workers walking significantly longer durations than ‘part-time workers’ (a mean difference greater than one hour) and ‘retired’ people (on average almost one hour longer). This contradicts the idea of available free time resulting in longer durations of walks.

Some confirmatory findings were resultant from the analysis of duration. Group composition types demonstrated significant differences in duration of walk, explained by the principal difference between group walkers and respondents walking with friends and family, with the group walkers undertaking walks which were over 2.5 hours longer. This also reflected in significant differences between decision-makers in duration of the walk undertaken. The post-hoc test separated walking group leaders from other decision makers: the average duration of walks chosen by group leaders was almost four hours greater than that of those who stated that the decision was made by ‘myself’, and over four hours greater than respondents stating the decision was made by ‘somebody else in my party’.
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7.4.3 Which factors influence the distance of the walk chosen?

Table 7.21: The effects of route-choice, demographic and situational variables on distance of the walk chosen: t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Mean distance in miles (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term¹ or holiday² (n=433)</td>
<td>6.128 (0.353)</td>
<td>4.780 (0.328)</td>
<td>2.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday¹ or weekend² (n=433)</td>
<td>4.736 (0.225)</td>
<td>6.638 (0.461)</td>
<td>-3.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill¹ or low level² walk (n=386)</td>
<td>7.853 (0.578)</td>
<td>4.146 (0.174)</td>
<td>6.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday¹ or walk whilst on holiday² (n=289)</td>
<td>8.603 (1.086)</td>
<td>4.499 (0.181)</td>
<td>3.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male¹ or female² (n=419)</td>
<td>5.557 (0.241)</td>
<td>5.508 (0.250)</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Variables marked with + were adjusted in SPSS following Levene’s test for variance
Table 7.22: The effects of route-choice, demographic and situational variables on distance of the walk chosen: Correlations and ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=495)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>Number of adult males (n=392)</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=504)</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>Number of adult females (n=382)</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds (n=433)</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>Group size (n=455)</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=433)</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way ANOVA

Companions (n=430)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>5.941 (0.625)</td>
<td>5.364</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>5.546 (0.306)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>9.682 (1.235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means

‘Organised group walk’ vs ‘With friends / family’ Mean difference: 4.136 0.003**

Occupation (n=505)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5.377 (0.236)</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2.750 (1.750)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>6.061 (0.313)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>4.980 (0.461)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>5.409 (1.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.353 (0.816)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey test showed no significant differences between means of different groups

Decision-maker (n=427)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>5.150 (0.338)</td>
<td>7.813</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>4.811 (0.464)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>5.607 (0.239)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>14.429 (1.438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>3.500 (0.662)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>6.888 (0.644)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means

‘Walking group leader’ vs ‘Myself’ Mean difference: 9.278 0.000***

‘Walking group leader’ vs ‘Somebody else in my party’ Mean difference: 9.617 0.000***

‘Walking group leader’ vs ‘Joint Decision’ Mean difference: 8.822 0.000***

‘Walking group leader’ vs ‘Spontaneous (no real plan)’ Mean difference: 10.929 0.001***

‘Walking group leader’ vs ‘Following a book / route card / leaflet’: 7.430 0.000***

Tables 7.21 and 7.22 focus on the distance of walks, and whether walks are longer or shorter in terms of the selected route-choice variables. The premise here is that the distance may vary:

- at different times of the week or year
- in different weather conditions
- for different demographics

254
Due to the decision-maker

Due to group composition

Distance is greater in term times (almost a mile and a half longer on average than during holidays) and at weekends (almost two miles longer than on weekdays). This is in contrast to the findings for difficulty, where only increases in term time were significant, not increases at weekends; and duration, where only increases at weekends were significant, not increases at term time. These findings demonstrate the intricacies of route-choice, and also make it problematic to make predictions about walks undertaken at different times of the week or year.

In agreement with the findings for difficulty and duration, hill walks were considerably longer than low-level walks (more than three miles longer on average). Additionally, walks undertaken as part of a walking holiday were more than three mile longer on average than stand-alone walks undertaken whilst more generally on holiday. Given the tendency of walking holidays to be favoured by serious walkers, and casual walkers to be more likely to walk whilst on holiday, it can be emphasised here that for all three measurements of difficulty, walking holidays favoured more serious, difficult and longer walks, whilst tourists with a casual interest in walking, engage in shorter, less difficult routes. Temperature variables and age were low in correlation with distance. Gender and occupation were not significantly related to the distance of walks. Group size showed a small correlation (0.148).

Once again, walking groups resulted in higher distances, than solo walkers (almost four miles longer on average) or people walking with friends or family (a mean difference of more than four hours). This relationship was significant, and post-hoc tests revealed the key difference to be between organised group walkers and family / friends groups. Analysis of the decision-making variable and distance showed walking group leaders to be involved in decisions to
engage in significantly longer walks than all other type of decision maker. The findings of this analysis and that of the other route-choice variables relating to difficulty, show that walking groups and organised walking are engaged in longer more difficult walks. This may not be a reflection of all walking groups, but those who were encountered in the national park, at the time of the survey. It could be a reflection that walking groups who engage in shorter, easier walks, such as those aimed at beginners or ‘health walks’ are less likely to head to an area such as the Lake District, perhaps because easier walks proliferate elsewhere. The idea of remoteness is explored in the final analyses of route-choice.

7.4.4 Which factors influence the remoteness of the walk chosen?

Table 7.23: Effects of route-choice variables, demographics and situational variables on the choice of walk in terms of miles from a significant settlement (over 5k population): t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean distance in miles (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable 1</td>
<td>Variable 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term(^1) or holiday(^2) (n=518)</td>
<td>9.70 (0.220)</td>
<td>10.67 (0.135)</td>
<td>-3.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday(^1) or weekend(^2) (n=518)</td>
<td>9.64 (0.254)</td>
<td>10.16 (0.234)</td>
<td>-1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill(^1) or low level (^2) walk (n=458)</td>
<td>10.21 (0.319)</td>
<td>9.58 (0.198)</td>
<td>1.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday(^1) or walk whilst on holiday(^2) (n=341)</td>
<td>10.00 (0.451)</td>
<td>9.59 (0.244)</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male(^1) or female(^2) (n=500)</td>
<td>10.26 (0.245)</td>
<td>9.57 (0.237)</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) Variables marked with + were adjusted in SPSS following Levene’s test for variance
Table 7.24: Effects of route-choice variables, demographics and situational variables on the choice of walk in terms of miles from a significant settlement (over 5k population): ANOVA and correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=508)</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of walk (n=482)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (n=468)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (n=433)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adult males (n=465)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=518)</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adult females (n=454)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (n=433)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=518)</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group size (n=499)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=518)</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA Companions (n=513)</td>
<td>Mean (SE)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>9.45 (0.541)</td>
<td>4.043</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>9.86 (0.180)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group</td>
<td>12.03 (1.169)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey Test, significant differences between means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Organised group walk’ vs Solo, Mean difference: 2.581</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.022*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Organised group walk’ vs ‘With friends / family’, Mean difference: 2.166</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (n=507)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>9.57 (0.277)</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>4.85 (4.350)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>10.62 (0.276)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>9.71 (0.421)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>8.88 (0.910)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.73 (0.852)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey test showed no significant differences between means of different groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-maker (n=508)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>9.66 (0.338)</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>10.62 (0.464)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>9.57 (0.239)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>9.85 (1.438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>10.03 (0.662)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>11.55 (0.644)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey Test, significant differences between means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Myself’ vs ‘Following a book / route card / leaflet’, Mean difference: -1.896</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.022*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision vs ‘Following a book / route card / leaflet’, Mean difference: -1.985</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 7.23 and 7.24 contain the results of analyses to determine possible effects on the remoteness of the walk chosen, with the measurement based on the distance from the nearest settlement with a population of over 5,000 to the start point of the walk. Using this particular measurement, walks undertaken on holiday were more ‘remote’ (at a small distance of just under a mile more on average) than those undertaken during term-time. There was no
significant difference in remoteness between walks undertaken on weekdays or at weekends, or between walks undertaken on walking holidays and those taken on more general holidays. Hill-walks were slightly more ‘remote’ than low level walks (approximately 0.7 miles).

In terms of weather some interesting, yet partially unexplainable outcomes emerged. Temperature was not correlated highly, nor significantly with this measure of remoteness, yet clouds showed some positive correlation (0.298) and rain a degree of negative correlation (-0.361). The argument that more rain may cause walkers to look for less remote walks makes sense. Attributing a higher degree of cloud cover to a more remote walk is somewhat unintuitive. Duration and distance of walks showed no significant correlation with remoteness, but difficulty demonstrated significant but low, correlation.

Group size was not significantly correlated with remoteness using this measurement, nor was the number of adult females in the group. A higher number of adult males was positively correlated to some degree with remoteness (0.216). If taken at face value, this suggests that the number of males in the group is responsible for 21.6% of an increase in ‘remoteness’ using this measurement (and 78.4% is related to other factors). A logical starting point to explain this effect is that higher numbers in the group negate certain barriers to engaging in more remote walks, such as safety or confidence-related aspects, but does not explain why there is no correlation between remoteness and the number of women in the group, or offer any clues relating to gender differences. Unlike their effect on difficulty-related route-choice variables, demographic differences demonstrate some significant causal impact on the remoteness of the walk chosen. Male respondents engaged in walks slightly further from larger settlements than female respondents (approximately 0.7 miles further), and age showed a low negative correlation. Although an ANOVA test indicated significantly different means of remoteness in miles for occupational groups, the post-hoc test could not identify which groups caused this.
In accordance with the earlier route-choice analyses, organised groups ventured more than 2.5 miles further on average from large settlements to walk than solo walkers and more than two miles further than those walking with friends and family. Unlike the earlier analyses though, the decision maker, although appearing significant in the ANOVA test, only showed a significant difference between those making a joint decision who on average ventured approximately two miles further from larger settlements for their walks than respondents ‘following a book / route card / leaflet’.

Table 7.25: Effects of route-choice variables, demographics and situational variables on the choice of walk in terms of miles from a smaller settlement: t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean distance in miles (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term¹ or holiday² (n=518)</td>
<td>2.64 (0.200) 2.16 (0.104)</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>0.032*+¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday¹ or weekend² (n=518)</td>
<td>1.92 (0.091) 3.02 (0.267)</td>
<td>-3.925</td>
<td>0.000***+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill¹ or low level² walk (n=458)</td>
<td>3.15 (0.305) 1.97 (0.150)</td>
<td>3.469</td>
<td>0.001**+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday¹ or walk whilst on holiday² (n=341)</td>
<td>2.52 (0.435) 2.13 (0.176)</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.404+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male¹ or female² (n=500)</td>
<td>2.83 (0.236) 2.10 (0.189)</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>0.018*+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Variables marked with + were adjusted in SPSS following Levene’s test for variance
Table 7.26: Effects of route-choice variables, demographics and situational variables on the choice of walk in terms of miles from a smaller settlement: ANOVA and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=508)</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=518)</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds (n=518)</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=518)</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One-way ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companions (n=513)</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>2.03 (0.459)</td>
<td>5.893</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>2.45 (0.157)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>4.82 (1.289)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tukey Test, significant differences between means**

‘Organised group walk’ vs Solo, Mean difference: 2.791
‘Organised group walk’ vs ‘With friends / family’ Mean difference: 2.365

**Occupation (n=507)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1.97 (0.240)</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td>0.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>0.70 (0.200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>3.24 (0.281)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>1.92 (0.293)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>2.56 (0.565)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.58 (0.492)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tukey Test, significant differences between means**

Retired vs Working full time Mean difference: -1.264

**Decision-maker (n=508)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>2.51 (0.284)</td>
<td>2.432</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>2.61 (0.393)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>2.19 (0.208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>3.67 (1.382)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>1.36 (0.619)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>3.81 (0.700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tukey Test, significant differences between means**

Joint Decision vs ‘Following a book / route card / leaflet’ Mean difference: -1.628

Tables 7.25 and 7.26 make the same analyses as that above on route-choice variables, but in this case the analysis uses a distance of the walk undertaken on the survey day from smaller settlements\(^{20}\) as its measurement in remoteness, resulting in much smaller mean differences.

---

\(^{20}\) If the nearest larger settlement was of a nearer proximity to the walk than any other village, ie one survey day was in Windermere and surrounding walks, then this measurement was used. This circumstance was the exception rather than the rule.
between groups of respondents. This analysis resulted in slightly more remote walks in term-time than during holidays; during weekends than during weekdays; and for hill walks which were further from a smaller settlement by than a mile on average than low level walks. These results differed from the earlier analyses on settlements with a population of over 5,000 people, as previously, holiday times demonstrated more remote walks. There was no significant difference in remoteness between respondents walking whilst on holiday and respondents and a specified walking holiday. Using this measurement, some of the group and demographic characteristics appeared to show similar effects on the remoteness of the walk chosen to those resulting from the earlier analysis. Male respondents were travelled to slightly more remote locations than females. The number of adult males in the group showed some statistically significant correlation with remoteness, but the number of females was not significantly correlated. Group size showed low correlation. Organised groups were again significantly more likely to find more remote walks. Understanding the influence of the decision maker proved similarly inconclusive during this analysis, as again, the only significant difference was between a joint decision or ‘following a book / route card / leaflet’.

Correlations with remoteness for distance and duration of walk were low, and only significant in the case of distance. Difficulty showed some correlation with remoteness. The explanation for this might lie with the earlier finding of hill walks usually being more remote. In this case, weather related variables show similarly confusing results suggesting that higher cloud cover (at a correlation score of 0.485), higher rainfall (0.314) and lower temperatures (-0.299) influence decisions to engage in more remote walks. Each of these correlations were statistically significant to a very high degree. Weather-resilience and the propensity for serious walkers to engage in walks ‘off the beaten track’ are potential causal factors for this finding.
Table 7.27: Effects of route-choice variables and demographic variables on the choice of walk in terms of miles from the M6: t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Term² or holiday² (n=516)</th>
<th>Weekday¹ or weekend² (n=516)</th>
<th>Hill² or low level² walk (n=498)</th>
<th>Walking holiday³ or walk whilst on holiday² (n=340)</th>
<th>Male³ or female² (n=468)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean distance in miles (SE)</td>
<td>45.34 (0.913)</td>
<td>39.37 (0.819)</td>
<td>48.12 (1.339)</td>
<td>50.41 (1.932)</td>
<td>47.51 (1.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-score</td>
<td>-3.640</td>
<td>-9.228</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>2.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. 2-tailed</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.050*+</td>
<td>0.001***</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.28: Effects of route-choice variables, demographics and situational variables on the choice of walk in terms of miles from a smaller settlement: ANOVA and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearsons’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=506)</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=516)</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds (n=516)</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=516)</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way ANOVA Companions (n=511)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companions</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>46.29 (2.022)</td>
<td>10.199</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>45.43 (0.716)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk</td>
<td>60.00 (5.387)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means

‘Organised group walk’ vs Solo, Mean difference: 13.711 0.001***
‘Organised group walk’ vs ‘With friends / family’ Mean difference: 14.567 0.000***

Occupation (n=505)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>45.43 (1.116)</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>36.00 (13.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>48.43 (1.208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>43.07 (1.660)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>42.56 (3.209)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47.29 (2.242)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision-maker (n=506)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Mean (SE)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>45.90 (1.250)</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>42.67 (2.120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>45.95 (0.927)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>48.80 (6.523)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>47.45 (3.132)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>50.39 (3.203)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey test showed no significant differences between means of different groups

21 Variables marked with + were adjusted in SPSS, following Levene’s test for variance
Using the distance from the start point of the walk to the nearest motorway (M6), a further analysis of remoteness was made (tables 7.27 and 7.28). Weekend walks were on average approximately more than 12 miles further from the nearest connection to the motorway than weekday walks. This is in accordance with the earlier analyses using distance from settlements over 5k population and distance from smaller settlements as measurements of remoteness. There was a greater likelihood of remote walking activity for respondents during holiday times. This finding agreed with the analysis on distance from larger settlements, but not with that on smaller settlements. Hill walking trips were around three miles further away from the motorway than lower level walks. Walking holidays were approximately 7 miles more remote, using this measurement than walks undertaken whilst on holiday. This was also agreement with the earlier analysis.

Of the measurements relating to difficulty, the most consistently significant correlation with measures of remoteness was perceived difficulty, in this case the highest correlation at 0.162, but as this is overall a relatively low score, its use in explaining route-choice is tenuous. Both of the other two measurements of difficulty correlated significantly, but at a low value, with this particular measurement of remoteness.

Once again males appeared to engage in more remote walks than females, and both age and occupation were not significant differentiators. Group composition broadly followed the same pattern as the earlier two analyses of remoteness. There was a positive correlation for the numbers of males in the group and distance of the walk from the M6. The number of females in the group was not significantly correlated. Group size was correlated to a low degree with remoteness using this measurement, although higher than the other two analyses. Organised group walks once again were more remote than walks taken with friends or family, or solo.
Table 7.29: Effect of route-choice and characteristic variables on distance travelled to walk (by car only): t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Mean distance in miles (SE)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term² or holiday² (n=386)</td>
<td>29.738 (3.197)</td>
<td>21.941 (2.666)</td>
<td>1.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday¹ or weekend² (n=386)</td>
<td>21.480 (2.031)</td>
<td>32.818 (4.145)</td>
<td>-2.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill¹ or low level² walk (n=338)</td>
<td>38.693 (5.225)</td>
<td>19.600 (1.964)</td>
<td>3.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday³ or walk whilst on holiday² (n=234)</td>
<td>43.952 (11.424)</td>
<td>14.006 (1.264)</td>
<td>2.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male¹ or female² (n=376)</td>
<td>28.205 (3.709)</td>
<td>25.173 (2.466)</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²² Variables marked with + were adjusted by SPSS following Levene’s test for equal variances
Table 7.30: Effect of route-choice, situational factors and characteristic variables on distance travelled to walk (by car only): ANOVA and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Spearman’s co-efficient</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Sig. 2-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=380)</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>Distance (n=327)</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (n=386)</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>Duration (n=353)</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds (n=518)</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.035*</td>
<td>Difficulty (n=364)</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain (n=386)</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>Group size (n=347)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult males (n=347)</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult females</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=338)</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way ANOVA
Companions (n=385)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean (Std. dev.)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>42.094 (6.507)</td>
<td>5.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends / family</td>
<td>24.928 (2.629)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group</td>
<td>61.615 (15.025)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means
‘With friends and family’ vs ‘Organised group’ Mean difference: 36.811 0.019*

Occupation (n=379)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean (Std. dev.)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>29.950 (4.654)</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>n/a23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>27.968 (3.987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>28.109 (4.610)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>11.550 (2.846)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.071 (2.387)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc Tukey test not viable, as one group had too few cases
Decision-maker (n=382)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean (Std. dev.)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>26.638 (3.622)</td>
<td>3.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody else in my party</td>
<td>33.692 (8.887)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Decision</td>
<td>19.737 (1.959)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking group leader</td>
<td>50.833 (22.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous (no real plan)</td>
<td>41.300 (12.467)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a book / route card / leaflet</td>
<td>49.686 (14.775)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey Test, significant differences between means
Joint Decision vs ‘Following a book / route card / leaflet’ Mean difference: -29.948 0.004**

A final analysis was made, which does not directly imply remoteness, but gives an indication of how people access walks. The distance travelled to the start point of the walk was used as a route-choice variable. As the vast majority of the sample arrived by car, it was not possible to test for users of other modes of travel. Tables 7.29 and 7.30 detail the findings of this. There was no significant difference in terms of distance travelled by car between term-time and holiday, but weekends involved on average longer distances travelled than weekdays by around...
11 miles per trip. This reflects the extra time available to some of the population at weekends, and may also capture staying visitors arriving from further afield and walking on the same day: as Friday and sometimes Saturday are changeover days for tourists. Walking holidays showed a much larger mean for distance by car travelled (almost an extra 30 miles per trip) than walks undertaken while on a more general holiday. This suggests that more casual tourists will look for nearby walks, based on convenience, often near their accommodation. Additionally it can be assumed that serious walkers who have travelled specifically to walk will venture further, whilst on their holidays. People also travelled considerably further to access hill walks.

Distance travelled by car showed some correlation (highly significant in all cases) with the three measures of walk difficulty: distance (0.250), duration (0.195) and perceived difficulty (0.228). To a minor degree therefore it appeared that walking tourists travelled further for more challenging walks. There was very low correlation with any of the weather variables, and it therefore confirms that weather is not a predictor of distance travelled. In terms of group composition, age, gender and occupation of the respondent showed no significant influence on distance travelled, nor did group size or the number of adult females in the group.

The number of adult males did seem to have some positive influence on distance travelled, correlating at 0.210, with a high degree of statistical significance. Organised group walks were a great deal more further away other types of walking company, by a mean distance of almost three times more than solo walking, and around 50% further than walks with friends and family. The only significant difference in decision maker was between joint decision and ‘following a book / route card / leaflet: an average difference of 30 miles more.
Summary of route-choice analysis

This chapter has concluded the analysis of the second stage of primary research: the survey questionnaire of recreational walkers in the Lake District. The route-choice investigation uncovered a number of important findings which can be used to present a working model in the next chapter for others to take forward in the future. The data enabled the researcher to make a detailed analysis of relationships between a number of variables relating to walking choices. These variables encompassed 518 respondents’ walks, undertaken on the day they were surveyed, and therefore gave a valuable source of route-choice information to interrogate. Furthermore, as each respondent was likely to have at least one companion, the number of walks covered could be considered as higher. The walks used in the analysis were a mix of length and duration, and almost evenly split in description as either ‘hill-walk’ or ‘low-level’. The majority were circular rather than linear. In terms of group composition, the majority of respondents were walking accompanied, with friends and / or family. Small niches walked solo or as part of an organised walking group. In nearly all cases, respondents arrived by car. The sample also provided a mix of people on a specific walking holiday, staying tourists who were on holiday and used walking as a vehicle to explore the Lake District, day visitors from within the National Park and others from further away who were willing to travel long distances to complete a certain walk.

Following the segmentation analysis in the previous chapter, a further analysis of casual and serious walkers was made to ascertain differences in their route-choice behaviour. Certain differences between the groups’ characteristics were re-emphasised in this chapter. They included the propensity for serious walkers to engage in longer, more difficult walks; their walk on the day was more likely to be as part of a walking holiday, rather than a walk on a holiday where walking was not the main focus; travel further to access their walks; and were more likely walk at weekends. An analysis of the motivations for walking on the day identified a range of
journey aspects and experiences which were universal and not specific to either group (such as exercise, recreation and scenery), and some other considerations which were more specific to one particular group. In this case, the route-choice analysis highlighted differences which gave a greater insight into casual walkers than serious walkers, providing depth to their description. There were several small significant differences indicating a preference of this group for routes with a greater level of management, more signage, better path surfaces, and closer amenities. This group also were more likely to be on a holiday without a significant walking focus, using walking as a vehicle to explore the area.

Finally, using the combined sample, the relationships between route-choice variables were analysed, with specific consideration given to the effects of individual characteristics of walkers, group composition variables, situational variables and time of the walk on: the duration, distance, difficulty, and ‘remoteness’ of walks; and the distance travelled by respondents to access them. The analysis showed a variation in the level of effect of these variables, emphasising the complexity of route-choice decision-making on the day of a walk. The analyses of the effects of some variables were relatively conclusive. Hill walks, weekend walks and walks undertaken as part of walking holidays were most often more difficult, longer and more remote. Age and occupation were generally not found to be significant, but in some cases gender was, with male respondents favouring more difficult and more remote walks. There were some less explainable findings. The effect of weather produced some unexpected findings, such as more remote walks being undertaken on days of higher cloud cover, and (using certain measurements of ‘remoteness’), higher levels of rainfall.

There are significant correlations between some of the variables; many of them are low (below 0.2, positive or negative). In light of the interview findings in chapter 5, route-choice was already considered by the experts in the field as a complex process. Therefore it stands to reason, when
considering the impact of all factors on the choice process, it seems likely that it is characterised by small correlations between many factors, in this case, rather than larger correlations between two or three variables. The marked increases in difficulty, distance, duration and remoteness of walks, occurring when the respondent was part of an organised walking group must also be considered with caution. From 518 respondents, 25 were in this niche (4.9%) of the sample, and they generally were in the Lake District to do more punishing walks, such as the 3 peaks challenge. Further research is required into organised walks to understand the full range of walks they engage in, and provide a more complete picture.

Therefore, whilst some bivariate relationships between route-choice factors have been established, the construction of a statistical multifactorial model cannot be undertaken at this stage without future study based on ascertaining the true nature of the way factors interact. This extensive analysis has provided a number of avenues to pursue to this end.

The two stages of primary data collection produced extensive findings, outlined over the past three chapters. Different methods were used, but they are in many senses confirmatory and complimentary, and this process will be discussed and reflected upon within the next chapter. As this chapter and the last have been quantitative and necessarily mechanistic, number-heavy and iterative; the next will return to the theoretical aspects, and explore in depth the findings of both stages of research, applying meaning and tourism related theory. It will return to the literature and contextual background of the research, and bringing the study forward to a point where future conceptualisation may progress the findings.
Chapter 8

Discussion of findings and conclusions

8.1 Introduction to the chapter

At the end of chapter seven the results of the two primary data collection exercises were complete. A wealth of findings, both qualitative and quantitative have been presented, resulting in some clear outcomes of the research study. This chapter will interrogate the most relevant findings and evaluate their use in building an understanding and furthering knowledge on walking tourism. The core themes resulting from the literature review from Chapter 2 and the research context material from Chapter 4 are also revisited to form a discussion which will draw the thesis to its substantive conclusions.

In taking this discussion forward, it is necessary to assess the key areas where this study has made a difference in the research area:

1. It has provided a conceptual basis for the field of tourism to understand walking as an activity and as part of the tourism sector (discussed in section 8.2)

2. It has produced a typology of recreational walkers, using empirical data (section 8.3)

3. The qualitative stage of research highlighted a theme of confidence which is a differentiating characteristic of walkers, affecting their decisions, attitudes and behaviour regarding the activity of recreational walking (section 8.4)

4. Based on the survey results, there is now a more concrete idea of how route-choice variables interact, and insight has been gained into the preferences of walkers in national parks. (section 8.5)
These core themes are now discussed in conjunction with the literature. Following these discussions, the study will be concluded and reflected on in section 8.6.

8.2 Understanding walking in the tourism field

The qualitative stage of research built theory on the activity of walking as part of the tourism sector. The mutual construction of knowledge between interviewer and interviewee is important in this context as the research has drawn insights about the walking world from the perspective of key actors involved in framing it, and then applied them to the field of tourism, where the study sits in both theoretical and practical terms.

A rich picture of walking, both in the nationalised context of the UK and a more local context of the English Lake District, reflected the intricacies of the relationship between supply of resources and demand for the activity. The interviewees were drawn from a nebulous mosaic of organisations which serve the walking industry, including national parks, interest groups and other rural tourism businesses. Previous research into rural tourism supply structures and protected areas reinforces difficulties in defining the boundaries of networks. They are often multilevel, heterogenous, and subject to a number of other complexities based on local specifics (Saxena et al., 2007, Hiedanpää, 2002). It was optimal to talk to a varied range of practitioners because each had a different focus on walking, and their organisations were not always primarily occupied with tourism purposes. The supply sector for walking mirrors the tourism industry in this regard, as many tourism businesses often function within areas outside of tourism (for example transport organisations).
Demand and supply interface and overlap in the recreational walking sector. It is clear, especially from the contributions of representatives of walking organisations such as The Ramblers’ Association and the Long Distance Walking Association, that walking is an activity in which the more dedicated individuals and groups are significantly involved in supply issues. Local participation and ownership of rural activity is considered as a growing and powerful means of developing tourism underpinned by sustainability (Stem et al., 2003; Briedenhan and Wickens, 2004). Walking should be seen as a key area in which this can happen. Sustainability is socially constructed in rural regions (Saxena and Ilbery, 2008) but the forest economy which increasingly encompasses recreation varies in its harmony with conservation ideals (Hiedanpää, 2002). The relationship between walkers and their walking environments is significant in understanding tourism in national parks, given the role walkers play in volunteering, advocating access and other activities which are designed to improve the offer of walking environments.

Given that national parks are largely tourism areas, and also that walking is a principal activity in park areas, and furthermore that the industry shows a close link between persons involved in the supply and demand of resources (they are almost all walkers and tourists themselves); walking as a tourist activity demonstrates an intriguing means of understanding tourism spaces, their management and the activity which occurs in maintaining them. The sustainable tourism paradigm which has taken root in the field of tourism study (Hunter, 1997; Choi and Sirakaya, 2005) draws significantly from the interaction between people, management and environment. The transportation element falls within this conceptual area. The material resulting from the interviews highlighted the tendency for some walking tourists to view utilitarian walks as pleasurable. The survey results suggested that the more serious or involved individuals are with walking, the greater likelihood of this being the case. Curry and Ravenscroft (2001, p.288) suggest two principal types of recreation use: a use of local space which involves the regular use of ‘unassuming’ countryside, close to home, and usually arrived at by foot; and outings
‘invariably by car, for longer periods of time, and to more distant, often specific destinations.’

Whilst both of these categories of visit to rural areas can fall on a wide area of the utility-pleasure spectrum, walking in these contexts is the mode of travel around tourist spaces which is most sustainable and most conducive to a touristic experience. Moreover, walkers are also participants in many of the other activities which occur in natural tourism spaces. Outdoor recreationists generally undertake multiple adventure related activities in their holidays (Pomfret and Bramwell, 2014). Thus, by drawing from this investigation, the sustainable tourism body of research can draw ideas on the role in which walking plays in rural tourism spaces to understand more about them.

Figure 8.1: Relationship between walking, walking tourism and tourism approaches to management

Figure 8.1 summarises the interfaces between sustainable tourism and walking in the frame provided by the findings of this research. It finds walking infrastructure in very much the same place literally as that required for tourists on foot to move around: in urban areas this is the pedestrian environment and in natural areas, the footpaths. Although for many the most obvious location for walking is the rural tourism environment, the urban space has been shown
as important in both the findings of the interviews, and the survey results. The urban walking tour is an important part of urban tourism, for example. This research has shown many walkers use urban environments frequently, and those with more serious an interest even more so.

In both rural and urban walking areas, a range of stakeholders have an interest in managing resources; those involved in walking are a different mix to those invested in tourism more generally. Whilst walking affects the whole population in management, policy and other supply contexts; tourism, and more specifically walking tourism supply activities are narrowed to smaller margins. Given the trend towards a sustainable tourism paradigm, the two spheres of influence of walking and tourism supply will overlap further as time goes on.
8.3 Serious and casual walkers

Figure 8.2: Comparison of all significant differences in mean responses to attitudinal variables

A key finding of this study are the differences between walkers in terms of their characteristics. Whilst the interviews left open the possibility that serious and casual are terms which can be used to differentiate the type of activity (one person could undertake serious or casual walks at different times); the survey found that individuals who fall into two empirically derived groups differ in their attitudes towards walking and their walking behaviour. Figure 8.2 (above) and figure 8.3 (below) illustrate the significant differences in attitudinal and behavioural characteristics from the analysis in chapter 6. They attribute higher mean scores to serious walkers generally in most of the indicators. Discounting fundamental differentiating attitudinal variables (casualness, seriousness and experience), the most pronounced differences are in attitudes towards goal-seeking, wilderness seeking and weather resilience. Additionally, agreement on the importance of equipment is also skewed towards serious walkers. Map reading is associated with serious walkers to a greater degree than casual walkers. The analyses of walking activity in chapter 6 and of route choice in chapter 7 both showed serious walkers...
would walk for longer, choose more difficult routes, with higher gradients and would also be more likely to walk as the main focus on their holiday, whilst casual walkers would be more concerned about management, amenities and convenience (see figure 8.4, below).

**Figure 8.3: Navigation preferences of casual and serious walkers**
It is now relevant to return to the serious and casual leisure concepts originated by Stebbins (1982, 1997). Serious leisure, Stebbins (1997) argues, is focused on acquiring skills, knowledge and experience, reflecting a career pattern in the individual’s engagement with the activity. On mountaineering, Stebbins (2005, p.15) discusses a form of ‘nature-challenge’ hobbyism, characterised by adventure, ‘extremism’, risk and sensation seeking. Green and Jones (2005), whilst analysing serious leisure in conjunction with sport tourism, point to the skillset of ‘serious hill-walkers’ requiring competency in navigation and weather conditions, and Yoder (1997) notes the characteristic of serious leisure participants to persevere through any given adversity including extreme weather in order to engage in their chosen pursuit. Each of these attributes have similarity to those of serious walkers found in the survey results. The elements of risk, adventure, goal-seeking and wilderness experience are attributed to high altitude environments (Ewert, 1994). Although the Lake District Fells are considerably smaller in comparison than the environments discussed in such studies the results of the survey demonstrate a set of people who hold the same motivations when they go out walking and at least think that the experience they are deriving has some similarity. Whilst there is a tendency to equate some of the motivational elements of serious outdoor leisure activity to sports, the criteria for
competitiveness such as established rules, is only tangibly present in walking when it is a challenge event. However, the challenge and endurance elements of serious walking are part of the motivational picture.

In general terms, there is more substance in the survey data to use in describing serious walkers: what they are and what casual walkers aren’t. However, casual walkers have their own specific traits: greater need for managed paths and amenities, favouring shorter and easier walks and a greater motivation for the social elements involved in walking. There is less to draw from in the literature on casual leisure to discuss this. DeLucio and Mugica (1994) studied visitors to national parks in Spain and describe casual visitors as harder to access, and less engaged with the landscapes, and therefore their attitudes towards the environment may increase their negative impact. The authors suggest they favour ‘prototype’ landscapes and reject national parks with more distinguished or wild characteristics. This suggests an attraction to more manicured landscapes evoked in the more managed sites. Stebbins (1997) attributes social attraction, self-enrichment and refreshment as motivators for casual leisure. Other characteristics of casual leisure which broadly correlate with the interview findings and survey results are a greater desire for contact with the social world and less emphasis on identity than serious leisure (Green and Jones, 2005). Stebbins (1996) discusses cultural tourism as a serious leisure pursuit. He suggests that tourists who pursue cultural activities can be thought of as hobbyists if they develop a ‘career’ and that those who only go on 2-3 cultural tours whilst on holiday are ‘cultural dabblers’ or more pertinently, casual leisurists. This can be equated to the survey finding that serious walkers were likely to be on a walking holiday, whilst casual walkers were more likely to walk as an activity on a general holiday where walking was not the main focus.

Kay and Moxham’s (1996) segmentation of types of walk resulted in 20 variants which they grouped into clusters. A ‘casual’ cluster encompassed sauntering, roaming, ambling, walking,
wandering and plodding. At the serious end another cluster included back-packing, hill-walking, fell-walking and yomping, and in the middle-ground, trampling, rambling, striding, trail-walking and trekking. A criticism of this study rests on the methods for deriving the clusters, and that there are too many to effectively delineate walkers in both theoretical and practical terms. However, a potential criticism of the two cluster solution of serious and casual walkers is that there are too few, and that a continuum between serious and casual walks, reflecting Kay and Moxham’s hierarchy based on the seriousness of different walks, is more appropriate. Scott (2012) suggests that leisure activities all fall onto a continuum from casual to serious, that seriousness can be partitioned further into particular ‘levels’ of seriousness, but that certain complex pursuits can be pursued casually. The view that is taken in this thesis is that the walks are on a spectrum of difficulty, which varies based on situational factors, but individuals’ vary based on their attitudes and motivations, which is evident in the survey results.

A segmentation example by Moscardo et al. (1996) used activities as a differentiator for clusters. Whilst walking tourists choose their destination based on factors such as the attractiveness for walking and the locations walked through, this study is relevant, as it follows some of the themes which have arisen. Fundamentally the exercise showed that groups of people differ on their motivation for certain activities. These activity-based segments vary in levels of motivation to visit specific destinations, which are attractive because of their shared needs to engage in particular activities. This can be related to serious walkers being more specific in their choices of location who are driven by walking as their passion (for example ‘serious walkers’ will be more particular about where they choose to walk). Another example by Shoemaker (1994) involved segmentation analysis on people grouped by previous trip experiences to understand how they affected travel destination decisions. The focus was marketing strategies which could be employed relevant to previous experience ‘rewards’. Walkers with more experience, a factor closely correlated to seriousness will have more walks in their memory, to draw from in their
decision-making process, and furthermore the survey analysis also found walkers to be more engaged with the environments they have walked in, meaning that they consider potential locations with more thought.

Figure 8.5: Conceptual diagram of serious and casual continuums for walking

Figure 8.5 (above) draws together the double-continuum idea that an individual walker can be casual or serious in their outlook towards the activity, but can engage in walks that sit on a continuum of their own. It is more likely that one whose characteristics lie towards the serious end of the spectrum will engage in walks that are at the serious end of the walk continuum.

Take the example mentioned in the interviews of the serious walker who will engage in challenging walks one week, and then the next will walk with a young family on a shorter more casual basis: this demonstrates that two continuums are a more appropriate means to understand behaviour and choice-making. Another example is the walker who is time
constrained, or for geographical reasons cannot reach areas often to engage in serious walks. Group walks also affect the nature of the walk chosen, as the individual may sit somewhere on the serious-casual continuum, but conforms to the group norms in terms of the seriousness of the walks they manage. The influence of individuals on groups and vice versa is a complicated area in itself. Decrop and Snelders (2005) studied holiday makers from Belgium, splitting decision-making factors into four domains. Initially ‘primary’ personal attributes, such as age, lifestyle and education provide a foundation for all other factors. Drawing from ‘primary’ personal factors, ‘secondary’ personal factors include motivations, experience and personal history. Next, inter-personal factors, which relate to group decisions, are based on both primary and secondary factors; and finally, situational factors including availability and information ‘come into play when the vacationer makes his/her decisions’. This last set of factors includes moods and emotions, which were identified in the first-stage interviews as being important in the walking decision process, and fundamental to understanding its complexity.

Although the conceptual diagram describes attributes such as the need for social contact at the casual end of the scale, and the challenge and risk at the serious end, there is likely to be a fluidity between motivations for each individual at individual times. Social contact may well be part of the experience for serious walkers who walk together, yet the results of the survey show it is more prominent in the casual group. Additionally, universal motivations such as scenery, exercise and recreation are important for all walkers, but they may be lower in the priority list for serious walkers. Nevertheless the casual / serious distinction which has arisen from this research is useful in a theoretical sense to provide a solid picture of the differences between walkers and types of walking in evidence. The idea that confidence plays an integral part in how individuals move along either continuum was introduced in the interview findings, and will now be revisited in the next section.
8.4 A question of confidence

Confidence is addressed to a limited extent in the tourism literature and more widely in other disciplines. In some cases it appears as one part of a conceptual model. Pearce and Lee (2015) used an array of different elements drawn from touristic experience, including romance, stimulation, isolation and autonomy. Confidence is present as an attribute in one factor group category (self-development) as ‘Gaining a sense of self-confidence’, but in this model was not a principal element of the experience. Alternatively self-confidence is a significant element of Pomfret’s (2006) conceptual framework for adventure tourism research. Confidence is more prominent in adventure tourism research, and is discussed in conjunction with increasing the skillset to manage better the associated risk and uncertainty with outdoor activities (Ryan, 2003, p.62), and the challenge of overcoming barriers to success (Kane and Tucker, 2004). Certainly, the findings of the interviews with walking practitioners show confidence to be a more central over-arching theme in the minds of the people involved in providing walking resources, but in academic terms, it is only being associated with the more serious forms of leisure.

Other tourism studies are now focusing more on risk and uncertainty in the travel decision-making process (Quintal et al., 2010). Considering walking as a form of travel, these elements are present when dealing with situational factors and the route-choice decisions made by walkers are based on the relative safety implications to individuals. Teare (1994), on consumer behaviour in travel and tourism, attributes a higher level of confidence to more experienced consumers. Because of this confidence, they have a more decisive outlook, and low personal involvement in the decision-making process to choose a product. This is in contrast to a high-involvement, low-confidence approach by consumers with less experience. Walking for recreation involves choices based on experience, but although decisions may be quicker for experienced walkers, situations during walks may require involved decisions which aren’t completely based on confidence: for instance changing routes due to situational factors. It
would be fair to say that the level of involvement in the decision is generally high in different ways for consumers of low and high levels of experience.

Self-esteem is a term which is used within tourism and elsewhere, and is closely related to confidence. Walking experiences can change confidence levels, variably dependent on individual attitudes and outlook. Self-esteem is developed during walking experiences especially because of the physical benefits, and the engagement with natural environments (Priest, 2007). Typically, psychologists consider that the maintenance of self-esteem is engrained in human behaviour (Benabou and Tirole, 2002). It is also a fundamental need which is fulfilled in Maslow's hierarchy (1943), and important in the experiential rewards of tourism. In broader tourism terms, confidence plays a role in seeking out certain experiences through increased cultural contact (Graburn, 1983)

Confidence is also valuable in affecting personal motivation to complete certain tasks. Benabou and Tirole (2002) consider one's ability to balance the tendency towards over-confidence with the greater motivation which self-confidence can bring. In the context of walking, the interview findings showed that individuals build up this natural confidence over time, based on experience of walking, and in the case of hill-walks, overcoming risks, enduring distances or height. The false confidence which some inexperienced walkers might display by not preparing properly, ignoring weather conditions or experiencing navigational problems, is something which can be overcome by gaining this experience. Therefore, the continuation of walking and increase of regular distance walked is not only likely to maintain self-esteem, but also to cause added motivation to push oneself to walk more.
Understanding the effect of walking from a low point of confidence is also important. Priest’s (2007) study on the mental health effects of walking explores the relationship between social settings, natural environments and the activity of walking impacts. In particular it focuses on walking groups for people with mental health difficulties. A grounded theory analysis drew out comments such as ‘being close to nature’, ‘feeling safe’ and ‘being me’ and indicated the importance of being away from the hustle and bustle, calmness, and experiences relating to place (the escape element) and the walking group (the respite provided). Benabou and Tirole (2002) draw attention to two more significant ideas: firstly that in difficult circumstances, goals can be achieved by self-efficacy, the belief that an individual can achieve a given action (see Bandura, 1986); and secondly, the theory that a low level of self-confidence is sometimes addressed by with-holding effort, a coping mechanism employed by the individual (Berglas and Jones, 1978; Baumiester, 1998). Given these ideas about how confidence can be gained by those with low confidence, and the effects walking can have, a symbiotic relationship between the activity and the self-esteem generated is apparent. But the nuances involved in overcoming problems of low self-confidence are not limited to walking and in each case, one must first understand the nuances of the individual involved.

One subject area in which the psychology of confidence is particularly relevant is sports science. Woodman and Hardy (2003) investigated the relationships between cognitive anxiety and self-confidence with sporting performance. They conducted a meta-analysis of 47 previous studies focusing on a range of sports. Both cognitive-anxiety and self-confidence were more significant in their effects on ‘high-performance’ sports than ‘low-performance’ sports. It is up for some debate how walking as an activity is affected by this, as only the more competitive niches (for example the three peaks 24 hour challenge experienced by the researcher in the Lake District survey) have synergies with sport and thus, participants are susceptible to performance anxiety. Additionally, in Woodman and Hardy’s (2003) study there was much lower significance in the
role of self-confidence and cognitive-anxiety for the more sedentary sports such as bowls and shooting. It is agreed that in many cases walking is likely to be associated less with cognitive anxiety than many high performance sports, but that the self-confidence element increases with the severity of the walk. The anxiety element in most forms of walking is more related to the risk element, or for inexperienced navigators, being lost. Thus, walking holds its own unique rules relating to confidence when compared to other activities.

8.5 Route-choice in national parks

Tables 8.1 and 8.2 summarise the analysis of route choice variables from chapter 7. As the analyses differed between types of variables, some are presented as a strength of correlation between two interval variables (for instance the effect of group size on the duration of walk), others are provided as the most influential of two binary options on an interval variable (for example, is distance walked greater at weekends or on weekdays?), and others as the most influential of more than two options of a categorical variable on an interval variable (does the type of decision maker affect the perceived level of difficulty of the walk?). Where necessary, it is stated when there were no significant differences found.
Table 8.1: Influence of time of year, time of week, holiday status, physical aspects of walks, demographics and group size on route choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>5k</th>
<th>Smaller than 5k</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>Car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term / holidays</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday / weekend</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill / low level</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday / walk whilst on</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Very strong correlation</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male / female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>No significant</td>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td>No significant</td>
<td>Working full</td>
<td>No significant</td>
<td>Working full</td>
<td>No significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>differences</td>
<td>significantly</td>
<td>differences</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>differences</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>different to</td>
<td></td>
<td>significantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>working part time</td>
<td></td>
<td>different to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.2: Influence of group composition, decision maker and weather on route-choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>5k</th>
<th>Smaller than 5k</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>Car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult males</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult females</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo / family and friends / organised groups</td>
<td>Org??</td>
<td>Organised groups significantly different to solo</td>
<td>Walking with friends and family</td>
<td>Organised groups significantly different to solo and walking with friends and family</td>
<td>Organised groups significantly different to solo and walking with friends and family</td>
<td>Following a guide book, route card or leaflet significantly different to joint decision</td>
<td>Following a guide book, route card or leaflet significantly different to joint decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>Walking group leader significantly different to ‘myself’ and joint decision</td>
<td>Walking group leader significantly different to all other variables</td>
<td>Walking group leader significantly different to all other variables</td>
<td>Following a guide book, route card or leaflet significantly different to ‘myself’ and joint decision</td>
<td>Following a guide book, route card or leaflet significantly different to joint decision</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>Following a guide book, route card or leaflet significantly different to joint decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Some correlation*</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Some correlation</td>
<td>Reasonable correlation</td>
<td>Very low correlation</td>
<td>Low correlation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Some correlation*</td>
<td>Reasonable correlation</td>
<td>Reasonable correlation</td>
<td>Very low correlation*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The physical characteristics of walk, tested in the survey, are all closely related to one another. Distance, duration and difficulty are well correlated and hill walking in particular affects measurements of route choice. Physiology studies have assessed hillwalking performance by age group and found that people dehydrate quicker in mountain environments, and that decision making is impaired; these issues extend to age groups at different rates (Ainslie et al., 2002a). The terrain and weather are also a factor which influences perceptions of difficulty (Ainslie et al., 2002b). Where this study goes beyond others is the matching of difficulty measures to other variables.

Using time of year or time of the week as a route-choice variable produced some small variations in the difficulty of walks, how remote walks were or the distance people travelled to the walk start-point by car. Seasonality is a prominent issue for tourism suppliers, and demand is determined by a number of causal factors, including fluctuations for different segments (Jang, 2004). Differences in difficulty and distance were minimal between term and holidays, and most likely caused by segment-based variations in available free time. Walking has been described as an activity prone to seasonal variations, but these vary by area, and to an extent based on the patterns of staying tourists (Midmore, 2000). The Lake District has its own pattern in this sense, but any variations in difficulty and distance are likely to be affected by weather patterns, especially given the erratic weather in the region, during the final few months of the survey.

It has been problematic attempting to understand the influence of variables on the remoteness of walks chosen. Finding the most appropriate measurement is the main issue: using distance from a settlement of over 5,000 population did not produce many significant results, and although there were some significant differences when using smaller settlements as a measurement of remoteness, the differences were minimal. Remoteness has been reported in conjunction with a number of adventure tourism activities, using measurements such as
transportation access, whether locations are inhabited, proximity to towns and number of
visitors (Buckley, 2007). It is a measure which is essentially open to interpretation, and the Lake
District, as a relatively sparsely populated, but heavily visited national park area, should be
considered as a destination in its unique geographical context. Remoteness is important to the
experiential qualities of natural landscapes, and the presence or absence of major roads is a
significant influence on the visitor experience (Boller et al., 2010). Therefore, given the large
majority of respondents arrived by car, and the situation of access to the main motorway in the
region on the Eastern boundaries, the more remote areas in this case are towards the fringes,
away from the motorway, where the roads are narrow, and villages small, and then further
remoteness is achieved by walking into areas away from the roads. Car access is an important
variable in countryside recreation visitation, particularly for young people and lower socio-
economic groups, where it may be limited (Mulder et al., 2005), and therefore the sample used
in the survey should be considered with a degree of caution.

The details acquired on demographics of respondents and their companions allowed some
assessment to be made on group dynamics with regard to route-choice. Although group size
has been shown to alter spending patterns on walking and cycling trails, and is associated with
the duration trail-users stay on a walking and cycling facility (Downward et al., 2009), there were
no significant effects on route-choice in this instance. There were higher correlations between
a number of the route-choice variables and the number of adult males in groups. A range of
literature exists in the recent past on the constraints women face to participate in outdoor
leisure activities, (Shores et al., 2007) in what is still considered as a male-dominated
environment, reflected in media and advertising (Warren, 2014, p.361). However although the
survey results showed males individually as respondents to report more difficult and longer
walks, they did not specifically suggest the presence of females in the group as reducing the
difficulty or distance of the walk. The gender balance recorded for many groups reflected
couples and families. More often, trips are planned with the whole group in mind, from pre-planning to the day of the activity and family dynamics are therefore significant in cumulative decision-making (Woodside and Martin, 2012). This has the effect of elongating the experience.

Fodness (1992) analysed the family life-cycle with specific reference to how it affects travel decision making. The presence of children in the family is important in the travel decision, as is the influence of husband or wife on the final decision. Although there are three possibilities (husband, wife or joint involvement on the final decision) on the final decision, the joint decision by husband and wife is the most prominent. However, modern families are much more diverse than simply boxing them off as husband and / or wife and their children, and certainly, the groups encountered on the survey also included a mixture of extended families, friends and in some cases multiple families walking together. The segmentation approach used by Fodness (1992) was based on the age of the children primarily, but also took into account the age of the spouses: finding that younger spouses would make different decisions to older spouses. This is at odds with the findings of the survey element of this study, in which age was not a significant determinant of route-choice. In Fodness’s study, wives were found to be more dominant in travel decisions involving groups with children. This particular assumption has not been reinforced in the survey results.

The two noticeable trends with regard to decision maker, were that: decisions made by walking group leaders resulted in more difficult and longer walks than other forms of decision making; and those following guide books, route cards or leaflets would travel further and to more remote areas than people making a joint decision within their group, or choosing by themselves. It was already established that walking groups make up a small niche in the sample, and that larger numbers of people make their own choices, singularly or together. It was found in a study of UK tourists that 49% of people undertaking walking and cycling holidays preferred to plan their own
route (Mintel, 2013). There is nothing in the existing literature with which to compare the effects of using guide books or other printed material with other means of route planning. The information levels within guide books may reflect a more diverse range of walks based on their remoteness than the average self-planned walk.

8.6 Conclusion of the thesis.

8.6.1 Conclusions

This final section of the chapter and indeed the thesis summarises the key achievements of the work and where gaps or limitations exist. The study has addressed all research aims in an increment in relation to previous tourism-based work on the activity of walking. A deeper understanding of the walking sector, particularly in national park areas has been achieved using a pragmatist approach. A theoretical framework for research into the activity of walking for recreation is provided. Walking sits within the sustainable tourism paradigm as a key component, and as yet has not been adequately addressed as such. Studies of rural tourism, should consider concentrating on walking more, as an important element of the experience, and as a travel mode. The interviews have proven that on the ground, practitioners clearly do see it so. The Lake District, thus proves a significant case study in demonstrating the importance of walking to future research in protected and rural areas.

Casual and serious walkers demonstrate distinct characteristics in terms of motivations and preferences for locations. In evaluating segmentation ventures, it is important to consider ‘the fit of potentially interesting segments with the strengths of the tourism destination’ (Dolnicar, 2007, p.143). The Lake District management already consider these groups in their approach. Other national park areas may be subject to different balances of day and staying visitors, and those who focus mainly on walking, or those who are visiting for a range of purposes. That said,
the basic descriptions developed here are transferable to other areas if these balances are taken into account. Those aiming to understand segment-based differences in decision making should gauge transferability for statistical generalisations (Decrop and Snelders, 2005). The casual / serious delineation is useful to describe a range of characteristics which define them. In practice, walkers are often lumped together, although the presence of specialist organisations such as the British Mountaineering Council, Ramblers’ and Long Distance Walkers’ Association ensures a range of niches are catered for to an extent.

The concepts of serious and casual leisure originating from the leisure studies field have proven useful in this study to apply to the tourism context. They have been shown to be applicable to national parks in terms of visitor behaviour, and can be extended to other activities. It is helpful to hold onto the double continuum idea: that either the actor or the activity can be casual or serious. To understand better how individuals convert a casual interest to serious a travel career ladder may be a useful concept to draw on – assuming certain needs are fulfilled or sought in order to progress. The role of confidence as part of these needs being met is key to understand how a career in serious walking develops. In tourism studies this has traditionally been addressed as self-esteem, but the experts in walking behaviour suggest that confidence is a significant component. Tourism research has previously used psychology to understand experiences and how events and memories are related (Larsen, 2007). Drawing from psychology more to add detail to the confidence / career ladder theory would be an important step in continuing research. Although sports psychology may explain some of the process for more competitive walking, the majority or walking activity is subject to a different set of factors.

Overall, the route-choice findings represent an increment in research on walking which can be built upon in future studies. There are relationships between variables which this study has proven: greater perceived difficulty is correlated to duration and distance and associated with
hill walks, walking holidays, organised group walking, weekdays and term times. Walks which are more remote follow similar rules. Age and occupation are not relevant, but gender does appear to be. The effect of weather has not been conclusively analysed. This study has provided findings about walkers which are not entirely reflective of previous research on wider tourism route-choice behaviour, and therefore demonstrates a justification for focusing on walking.

8.6.2 Limitations

The study has limitations. The literature review was extensive in its scope, but limited on material directly associated with walking, which led to the grounded approach. Whilst there is some debate as to the place of the literature review in studies of grounded theory (McGhee et al., 2007), Glaser (1998) considers conducting a minimal literature review before data collection to be an appropriate approach, which carefully avoids influences which might affect the construction of theory, leaving the majority of the literature review in the substantive subject area until the post-analysis stage. The discussion in this chapter has flagged up areas in which future research on this subject can build upon this. In this sense, the direction of research will be picked up by others into more targeted literature areas in future studies.

An additional limitation relates to the complexity of the subject area. In order to address the aims long interviews were employed. Tourism studies use these methods to cope with the fact that the process of travel decision making and resultant behaviour is extremely complex (Martin and Woodside, 2008, p.62). Thus, this study has aimed to use the complexities to filter the wide range of variables associated with walking, but in the scope of the research, could not go beyond that to provide a definitive route choice model. It has, however, provided a working framework for others to build upon.
The survey contained a question on journey purpose which was presented as a ranked question, with ten options, which were intended to be ranked in terms of importance. Unfortunately too many of the respondents misinterpreted the question and therefore the data for this question was discarded. Having this information in the model would have potentially improved the accuracy of the fit, especially as purpose and type of walkers are likely to be related.

Lastly, remoteness was incorporated into the route-choice analysis, on several reasoned parameters. It is difficult to measure, but has been discussed in previous studies in similar terms: distance from roads, population, and quietness. Therefore findings based on remoteness have to be taken in context based on the parameters outlined in chapter 7.

8.6.3 Reflections

Documenting the research journey is important. Beginning with a comprehensive literature review, and then following a research framework based on grounded theory, changes in lines of thinking and other external changes occurred during the six-year period of completing this PhD study. The emergent finding of confidence shaped much of the thinking post-interview stage. Whilst the research began with a focus on walking as a form of tourist transport, over the course of the study, some added focus on adventure tourism principles were influential. The strand of adventure tourism research has also grown in this time. It is suggested that this study has to, by its very nature, straddle the subject boundaries of rural tourism, sustainable tourism and adventure tourism at the very least. These elements have been taken into consideration but fundamentally, the research has sought to stay as focused as possible on its original track.
The use of NVivo to guide the first stage of the data collection process led to longer, more in-depth and carefully considered analysis, aligned to the grounded methodology. A quicker analysis (for instance making notes on transcriptions) may have overlooked some of the less readily obvious findings which resulted from the analysis. Using NVivo therefore allowed some elements to emerge over time which would perhaps not have been identified. It is the opinion of the researcher that this is one of the principal strengths of the research approach. The first stage of research was an analytical process which was undertaken with the design of the second stage in mind: the codes becoming options on the multiple choice questions used in the survey questionnaire. Glaser (1978) makes clear that the test of a grounded theory study is the fit of the emerging theory to the context being observed, and that it helps others understand more clearly the context surrounding the research area. In this sense the survey provided a rigorous test of the concepts emerging from the interviews, the most significant being the definition of casual and serious walkers.

Lessons learned on ‘being a researcher’ include a greater appreciation of the management of a completely unique and substantial piece of research. It is important to consider in-depth the methods used and their suitability for answering the research question. It is equally important to be reflective on their execution. The more time spent considering and perfecting the research design framework in the planning stages, the better the academic rigour and confidence in the results. In particular, in using qualitative and grounded approaches, one learns how to trust their own intuition in the analysis of findings. Managing this piece of work and seeing it from conception to completion has improved my abilities as a researcher further.
8.6.4 Future research focus

There are a number of areas from which future research into recreational walking can direct attention. The delineation of casual and serious walkers can be characterised further. The career of a serious walker is an idea which has emerged over the course of this research, and should now be interrogated in order to understand in more detail how the entry points and trajectories manifest with different people. Casual walkers are very important to understand for visitor management purposes in tourism areas in terms of managing both sites and behaviours; and both groups are of interest to those marketing tourism resources. The most appropriate course of action is to conduct future qualitative work, this time focused on walkers themselves who are either casual or serious in their approach to the activity to understand in more depth from their perspective. Taking the casual and serious definitions from this context and applying them to other activities (cycling for example), to see how they compare is another interesting area to build on. An additional focus involves understanding the boundaries between definitions of casual and serious, and how a continuum can be determined further.

The theory of confidence which fits with this was nuanced towards individuals and requires extra understanding in order to measure it; and therefore was not directly included in the survey, after being so prominent in the interview findings. Broadening out the tourism subject area to explore other possibilities is also valuable. Drawing from other disciplines such as psychology to add theory to the ideas presented here would be useful. A greater understanding the psychology of tourists in general and walkers in particular is required for the field of tourism study. Analysis of the nuances of personal confidence and how that applies to walking choices and behaviour is of particular value. The route-choice findings include data relationships on walking activity which are useable for modelling on a wider scale: such as projecting demand for new walking facilities, economic impacts or predicting the results of developing walking tourism.
In future, researchers should investigate hierarchies; primary and secondary factors in route-choice decisions.

The study approach of interviewing walking professionals, often in walking locations, and undertaking survey research in a national park has an ethnographic edge. This dimension of ‘living in the research world’ has been important to the personal understanding of the researcher, and has helped bring the research to life. The walking-talking phenomena is therefore an area of potential research which would be important in shaping future theory on walking tourism.

Lastly and most importantly, recognising the role walking plays and applying it to sustainable tourism research should be a key part of the agenda in the coming years. In particular, walking highlights the issues which affect tourism and recreation in general over the demand and supply of natural resources. For the future of sustainable tourism practice and the conservation of the walking landscape, there must be a theoretical debate how the relationship between demand and supply is conceptualised in the discipline.
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Appendix A: Survey questionnaire

Figure A1: Survey Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About You</th>
<th>Your opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3) Why did you start walking for recreation?</td>
<td>21) How much do you agree with the following?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please state your level of agreement (1 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly)</td>
<td>Please state your level of agreement (1 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family took me walking a lot as a child</td>
<td>I live in a walking area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I went walking with school</td>
<td>My chances to walk for recreation are limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined a walking club at college / university</td>
<td>Walking, for me, is about achieving goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined another walking club (e.g. Ramblers)</td>
<td>Comfort is important whilst walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I started walking with friends / work colleagues</td>
<td>The pace of walking allows me to see more detail than other modes (such as cycling or car travel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td>I take pleasure from my utility walking trips (such as walking to work or dog walking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.4) How important are the following to you? | 22) Why do you like walking? |
| Please state the level of importance where (1 = unimportant, 5 = very important) | Please state the level of agreement |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| High specification walking clothing | I don’t mind some poor weather when walking |
| High specification walking footwear | The walks I choose are dependant on my mood and energy levels |
| Buying walking-related reading material regularly (e.g. magazines) | Today’s walk helped me re-live past memories. |

| 15) I usually walk: Please tick one only |
| | 16) What is your home postcode? |
| | 17) Are you: | 18) Which Age group are you in? |
| | Male or | Female? |
| | Please tick one only |
| 17 | 18  19 | 20 |
| Under 16 | 16-24 | 25-34 |
| 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 |
| 65-74 | 75 or over |

| 19) How would you describe yourself? | 20) Please state your occupation if employed: |
| Please tick one only | Autumn |
| Retired | Working full time | Home-maker |
| Disabled | Working part-time | Other |

Recreational Walking Study

I am studying recreational walking in the UK who walks, where and why. The information will be used to build up a picture of walkers in the UK and understand in depth what people walk in terms of their walks. I would be extremely grateful if you could spend ten minutes to fill out this survey and return it in the envelope provided.

Many thanks for your help!

Your walk today

1) What best describes your walk today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) (please circle one)</th>
<th>2) (please circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short stroll (1 hour or less)</td>
<td>Day walk (over 4 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day walk (1-4 hours)</td>
<td>Part of longer distance walk (more than one day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) (please circle one)</th>
<th>3) (please circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular walk</td>
<td>Linear walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started / ended at</td>
<td>From ..............................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ..............................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking holiday | Walk whilst on holiday |

Please return your completed form using the pre-paid envelope provided and send it to: University of Central Lancashire, Preston, PR1 2BP. No stamp required.

All of the information you provide will remain anonymous. The University has an ethical policy regarding all of its research matters. The information you provide, however, is invaluable and we thank you very much for your cooperation. If you would like to be contacted to help further with this study please provide your email address.

This survey is being conducted by the Institute of Transport and Tourism of the University of Central Lancashire. If you want further details, please contact Nick Davies, ndavies@uclan.ac.uk, tel 01772 695097.
Figure A2: Survey Questionnaire

Your walk today

3) Please rate the difficulty of the walk where the least difficult is 1 and the most is 10.....................

4) Are you walking: Please tick one only
   Solo ☐ With friends / family ☐
   Organised group walk (please give details) ☐

5) In your group today, how many:

   Adults
   Males ☐ Females ☐
   Children

6) Who made the decision to choose the route?
   Please tick the most appropriate answer
   Myself ☐ Somebody else in my party ☐
   Joint decision ☐ Walking group leader ☐
   Following a book / route card / leader (please give details) ☐

7) Please give any more details of your walking route today:

9) Please rate the importance of the following in your decision to choose this walk today, on a scale of 1-5 (where 1 is not very important and 5 is very important):

   | Scenery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   |--------------------------------------------------|
   | Completing a section of a national trail |     |
   | Point of interest (please state) |     |
   | Seen it in a guide, magazine or website |     |
   | Time spent with family or friends |     |
   | Local history |     |
   | Wildlife |     |
   | Photographic interest |     |
   | Exercise |     |
   | General recreation |     |
   | Convenience |     |
   | Flexibility to change route if needed |     |
   | Clear visible signs and directions |     |
   | Nearby amenities (toilets, refreshments etc) |     |
   | Smooth / even path surface |     |
   | Well managed paths |     |
   | Accessibility |     |
   | Knowing where Rights of Way are |     |

11) Approximately how often did you undertake the following types of walk for recreation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the last 4 weeks</th>
<th>In the last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short stroll (1 hour or less)</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day walk (1-4 hours)</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day walk (Over 4 hours)</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two day or more walk</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill walking</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level walking</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban recreational walking</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised group walk (please state)</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance trail</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular walk</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear walk</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking holiday / short break</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning walks

12) How do you normally plan walks?

   Please tick one answer per line

   | Map and compass - design route by self | ☐ |
   | Guide book | ☐ |
   | Leaflet | ☐ |
   | Route card | ☐ |
   | Internet | ☐ |
   | GPS or other technology | ☐ |
   | Spontaneous (no real plan) | ☐ |
   | Organised by somebody else (please state) | ☐ |
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Appendix B: Sample of interview transcripts and research coding process

The five transcripts included in appendix B were selected because they provide an accurate picture of the development of the research analysis pertaining to the first stage of data collection, the expert interviews with practitioners. The research journey between the analysis of each interview transcript was characterised by a development of understanding about the walking world, and the thought process which led to the findings in chapter five is now illustrated. Five transcripts are presented, with diagrams on coding process and critical summaries following each one. The colour and numbering coding corresponds to that in the coding diagram.

Interview 1: Designer of walking routes for leaflets and books, group walking leader, academic

The reasons I’ve asked you in for an interview today are – first of all, I’ve outlined you as a person who’ll be able to share…your experiences of the recreational walking market. My personal interest is actually in the characteristics of individual walkers and their preferences for certain routes and environmental characteristics. Maybe whether it’s possible to group them together in terms of these characteristics and also predict their choices in terms of route. So, hopefully by doing that I’ll be able to build up a picture. By talking to experts in these interviews.

Today, what I’m going to do is I’m going to use something called a ‘Grounded approach’. So what that means is that there is no actual set structure to the interview. I’ll be taking notes as I go along and will be able to build up a picture during the interview, depending on the direction of the discussion. The reason for this is because I’m trying to actually build the theory as I go along, using an emergent approach.

So, to begin with, I’d just like you to take a few moments to think about what walking actually means to you…how it’s fitted in with your life…now and in the past. OK?

Yep, well walking to me personally, is an incredibly important part of my life. I can explain that. Actually, I like walking everywhere…in towns, countryside, whatever. Walking in towns…I think it’s one of the best ways of actually seeing it…and you get…actually you get the smells and the sounds. (1) and I like to look up at the buildings and the character of the street. I’m really interested in that. So, virtually, even when I’m going on business, or visiting relatives, I tend to use public transport and I tend to actually like the walking bit. There’s a couple of things I don’t like about the walking bit, which I’ll be honest with you….again personally….traffic is a real problem. Traffic is a real problem to me in my life, because I believe walkers in towns get a second-rate infrastructure…traffic is given priority…it’s intrusive, it’s noisy and so I see that as problematic. The second thing is, I really hate walking when it’s absolutely pouring down. (2)

So do I

So do you? (laughs) Right. Now…when I’m at a railway station for work, and it’s tipping it down and soaking wet…(2) that’s a bit of a limitation to me, but yes. I know people say ‘wear the right clothes’ and so on, but even with the right clothes, when it rains the way in which we get heavy rain now…you get soaking. So that gives you some idea, I guess, of my feelings toward walking. Also about (pause) twenty five…thirty years ago, I started to walk seriously in the countryside for leisure, and recreation…and that has a similar appeal sometimes to walking in towns. Just instead of looking at the buildings and the sights and sounds, you’ve got them in the countryside…particularly interested in different landscapes, how things are working. Why I like walking…in the countryside more than anything else…I think I like it more than cycling or (pause) even just sitting on a bus…” I’ll tell you the reason why…you go at a pace where you can see a really close up mosaic of things. (3) You can see…bird’s nests, in the hedges. You can feel the prickle of a thorn, when you’re climbing a stile or something like that. You get the mud on your
boots. It’s this closeness...to the landscape...I think that's important. (4) And also...it’s about the only time, when I can really switch off. Because walking, I find that the actual movement takes me into a different mindset...different frame of mind....where I can actually lose my problems mentally, because I’m concentrating on crossing a stream, or going over a gate. (5) A landscape comes up. That’s the other thing, it changes...it changes the pace where you can take notice. I like mixed landscapes...undulating farm landscapes. I've become far more interested in the trees and the importance of certain things. (6) The trees and the landscape...their shapes (pause) when they’re cut down in earlier times when they’re on an old greenway, their root structures. They mesmerise me...so walking in a rural setting is in a way a release valve for the way in which I build up pressures at work and so on.

There is a third dimension...as opposed to town and (pause) countryside settings. That third dimension is health now...because I realise as I’m getting older that...health is more important. If you’re going to stay off things like high blood pressure, and you know...stiff limbs and so on. (7) I’m sort of still walking now. Consciously I’m thinking ‘Walk, walk, yes. Twenty minutes walking from the station to the uni. Hey that is brilliant, because I’ve got my brisk walking in. Because I live a fairly sedentary existence...and so with health, as I’ve become more knowledgeable about it, it’s become more important to me so I never see walking as a drag unless it’s absolutely stair rods. (2)

So I suppose, to sum up for you, walking is absolutely integral to my mind. It would be a major blow if I could not walk...and I’m hoping to be able to keep this facility all the way through my life....and in particular walking in the countryside...which has its irritations, I have to say...you know, barbed wire, electric fencing, leftovers, cattle herding round you when their looking for food and so on. (8) There are these bits and pieces which are irritations. Overall though, the relaxation package and the interest package, which comes with just exploring our countryside far outweighs everything else. (5)

So it sounds like you have a different set of motivations for town walking and countryside walking...is this something you consciously think about when you’re planning to go out walking?

Yes if I go on holiday for example and we go into a town I’m always looking for a place which is in walking distance and I will only explore city primarily...I know there certainly are big cities, but I like to explore them as much as possible on foot. Now also, when I’m going on holiday I get the maps out before I go. Because I like maps as well, I’m very fortunate, I can map read. I studied geography and I do like looking at maps. (9) I’ll have a look at the footpath and the walks here and the walks there. I don’t really look at a guidebooks and things like that first off, it’s the maps. I know sometimes guidebooks or walks leaflets are useful. (10)

Most routes will be viable as long as you’re not needing a machete to get through as a brambles and over growth and so on, but on the whole, looking for footpath networks is important. (8)

Now, closer to home, because I live out in the countryside then I’ve got some really poor footpaths, because of the cattle, it’s dairy farm and it’s mud... lots of water on the ground. The bar gates are hanging on string, and all these problems. It gives you access to beautiful countryside, so I put up with that. (11)

I tend to have a way of going about it. To me personally, that way of going about it, walking is also low-cost ...I’m interested in the environment...I’m interested in reducing carbon emissions, and I think ‘Well, this is a great way of enjoying life without much carbon footprint’ and so if I go beyond my immediate footpath network which is attractive otherwise, there’s some lovely walks nearby... then, I'm into these linear walks and when I say linear walks or point to point walks...these are the walks which I like most of all ...and I’ll tell you the reason why. I like to catch a bus out or a train out, and walk back. And the reason why I like that is because of the variety, the diversity you get on a linear, The challenge you get of threading the paths together is...I find exhilarating sometimes, if not I find... very pleasant. Walking...when I have done
walking in circles back to a car or a car park with friends, I often find bits of it to get back to the circle are really boring... and the whole point for me of being in the countryside is not having any of the structure, to be quite honest. It’s like a landscape analogy... quite like landscape gardens, but I prefer natural landscapes and landscapes that are farmed, which allow a proliferation of the two. Messy hedges that are not manicured, fallen trees, streams partly silted, or making their way through different ways and so on. That to me is more attractive than walking through a capability brand landscape. (12) That’s attractive too. A line of trees or avenue of trees or whatever, but it's not as good to my mind as countryside, or semi natural.

That’s interesting actually, so you think over time, you’ve developed a taste for different landscapes almost?

Without a doubt, through walking and not cycling. With the cycling, I find I have to concentrate a bit too much. You’re going say 7 to 10 miles per hour, you go through the back lanes to the local pub and you still miss a lot. But actually with the walking I still stand back. I used to just hoof it a bit more and move along the path. Now a stand back and I think I didn’t see that. (3)

‘What is that farmstead doing there, why is it there?’ This brook – my son told me even the smallest of streams could be where fish will come up to lay their eggs and trout spawn... and I'm just more interested in nature, and that's come about because the walking...which is true. (4)

Maybe in the past 10-15 years... before that my major interest I have to say is about the heritage. I’d look for a castle, or I’d look for an old village. The social history would interest me. (13) We used to live in the Northwest and walking to an old farm community or to an old textile community...Lancashire Peninnes. I think it’s great(14)...’Oh look at those windows. Weavers used to weave in those old windows(13). Now, I’m equally interested in wildlife, grassland, what they’re doing for farming, what type of trees are growing, is it coppiced, is it not, what’s in this river, why is it not flowing? (15)

So, it’s almost educational as well

Very much

You learn as you go along

Very much so, so the entertainment, the outcome comes by getting back...because someone once said to me: ‘What’s the best bit about walking and I said jokingly: ‘It’s the bath afterwards, or the pub afterwards...you know, when you’ve finished the walk you’ve got a sense of achievement’. (14) Actually, my feeling now is that the beauty of the walk is the way that landscape unfolds bit by bit as you go through it... and you know I’m equally happy to walk through a landscape in Lincolnshire and say: ‘God this is flat, this is featureless’. Because it's featureless it has some sort of character. (6)

Yes you can see further.

Yes, lots of skies, almost everywhere is of interest to me,,, more so than...I did part of the Pennine Way once with a friend and it was a real bog-trotting exercise. An okay, we did it and we did 20 miles one day, for his 50th birthday and okay we felt good you know...we were getting older blokes...and did it but actually that sort of more barren-landscapes are less interesting to me now. I do like undulation, valleys... (6)

So that kind of trail walking is more of a means to an end to do some kind of achievement, rather than actually what you were saying – looking at the finer detail, on a nice walk. That kind of might be different.

Well yes, it depends - for me some trails are less attractive than others... and I quite like using the trails for linear walks. (17) You got some that are challenging, like Offa’s Dyke... is very challenging(19) Also it’s got a diversity of landscapes. You’re switching from quite remote
wilderness landscapes to gently farmed landscapes... (6) beautiful valleys...you’ve got that historic heritage but you take a coast-to-coast walk and the infrastructure...there’s more infrastructure gone in there now more people doing ...(18) but it’s still got that diversity of landscape and so I think that’s the appeal of the trail... to its design. (6) Now, the ones which I think the less interesting are those... I wouldn’t want to do a river landscapes all the way down. You’re getting river side most of the time...or I think the Pennine Way - you get tops of moors most of the time. I know you come into the valleys and settlements...but as a general rule, to my mind that type of trail, which a lot of people go for, is less attractive to me for more than day walking... (20) and then looking out at shorter distance trails, regional trails, county-based trails, or part of them, we’ve got more diversity.

So, we’re talking about your own tastes there, and you’ve mentioned what you think about other people’s tastes. Maybe just before we talk about that we should maybe talk about your involvement with walking in relation to other people, in the past and now...I know you’ve led walks sometimes, what other contexts have you been involved in walking?

Okay...I think there’s three or four aspects of this - in my previous work in public transport I did have to lead guided walks, and I have been in the Rambler’s off and on...not continuously I must admit... (21) and the reason why I get fed up with the Rambler’s is that they always do car park...primarily do car park walks, with 30 people and to be honest, that’s not my cup of tea and I was leading these walks with 30-40 people over the stiles and so on and some people were saying go faster, and some go slower, so there is an art to guided walks. (22) You have to be quite a diplomat in terms of choosing a walk that is going to hit the right buttons, so...the people who come on them. Some will want to go fast, some won’t, so you need a bit of a dialogue...continually going on... a little bit about the landscapes, so you take a break and they catch up slower and so on.(21) So my involvement with guided walks means you can design guided walks. They’re harder than when you design linear ones...because, like I say, sometimes public transport fails...for whatever reason. (23) So you always have to design them so you catch public transport and walk back. When you’re catching public transport between point to point, like between two railway stations, you’ve still got to walk. I’ll tell you an interesting bit of information...time it to be easy, add some time on. When people came on, there was about 30 of us...they slowed it tremendously. (24) Several people came who were grossly unfit, even though I told them, and they came in with the wrong footwear so they were told, so then everything slowed up.’ And there was a whole diatribe of people saying ‘Can we have a coffee break now’. So fortunately I was with another leader, we have to split it, because the way we were going, everybody was going to miss the first train. And then there are 3 hours between trains. I did warn the other leader: Let’s not design it this way. Lets design it so we can catch a train to somewhere we can walk back to the start point’, but she wanted to do point to point, and it’s very very difficult, but quite rewarding when you get it right, and the Rail Rambles people have got it down to a tee. So, I’ve done that, and I’ve continued a little bit on a voluntary basis once or twice. My main professional interest in walking however, actually I’ve written twelve walking books, and all these were written when I was in my 30s, about 20 years ago, and I read a whole stream...and I got into it. I found it very enjoyable because I had this view that I’ve enjoyed it so much so I’ll share it. I didn’t just do linear walks... (25) I mixed linear walks and circular walks, mainly from villages where there was a pub, pub walks...facilities and a public transport service. Because I’ve always held this view about all these pared cars in the countryside even though when we talk about CO2 emissions there are lots of other environmental impacts, and I did, I wrote these guides...sold reasonably well the idea of doing that is I learnt the hard way... the difficult thing is to describe a walk. (26) You think you’re describing something but what you see, someone else may not see, so you might see across the other side of a tree as a guide and yet they may see a double barred gate...so you have to be very particular, and test...you have to always remember to be there, because people have different perceptions about what they pick up on the landscape and also the landscape changes continually as well. (27) You know as soon as you’ve written a walk, a farmer will take out a
hedge, a farm will go up or a forester will chop down a hedge. Forests, by the way, I hate because, with coniferous plantations...I get lost.

Yes because they're very regimented, aren't they.

Yes, and actually sometimes they put in these nice big tracks so you can get access to and wipe out the existing right-of-way away, and put you onto this track and put 6 or 7 waymarks up, you can't quite follow the map – you can't see where you are of going. So I think forested areas are the most difficult. When they do put in footpaths they are all manicured, and they're waymarked to the death. Always in a forest near us, some routes have about six or seven waymarks on them from different walks. So they become motorways of people wandering around.

Anyway, so...walks books - I've just come back to the walks books again because one of the books is going to be reprinted and I had to go to new research and I really enjoyed it. Not the same enjoyment that I talk to you about personally, but it's a painstaking experience because of this accuracy required in the detail, describing general landscapes and like you say, simple things...'Aim slightly right of style'...But next time you come there, someone's put in a kissing gate because there's a change of policy, for encouraging disabled people or people bad on their feet, or because farmers in the area have agreed with a ranger that it's better for their stock. Another thing I dislike is the change. I'm going to go on and on and on. I like the vernacular architecture of walking furniture. What I mean by this is, in Shropshire there used to be old V-stiles, but hardly any of them left. In the Pennines you get lots of gritstone steppingstones stiles...or ladder stiles. And they're all being replaced by these...not even these beautiful...there used to be these beautiful metallic Victorian black painted kissing gate or these fences which you get around parkland...not many of them now. Now we're getting urban metallic...from countryside agencies or national trust...Whatever the land owners are a putting them in because they think that the better for people with dogs...better for people who're poorly on their feet. So there's a functionality about that but they're actually destroying some of the aesthetics of beautiful walks. Right, so walking books then...same old things. It's quite formulaic really...out of a fairly big settlement. Don't encourage people to park up in the middle of nowhere...has to have a pub or a shop...somewhere where they can get refreshments...has to have a public transport service even if it's just six days a week. Sundays are pretty thin on the ground and...because you realize people will go by car for circular walks...then it has to have a non-intrusive car park...where the parish council have invested in the carpark of the village hall or something so you'll be using...—nothing that encourages more people to come to the countryside by car. So, I've done that. I can't see me writing any more but I did include one long-distance...unofficial long-distance route called the Marches Way...and again that was designed based on ...sustainable development principles. That was done in 1990. It was ahead of its time. It links up all of the railway stations between Chester and Cardiff ..and obviously ...bus networks at a place called Monks where there's not a railway station, so you could do all by day walks, in sections, and it was meant to be a sort of green tourism project. It had a following. Someone set up a website - a group of people used to go and do it - but that was withdrawn when the publisher withdrew the book. And Ordnance Survey took it off the map because no one maintained it.

It's not a long-distance route then?

Maybe not now. I've secondly have been involved with teams and feasibility work on looking at the design and demand of trails. Two in particular. I've been involved in three with a guy called Simon Holt marketing and the three that I've been involved in: are the Wye Valley walk. That was already in existence, but they wanted advice on how to improve it and upgrade...and the second one was a completely new idea of the Mortimer trail which is about 36 miles long between Ludlow and Kington – Ludlow in Shropshire and Kington in Herefordshire and that was fantastic. It was interesting - it is a conflict of professional interests. The countryside people and the County Council wanted it just go along a fantastic ridge...beautiful countryside, great wildlife, buzzards, bats badgers, you name it... beautiful quiet countryside untouched by walkers...
really. So they wanted that, and some of us would argue: ‘Well, where are people going to stop for accommodation?’ It’s too much for one day. Most people are looking for accommodation...and also how are we going to get people to use local facilities? (31) So, from the main route we did six littlest walks from local villagers from the spine to pubs and so on. They could be done as day walks. And at the time they were pressing us to say what car parks should we put in? (24) And we actually turned up as a team and said: ‘Don’t put any in because you’ll only spoil what is the essence of the trail, because there’s car parking...and that Mortimer trail is still doing okay...could do better, could take you know, 30, 40, 50% increase without spoiling anything. (35) And then the third one which I think was far less attractive as a trail...really in terms of landscapes was a trail from the source to the sea of the Severn. The reason why I say that was less attractive: We did a demand survey and looked at it...It has a principle of following the river as closely as possible.

You’re tied to the river in that sense

There weren’t rights of way in lots of places so you’re putting people down roads. It just lacks that appeal. I suppose some people would say it source is beautiful in its infancy but the rest of it... (6) The Severn is particularly wide valley...it gets flooded a lot. Some of the towns and villages are lovely (18)

The length of it as well

Yes, they wanted to end at a place called Severn beach. A new railway station near Avonmouth and Severn beach has got a sort of a chequered history of being a bit of a local seaside resort in the mud.. decades ago and this is great industrialization... and it wasn’t the place. Not very inspiring. Also at the time we had problems with the local railway. So we suggested it went into Bristol. There was a nice place to end. But my feeling with that was: you don’t get that diversity that I talked about sufficiently and there’s only so much river you want...and even though there is a distinct set of habitats associated with the river which you can interpret... then you know...you have to walk long distances to get a change interpretation, change of habitat, in the lower reaches, whereas in the Wye Valley walk moves away from the river quite a bit, but the river valley is beautiful and criss crosses. (6)

Do you know anything about how popular these walks are?

Yes I’ve chosen these places because the Severn Valley Way will have millions of walkers per year, but they’ll all be dog walkers, walking locally, walking in the hotspots. It passes through Ironbridge (36)

And they’re not too fussed about the fact that they are doing this trail?

They’re doing two hours / four hours...but end-to-end walkers...I think we estimated no more than about 10,000 per year, if that. The estimate for Mortimer trail was about 10,000 per year. We did note...that went in about ’96. We did go back and did a bit of a review and a lot of the businesses said that they could see a noticeable change. It gave them a lot in accommodation but it hasn’t really attached that many new people...so we’re not entirely certain...

What’s the reason for that then?

Well it’s very remote...and it’s not known. It’s the same with the Wye Valley walk. The Wye Valley walk is a beautiful walk. (34) It’s perhaps far better, but that didn’t have a lot of people on a lot of stretches. Now, if you take the lowest stretch in Chepstow along the lower Wye Valley which is a popular destination, all the places are very popular, lots of people, same with Offa’s Dyke, lots of people, very well walked, loads of people. (37) Beautiful compressed scenery, there’s a river’s cutting down, climbs and walks and dropping into villages. (24) It’s all there so people can get a taste. I think if you walk up through the plain, there’s orchards. Herefordshire.
I don’t think we noted the numbers down. So these trails have different numbers on them but I think that one probably is more popular, maybe 20,000.

**So what are the key things that bring people to these trails...certain trails?**

Well my view is that there are different markets, and a lot of these trails appeal to their local markets... (38) and that’s underestimated in a lot of these studies, I suppose because they’re looking for economic impacts. So I think the trails do bring the quality of life to these communities because they have nice day walks which are relatively short. So I think people who go on trails like to be assured that there is a right way and that the quality of stiles or waymarking is pretty strong... even these trails... (28) have noticed can get overgrown... because you know the growth in late Spring and people want... even these trails... I have noticed can get overgrown... because you know the growth in late Spring and people want... (managed?)... the second thing is... people assume. It’s like a brand. If it’s called Wye Valley Walk, it has to have something good to talk about. So it reflects that destination... I think first and foremost they’re going for a walking experience. What I mean by the walking experience is what I was talking about before: relaxation, moving away from one’s own life... (5) that mix of education and interest in the locality... vernacular architecture... different... you know when you are walking through an orchard... so I think that drives people. (39) There are quite... well I think there are a lot of different trails in the country, and a lot of branded routes and a lot circular routes as well, and I think... what they don’t want is... to be stuck somewhere, and the path doesn’t go where it is supposed to. And all of a sudden what is a pleasure becomes a struggle... and I know. I’ve been there millions of times. When the light’s going and ‘I can’t see a waymark here’ (28) and ‘I can’t see the map quite right’ And obviously they’re looking for that scenery and landscape as well, (28) and ‘I can’t see the map quite right’ But obviously they’re looking for that scenery and landscape as well, so there’s a mix really. So there’s a walk experience, and that can be anywhere. There’s a landscape experience which can be very wide and which might determine why they choose riverside. Interestingly one person in one of the focus groups we did recently said they didn’t live the Wye Valley walk because they were worried about cows. (8) animals, stock. So some people go for high-level walks because sheep don’t frighten them so much, but they don’t like bulls. They don’t like stock. I mean heffa’s can be quite frightening if they’re all rearing round looking for food. Some people don’t like hills, they can’t do the hills, but generally speaking... I think it’s a movement... going through a place and it’s a combination of the landscape at a couple elements. (40) Motivation for trails too... but the difference with trails too, they tend to attract a different type of walker – it’s maps, accommodation providers at the start, to say they’re on the trail... get stickers in their windows. But also, it all of a sudden becomes a brand. It’s not just going for walk, its: ‘I’m doing so-and-so trail, and that maybe has given them better memories...

*Because they know that they’ve done it*

*They’ve done something which is a bit of an achievement* (16)

*And it’s not just a random walk...*

‘Did you go for a walk?’ ‘Well actually we just walked through this path, through 4 fields and back’ again’ Now... I went on a walk on the Meridian Way. Shropshire Way. Fantastic. That was a do-it-yourself type walk by the Ramblers. Decades ago. The County Council adopted it. They made it more of a product, you see, via a website. You can do linear walks, circular walks, where you need accommodation. You get everything... downloaded information package and all of a sudden someone says: ‘Yes, I’m going to take a few days off and do the Shropshire Way, because you think: ‘Hey, it’s the destination in its own right’. It’s not: ‘I’m going on holiday in Shropshire’, It’s ‘I'm going to do the Shropshire Way.

*Do you think that brings in the people who don’t walk so much? The fact that it’s branded.*

I yes, definitely. I’ve always advocated professionally, that if you brand, not saying every walk, but if you brand certain types of walk than you get people who never ever... because they can’t
map read, they don’t like reading books, if there are guide books on the walk. They’re looking for a walk where they can follow it waymark to waymark. (27) You should be able to do it without looking it up. And see you give them that confidence to go enjoy the countryside. So I think branded walks bring people who are far less confident into the market. (41)

And how about the people who are already quite experienced?

I think they’re still doing it. They might have a different view if they think it’s overdone and manicured, or too many signs. It’s a balance between just getting it right…I think they Offa’s Dyke guy said it to me as well, it’s just putting enough in so that people can move along but if you ‘over-manicure’ it, it wouldn’t be the experience that people are expecting, want it a bit rough. It’s a rough wilderness in places, it’s a rough scenery, whereas, if you’ve got a nicey-nicey river walk, soft river walk between two small settlements...(42)...you can take a wheelchair user on, or you can take children on with you. We’ve got different expectations, and I think it’s great that we’ve got that whole variety, that mix of walks. (20)

What I find a little bit annoying is that someone could go on holiday to a village, in Shropshire where I live, and say ‘Oh right, let’s discover these walks’ and you find some who are grateful and others, just because you have an obstinate landowner who doesn’t care, or they’re never used, all of a sudden, you’ve got a really nice...(43)...you can go out from your holiday cottage or your relatives and do one... half way round it’s totally quagmire, slurry pit ...like I say, barbed wire all over the gate...When we did this guided walk – it’s a bridleway. The farmer had tied it up, barbed wire all over the gate. So what happens if walkers couldn’t climb over that gate.

How important do you think it is about farms and access? Is it one of the major factors?

I think landowners need to realize that they taken on the land and inherited the land and Rights of Way. There are schemes, stewardship schemes would encourage them to look after them, but generally speaking I suppose they don’t like people on their land. I would think that was a general view, but my view is that walkers... serious walkers and when I say serious walkers I mean people who walk beyond the Riverside walk, beyond local town walks and so on, who are going out for a day in the countryside, are not the sort of people who would drop litter, smash bottles, probably hospitals, rip your gates up, chase your cat. (44) Where I feel sorry for some landowners or farmers, is next to a...There’s a lot of trespassers, a lot of kids and they don’t know any different, couldn’t care less.

It’s a lack of education about the environment?

Yes, some others...some of them - I don’t think they realize or care...only a few walkers go past. I find it amazing, I walk in the countryside and I do across one farmers landscape, he’s got a path across where he’s got an arrow across, it’s waymarked, the styles are good. You get to the fence it’s strings, barbed wire, and there’s no way of going in. I don’t like crossing farmyards. It used to be lovely years ago...not so many people. Now it’s rampant tractors, these tractors are like industrial things, cattle or Susan gates. I don’t see why, because years ago these were paths for the farmworkers to go between farms. They need to be like that. So I think all those sorts of things put people off and so that’s why I go for the paths. If they’ve had a bad experience, they’re not like, say you and me. They’ll say right, I’ll smash down this foliage, I will point out to the County Council that this path is obstructed. They just won’t do it again.

What do you think about...we talked about trails. What do you think about the Wainwrights and the hillwalks? Books. Do you think they’re the kind of romantic things that bring people in as well?

Yes, well you mentioned the romance. I think some writers are incredibly good and actually put a romantic edge on what they see...which has gone beyond...what some people see as drudgery. They won’t walk in town. They not saying ‘I love walking in town’, but they would only walk
maybe when they’re in the countryside. It’s seen as part of this romantic image about freshening up… I think it’s fashionable, you’ve got your leisure kit… for some people now, ski poles, Nordic Skiing Poles.(44)

Oh yeah, Nordic walking

That sort of stuff…and I can understand that. Now Wainwright I think is a fantastic author, and he had a sort of a nice northern sardonic taste and I find some of his walks difficult because all of a sudden you get a very gentle walk, climb half way up a waterfall, tops. (45)

So ability is paramount in that sense then?

Yes, and you know, for him, he was all right with it, but I get vertigo. I don’t like being on the edges. But you know, he certainly, because of his writing skills, and there are lots of other good writers who have done the same. I guess it’s part of walking tourism… It is walking tourism that’s developed this whole thing about a new way of interpreting landscape in the countryside and a lot of these guys are very good at it. (46) Mark Richards for example, also has a Wainwright styles. There’s an outdoor writers guild, they try to upgrade their writing skills. There’s another bloke in Wales, Thomas Watson (?)… he writes really well. So there’s some people around, who have penned books which are far better than I would ever do, and they’re like travel writers, I mean Hunter himself, although I don’t think his writing is very good. Some of them. These people really do look into some of the curious and odd things, to try and understand the landscape. They have popularized these writings in the newspapers, and Mike Harding has done the same, and they are popularizing walking, for pleasure in the countryside. Because we know walking in towns is declining.

It’s increasing in the countryside.

Well, I don’t know, whether it is or not

I’m not sure of the figures myself

But I don’t know. This is one of the things, we used to see more walkers, but I think all this rubbish about eroding paths and things like that – well okay, these are very minor impacts in comparison to cars

And heavy rainfall because of flooding

And heavy rainfall, the impact from freeze-thaw. My view is, that these writers are keeping the market buoyant. But people going on the countryside… if I remember rightly, day visits for leisure are static so I think walking’s pretty static.

So, the motivations of these different strands of walkers… Do you think they actually determine which way which routes they take? Do you have any view on that?

Yes, I think there are typologies with walkers. It’s very clear that…the people are looking for hill-scapes and challenges… and I would say that the younger market or for that matter, people who are moving on a bit, 50-60, who have grown up with that, and are fit, and still managing… maybe not during the mileage and they’re looking for hill-scapes, that challenge and they don’t mind the weather. They’re geared up for it. (47) They’re not particularly interested I don’t think in pubs. These are lone rangers, going out in small groups, or a few. Ok, yes at the end of the day they might go back to a holiday cottage, or their house or a pub. The challenge is in the walking done, or the mileage. (48) Then I think there’s a big range of people who I call landscape walkers, who are motivated by getting out and seeing the landscapes. There’s less mileage, slower pace. They are again walking in groups. I say small groups, 2-4. They stop and stare a lot more. They’re more interested in the pub, more interested in things that go along the walk, and… less challenging stuff. (49) Then, I think you’ve got what I sometimes refer to as
the strollers. A whole batch of people, families, older people, people who just want to take some fresh air in exercise, short walks. No more than two or three miles, I guess. They like things to be described about the walk, waymarked, and that is by far the biggest market in terms of The Lake District. It’s the people walking around the lakes, close walks from the villages...

Do you think these strollers might be the ones who are most tied to a car?

Yeah, they’re likely to bring a car

So most likely it grades up? More serious people might need the car for the equipment

This is the one thing about walking, I don’t think people need a car to walk because I don’t think...

...You can take everything you need with you in a rucksack. It’s just people who've got more out of the habit of using public transport in countryside areas, or they don’t think they’ve got the agency to switch, because they don’t want to go looking for timetables...they’ve probably got the image that public transport very limited and they might batch up with their makes instead in two cars....and I just think this thing about structural barriers. I personally think that a lot of the ‘let’s go and get a good day’s walking types...Hill walkers or like I say, this middle group of walkers...they walk a morning or afternoon. They do it by public transport because it’s made easier. Because some of these routes that I’ve walked on – they do get a lot of walkers on. There’s a walking group in Macclesfield that I’ve been involved in years ago and they sent me a note to say that they went out last Sunday, only doing a short walk to a brewery. It snowed like mad. They gave us 20 minutes packed in because they thought the road was blocked. The road gets blocked to the Peak district and the bus can’t get over, so they don’t say ‘Oh public transport’ because they knew it was rough going to the road on that day. It was just bad luck. But lots of people are worried about that. It’s got a negative image. What I’ve found is that, on that route I was talking about, on a Summer’s day it is full. 30-40% of people are going for a walk.

Just as an extension of the car thing, do you think it’s because they lifestyles in general have an impact on the types of walker and the routes they choose.

Well yes. I know for example in Macclesfield, I lived in Macclesfield. People love the Lake District and they would sit in the pub and say: ‘Hey, let’s go and do some walking’ These are a group of people who, when they were young, used to walk hills a lot. And they batch up in the car, two or three. Just early retired and they go to the Lake District in the car, walk Haystacks or something like that and come back down again on the same day. Now they wouldn’t have done that years ago, because they couldn’t get up the motorway because their horizons have changed. That compression of the day. We can do a ten mile walk, get a fix of The Lake District and come back, whereas previously they’d go up for a couple of days, two or three days. And another guy, same pub, will spend a lot of his time in the Peak District, doesn’t drive and so is forever going out on the bus to the Peak district. It’s closer as well. Never tires of it as well...but then he’s gone with them...so they got him in the car, going up to the Lake District as well, but by habit he would normally go back...go on the bus to the Peak District. So the car has changed habits of people. People are willing to drive long distances.

How about working life and location big cities or rural

Well, I think with big cities we have a problem because, one thing, recreational walking has been squeezed out. Parks are seen as less attractive. They’re not threaded through. There are not so many urban walks, or they’re hard to maintain. There’s families and problems and many of the places are run down. The other walks were put in to try and make something...and I think there’s a problem with all the towns. I think Marion Shaw of the Ramblers is one who knows the most about this. Every town should have a Sunday bus into the countryside, she argued. All walkers. Every town should have walking routes so they can walk from out of town
to their near countryside...and the number of places I've lived in where that isn’t the case. You’ve got to get out about two or 3 miles before you can really find the proper walking routes.

So, depending on the person, how likely, it the town has the provision, how likely is it to get the people to go and do the walks?

Yeah, like this Macclesfield again...A student came and did feasibility study for a circular walk, all the way around Macclesfield. It was good, it had some hill country. Technically it was feasible and I was discussing how and we agreed. And so any town of a certain size...probably 50,000 should have a wheel around it and a circuit around the wheel, so that people can actually just say today I got my exercise and walked all the way around. Rather than say ‘Today I need exercise. Where do I go to?’ I mean another place I used to live in was Hereford and they all go to a country Park of Dingwall because it’s safe and small. All the strollers go there. It’s 8 miles from the town so all these cars go there, but you only go there because it’s safely waymarked, there’s a café...why not have one of those around Hereford? You’ve got the River Wye, the Church, you’ve got all these things in Hereford = you could do that. So I don’t know whether that’s a possible solution. (23) Another thing is, I think people feel that life is fairly fast. They have a different view about time. That’s one of the things I like about walking. That is, I remove the concept...the contemporary concept of time. We are obsessed by time...’Can I run off a photocopy before I run to the train? Or do something else, can I ask people to do three things for me’ and I batch it all up and they throw it at me before I go to the station. We’re in that sort of set up.

Windows or pockets of time

So on a walk, I don't want a mobile phone, making calls to the world. My wife said: 'Take your mobile phone in case you have an accident, or you have a heart attack’ But I can’t think of a better place to croak it.

It is like tracking device

And I think well, wouldn’t it be great to just die on one of these walks. Die in paradise. And, so I think that people find it very difficult... and I suspect women, in particular. If they’ve got family, or they’re looking after mothers and fathers who are getting old. They I think, have more institutional barriers to just getting out and getting time. Also they’ve got the security thing. I see women walking the dogs, and I always shout hello as if I’m a moron. It’s a way to sort of allay any fears because if you’re wrapped up and you have a sort of burglar Bill bobble hat on, they might find you as a threat. So there are all these sort of societal barriers for certain populations.

So one last little thing to ask... my actual interest is actually in a certain area: The Lake District. What experience do you have of the Lake District in terms of walking and the walks there

My only experience is as a user. I have never done any work in the Lake District but as a user I have gone several times, and I think the Lake District probably has networks of paths and trails to suit all types of walkers and also has a reputation amongst walkers to being a place par excellence. Because it does still have pubs and culture. Everybody is talking about sustainability in pubs and so on. Half the problem is because they are poorly managed or poorly developed businesses. You never know when they are going to open. But, in the Lake District, it strikes me, that they serve food...snacks, sandwiches and things like that...at different times of day, cups of tea, coffee. It’s almost like ‘we’re open for business, so come on walkers and everybody’. (54) Public transport...the buses there might be old, but there certainly is a better network than a lot of places, so I know everybody talks about having confidence to leave the car behind in the Lake District. It’s got that brand identity because it has iconic features: the lakes, the high mountains, for those who want a challenging walk. And it’s got a Northern feel to it... people like the openness which is reflected in the landscape. It’s got a sort of a rich tourism
heritage as well. Now... the major floods which I personally think they're one in 1000 years floods, is something to do with climatic change... these floods absolutely devastate businesses. I think a lot of walkers.

There’s a lot of places that aren’t actually open.

People will get cold feet about it but that wasn’t intended. People will say they’re not too sure about it. Don’t forget Carlisle was flooded out last year or the year before that...

About two years ago

And it all builds up to you thinking...it always had a reputation for being wet, but people might think it’s going to be wall-to-wall rain...I’ve have some really fantastic walking up there with someone who loves the Lake District and I can’t tell you, but I can’t help you about the market.

Have you got anything else which you’d like to say on the subject area or walking in general?

Just this really: I think that even in my work and the work I know of the English tourism market, for the walking, I think we’ve all been guessing... as to motivations... and guessing a lot...assuming a lot. You have got a real gap here. My gut reaction is that lots of people that you speak to might even be vaguer than I am but they might know what the walking experience is for them on what they think it is for other people...and it might be interesting to speak to people who have designed leaflets. You’ve got Simon Holt, and who they actually do they think they know... because they’re not walkers themselves, but they design the walks. He’s got another contact: Neil Coates. He’s good. They live near each other, so you might want to note that. He’s written walk books, and has done lots of the design of walks. But the question I ask myself is: do the experts really know what the market is, or are we just actually designing for one possible market and the rest just come, because I don’t know.
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Sample transcript 1: First interview.

Descriptive note:

The interviewee was an experienced designer of walks, has written many guide books, and walk leaflets; an experienced walking group leader, sustainable transport campaigner and an academic with specialism in tourism. The interview was conducted in the ‘grounded’ format – allowing the interviewee to talk freely about the research area. Topics included an in-depth exploration of the walking experience, the characteristics of walkers, the considerations underpinning the design of walks and some appraisal of the research objectives.

Researcher awareness note:

The interviewee talked freely with very minimal prompting, demonstrating the effectiveness of the interview approach. The potential for this interview biasing future interviews was noticed by the researcher, but it was useful for laying out initial working categories for the coding process. Categories began forming from this interview onwards, in accordance with the grounded approach. It was decided to continue with the same format in subsequent interviews.

Inferences:

Themes on environment focused on the landscape features, differences between urban and rural walking experiences and the diversity of surroundings. Other themes going forward included the influence of management on the environment for walking and the associated experience of the walker, and the variety of expectations of people, hinting that there are different groups.

‘They might have a different view if they think it’s overdone and manicured, or too many signs. It’s a balance between just getting it right…I think they Offa’s Dyke guy said it to me as well, it’s just putting enough in so that people can move along but if you ‘over-manicure’ it, it wouldn’t be the experience that people are expecting, want it a bit rough. It’s a rough wilderness in places, it’s a rough scenery, whereas, if you’ve got a nicey-nicey river walk, soft river walk between two small settlements…you can take a wheelchair user on, or you can take children on with you. We’ve got different expectations, and I think it’s great that we’ve got that whole variety, that mix of walks.’

This also marked the beginning of the reflective theme of where the observations of walking are coming from – this is the view from the supply side, yet myself and the interviewee are regular walkers and therefore part of the phenomena and the demand side of walking
Interview 4: Living Streets researcher and town centre planner for Windermere

...There’s also a writer, ... and got completely different take to the next person who is a countryside officer, and so for you, I think I’ll probably have something different again. So, just to begin with, could you just give me an idea of what your relationship with walking? How do you actually operate within your job with walking as well as personally?

Yes, certainly. So I'm Paul Holdsworth. My job is Town Centre Manager for Windermere, Bowness, Ambleside and Grasmere. I’ve done it for a few years now and I came from.. My background was working for Living Streets and I've always been passionate about walking particularly, I've always been a great fan of recreational walking in the most obvious sense. But for me, utility walking is highly recreational, and that is certainly a major part of my relationship with walking... is actually enjoying just walking to the shops, to the railway station, that sort of thing.\(^1\)

That's interesting... you actually call it recreational in your own mind?

Yes definitely

Even though you’ve got a purpose which is a functional purpose?

Absolutely I think for me, I think people completely miss the point. A classic example: we have people coming up for walking holidays all the time. We have a fantastic quality countryside, world class scenery, people who love to walk in it. And our towns...the public realm in our towns and villages in the national park is very poor. It is behind the times. It hasn’t had money spent on it. There’s a very poor quality of walking. The reality is people come up for recreational walking on the fells will spend most at times in the towns and villages. Even if you spend all day every day upon the fells, you then spend the morning walking around town to buy your provisions, to spend evenings, and apart from that... some people and spend more time in the towns and villages than on the fells, but the vast majority do\(^2\)

Is that a good deal of people who come to walk?

The vast majority... absolutely, and locals too. A huge majority of people are locally born and bred, view the scenery as wallpaper, and a backdrop... and I've found... we used to have a local lass working with us, and she said she'd never been up fells and that she was going to do the Fairfield Horseshoe...and had no conception of what she is actually claiming that she was going to go and do as a first walk...\(^4\) something that even seasoned fell-walkers would think very carefully about before proceeding.\(^3\) I think the vast majority of people miss the point that... when I walk, I welcome the fells... recreational walking in his most obvious sense and yet, it’s not that that keeps me fit for my utility walking. It’s completely the other way round. It’s actually my utility walking, which enables me to walk up a fell without killing myself.\(^5\)

Rather than driving short trips.

Absolutely.

You make a habit of actually walking when you can.

Yeah, I was born in Inner London, lived there until about five years ago, and moved up to Kendal, so I’ve always lived in a big city. And for years and years we didn’t have a car in London. We had to use public transport, and inevitably, which involves a lot of walking engaged in fault and not obviously with Living Streets, we’re a campaigning group, I was doing a lot of walking both in the job and in my own time too...and London is very well suited for walking, especially combining walking with public transport. So I've always done a lot of that. So when we came up to Kendal, we chose Kendal as a place specifically because it has good public transport connections...and is very compact town, a very walkable town, and we live well into it. Alright
we lived in the outskirts to begin with. It is still very walkable...so I never use the car, in town. I always walk. And absolutely...it's a major part of the attraction of living somewhere like Kendall...is that it is highly walkable. (6)

When you say walkable, you mean things close together, and a nice environment to walk, the pavement and so on?

Yes, perhaps less obviously the quality of the public realm, the historic lay out of the town, absolutely. It is compact. It's high-density. It’s a market town, which actually still has a very strong importance to his own hinterland, in a way that a lot of market towns have lost. So lots of people come into Kendall from the hinterlands to shop. So in terms of what its offer and what its trip generators are: there’s loads of them. Loads of stuff to do. There are other things as well. All our friends now are living in Kendall, so if we need to go out we all walk into the town center, have a drink, go to the cinema, and then walk out again and that's part of its walkability. Whereas in London, I had loads of friends, all over London. When we went up to the West End, everyone had to get on public transport. So it’s walkable in those senses. And the reason I took this job...it’s not overtly and primarily about walking. It was because there were, finally after decades of looking at the landscape and not looking after the towns, there is a recognition although the money hasn’t properly followed yet. (2) There is a recognition that we need to improve the public realm in the towns and villages.

Within the Lake District?

In the Lake District. Within the national park. And there were two schemes on the stops when the job came up. Public realm schemes to improve walkability. One in Windermere village and the other one in a place called Waterhead had just outside Ambleside. And for me it was a great opportunity to extend my range of skills, in terms of walking as a professional, to actually look at delivery of the schemes. Whereas my work with Living Streets was about community engagement and looking at options and possibilities. Presenting those ideas and then buggering off now I actually deal with wrestling those ideas back into reality. So it's been a very useful process as well for me. And how you turn good ideas into reality. Often it receives all sorts of criticism. But that's really how I approached it. I've come to this particular job at this point in time.

Fantastic. So, in your job at the moment you have a relationship...What sort of relationship do you have with other people walking? At the moment how often do you interact with other walkers within the Lake District?

You’ll have to enlarge on that. Do you mean recreational walkers?

Recreational, as in not for transport.

I would say relatively little it’s got to be said. I tend to interact with people who interact with walkers because as town centre manager, I’m very much involved in public realm enhancement which are about creating a nice environment for people who are here recreationally. They’re not fell walkers. The vast majority. But they are here to stroll around our towns and villages but I'm not interacting directly with them, I’m actually trying to impact on the quality of their experience in the public realm....and the other two main groups I am involved are the retailers and the visitor attraction providers... who again have a very close relationship with recreational walkers, and with residents who, as I say tend much less....you tend to get two extremes....you get people who don't tend to walk for recreation at all and people who are very much outdoorsy types who do a lot of it, (7) but my interaction with them is incidental. It’s not actually about their walking, so for example, there’s a local group...bizarrely in a place surrounded by green space, we’ve got no allotments and have got to get funds to actually get allotments sorted, and a fair percentage of people on that waiting list desperate for allotments, are active people, who will be recreational walkers. But my engagement to them is incidental to that. But in a way I
quite like the fact that it’s incidental because I think, in a way, a lot of this is about just making connections with people and using opportunities to take people out and to change their preconceptions about what recreational walking, for an example, is. And often is much better to do that in an environment where that’s not the main topic of conversation. I think the other area where I do have a more direct involvement is… one of the things I do is living streets is conducts community street audits…which is a way of looking at the public space from the viewpoint of the people who use that space rather than the people who manage it….and doing it on the streets itself.

**How did you do that? Is it surveys? or observations?**

It’s really walk and talk. It came from an initiative...Scandinavian model... very very straightforward...where they would take people out with a short tick list, and say ‘okay, what’s wrong with this place, and what’s right with it?’ and we developed that to some extent. We worked actually in some of the major multi-disciplinary consultancies in the country. People like Taylor Young, and some of the big building design consultants, and they particularly wanted to go down an obsessive tick list approach...very engineering-focused They were producing tick lists of two or three hundred questions to ask people in a public space, and it completely destroys the spontaneity of walking and looking and talking and discussing..and we actually backed right down...as Living Streets, we backed right away from that and we recognize that the best way of extracting information about how public space that they know intimately works, but that they tend to use...they don’t consciously assess it is to take them out, get them to walk it, repeatedly stop them, and just push them to discuss that space, how it is working and how you could change it, and really that’s what it’s about. Small groups of people out, into public space. Discuss with them how it works, discuss with them what they like about it, what they hate about it, what they would like to change and constantly feeding them options that they may not have thought of about how they would change.

**Is it mainly urban environments?**

Overwhelmingly yes overwhelmingly urban, but realistically I suppose it could be used in almost any environment. We used to use it on industrial estates and town centers, and residential roads- big range of urban spaces. There is no reason you couldn’t...and in parks and gardens, recreation grounds, that sort of things...so there’s absolutely no reason you couldn’t go up on the fells and do the same thing! (8)

**people on the walks. Any observations on that? Any thoughts about that? And do the same exact thing?** I know of studies, very few studies, which have tried to do this, where people have actually have gone out for recreational walking in countryside settings and recorded or interviewed

I think there is actually a very interesting, and something very obvious I’m sure, I’m sure you’ve thought about it already, but people have a very interesting relationship with the landscape here, in the sense that it is natural, when clearly it’s not. It’s entirely man made in its current form. But also this relationship with how you manage it and whether you manage it, because there is this fiction that it is not a managed space when clearly it is an intensely managed space, and part of what underpins that is the sense that you are walking on natural in inverted commas paths. (9) And one of the major projects: ‘The Fix the Fells’ project, where motorway width paths have been created, especially on some of the ridge walks, where people have done the walks, just got wider and wider. What they’ve done is rebuilt paths, using traditional...often using traditional Lakeland techniques...but stepped paths, heavily used paths. And some people are very opposed to this because they feel that it actually destroys the...technical requirements of using...of walking on steep, loose surfaces, and a more traditional, as they would see it, look and feel to those routes they’ve used for years, hat they’ve been shaving off, and all of a sudden you’ve got some kind of stepped path, and some people are very uncomfortable with that. There are also issues around actually leading recreational walkers into areas beyond their
capabilities, because it seems to be a managed path, easy to get up, and suddenly you discover you're in real difficulties. There are also issues about signage. How heavily do you sign routes? To you sign them at the bottom? And then if you're saying this at the top of Fairfield, when do you stop putting signs up? How do you manage that? There was a recent case where the route across Morecambe bay, which is only passable at low tide and only passable with the Queen’s guide, Cedric Robinson, across the bay... and there was a sign up a public right-of-way across... and a sign pointing across... and people were saying, locals were saying: 'this is crazy, no one does that without a guide'. And the sign was removed. And that's just probably an extreme example of that sort of issue. Issues around wayfinding, and doing that... that tension between... do you say: 'OK, Here's a guide, plug it in your ear, and it will guide you along a route’, or do you say: ‘Actually, if you’re going up on the fells, you shouldn’t be relying on any guide. You should be relying on an OS map, compass and in the gray matte. (10) The traditional way, and now you've got people with iphones and GPS.

Absolutely, and talk to the mountain rescue. The number of mountain rescue callouts is going through the roof. People are getting themselves in difficulties because they are using technology. I think they are using technology... they are relying on it too much and they're failing to see that. (11) There is almost a philosophical difference as well between using technology and taking yourself out of the natural settings to actually go by your technology all the time.

One of the things I found interesting about moving up here was that some of the most challenging walks I now do are all low-level walks, and is actually about wayfinding, and much, much more challenging and also much more attractive, much quieter. (13) Much more varied. Especially in terms of biodiversity. But also in getting to know routes intimately now, so I often go out without compass and a map, because I just know that route, and can walk it without that. And that’s now a fundamentally different relationship for me as a recreational walker with the landscape and OS maps and compasses are technology. (14) It is traditional technology and it varies because... I can certainly remember when I hadn’t done as much fell walking as I’ve done now, being over-reliant on that sort of stuff, and the observational side of it being less strong, and me getting into difficulties because of that. So I think we've always had that relationship with technology. We use it but do we rely on it too much, and how do you develop that? (15) Maybe there is a spectrum or gradient of using nothing, and using too much. And it's where to find the balance almost.

Absolutely, and obviously I could get a GPS and it is very useful at times... I've resisted that, because for me... well I think the other thing is, I've got the luxury... I used to come up for the day, and it didn't matter what the weather was, I was going to go walking. (16) I’d be out tomorrow. It is going to be a fantastic day on the fells.

On Saturday as well.

Yes, and it's great for me as a town center manager, because I know that loads of people will be watching the weather, will know that there is still lots of snow on the tops, will know that it will be looking sensational and they either want to go and experience that when they're walking or they want to go on a low-level, and enjoy the great views. They’ll know what the weather's like. You know, this is not just good weather tomorrow, but forecasted to be good weather. It'll be a bumper day for the businesses too. So I'll be on the fells enjoying it, knowing that my client group had a good day too... but... I lost my thread a bit... But I think, that's the luxury for me. On
days when it's blowing a gale on the tops, I just don't go out in it. **So the sort of extra support that GPS can provide me with, I don’t really need so much now, because I'm not putting myself in that kind of danger.** (17)

You mean, you could have it as a backup.

I could have it as a backup, just in case the weather does something that you’re not anticipating but to be honest, I don't feel that that’s strictly necessary and again do you then start to take decisions that you shouldn’t take, to go out walking on days...when you talk to the local farmers they don't go on the top in adverse weather conditions unless they have to. It’s people who come up on a short break, who are determined to do a walk. And what they’ll do when they’re not fit enough for it, they’ve pulled a muscle the day before...weather’s wrong...because they're on holiday and as a real challenge for us as a community. I think because we have to manage the fallout from that, but if you live up here, you’ve got that luxury...of learning how to cope with those sorts of environment and those sorts of conditions much better and also choosing the days which is really the key to it. (18)

It does sound like there is a definite relationship between the walker and the environment they’re in or the environment they’re used to perhaps as well.

Absolutely. In the same way as there is an urban environment. I mean, the environment I know best is the urban London environment, and I know I go there, tear around it because I know exactly where I’m going I know how to negotiate busy streets like a dumb, I go out somewhere here, the people I see get completely freaked out because they’re out of their comfort zone and their relationship with that environment is one of ignorance and fear, whereas I know the place, I know that extra alertness that you need in an urban environment, because there’s so much going on. (20) You never know when a problem might occur, and that alone is coupled with an ability to not react to something unusual. Someone walks past an estate on a busy London street, you know not to turn around and look at them and treat it as if nothing happened, because there's always this challenge. There are people around who may be looking to check whether you're comfortable or not in that environment and clearly if you’re not then you can give out the wrong signals. So I think that relationship between person and environment is a strong one.

When you say fear as well, I think that’s important – level of fear. I think some people need a guide or a Wainwright to tell them where to go.

Absolutely, and I’ve been there too. And that’s a concern. I can remember when I stopped using guides. I’ve always used a map and compass, and a guide book. And I really used the guide book for the first one, or walking with someone else. (21) Someone else determined that this is a walk, they use it so this is a walk. And of course, then although I’ve often used guide books as inspiration, to get the process started, I make my own routes. And I make decisions on the fells too. So when the weather changes you make decisions. It’s a lovely afternoon, you have your boots on, you extend your walk, so instead of it being someone else’s walk, that someone’s put in a book and you follow it slavishly, (22) you then start to...

It’s almost like you’ve got more freedom, when you have experience, knowledge, a lack of fear and the confidence to not have a map and guide book. Most definitely, and it changes your relationship then,

Absolutely, you’re reading it much better, you’re looking at it all of the time, rather than looking at a map. SO it does, it changes your relationship with how you interact with it. (22)

So one of the things that has come up before is people have been brought up in a family where people walk, or university. Do you think that is something that is definitely there?
I think there are differences depending on your upbringing, and I’m sure people respond to those differences in different ways. I’m not from a walking background at all. I was brought up with five brothers and sisters, and I’m the only one who routinely walks, and to be honest for utility as well as recreation, or maybe that’s not fair...

*It’s hard to define the boundaries sometimes.*

But the reality is, I’m very conscious of using walking and celebrating it, but I don’t come from that background. My introduction to recreational walking, like you can do here was from a geography fieldtrip. And I think a lot of people—I’ve got friends, firm friends who did likewise, by geography fieldtrips. As urban kids we were taken out into wild environments, very experienced teachers who pushed us hard, and gave us experience of the wild landscapes and I think there is something positive about having to discover it for yourself, rather than being brought up with it [23]. Another friend has walked all his life, always used to go walking with his dad he spent a considerable period of his teens and 20s not doing any recreational walking because he was fed up with it, because he always used to go out with his dad...and he’s been reintroduced to it, he’s gone back to it, and he loves it again...whereas I never had that. And I had a similar relationship with cycling. I was never allowed bicycle as a kid. First proper job I had, almost the first pay packet I got was spent on a bicycle, and for years and years...I’ve stopped now, but for years, decades, I cycled. I used to go on cycle touring holidays, used it as a utility, and I think it’s because I didn’t see it as a child, saw it was something to be put away when you reach adulthood, it was a new thing for me. A new thing to discover for myself, and I think walking...recreational walking can be the same, and actually if you haven’t been brought up to do it, it can be a whole new excitement thinking. I think you can also be someone who never gets exposed to it at all. That’s the other side to it. If your family never expose you to it perhaps you never ever discover it [23].

Yes, it’s interesting. Really, when you said cycling as well, you can almost see a career path in walking and cycling in the way people start off doing a little bit of walking. Some people may carry on. Some people would be happy to stay the same level, doing a little bit.

But I’ve never done competitive sport... until recently...but I never ever was interested in cycling for competition. I love cycling, and pushing myself physically, cycling and competing against myself and my ability. That was quite a conscious decision... not to do that, but I think also the changing relationship with it went more from leisure to utility during that time. In the same way that I very nearly got involved in cycling advocacy in London – the London cycling campaign was so powerful and I just thought that walking was the Cinderella mode... and it wasn’t getting to...at that stage living streets was just... it almost died out. It started in 1920, and it was just being – a new director had come on and it was just starting to grow...and I made a conscious decision to say... ‘ Well cycling has been given a direction, and actually urban walking, utility walking needs a push.

*It sounds like in London as well, people I’ve talked to recently it is starting to really grow.*

Walking is the sharp end of the transport problem in the UK, and it’s at the sharp end of the solution. Its way ahead. In terms of use of walking, many more people walk in London simply because it’s a compact place, fine-grained public realm, great range of different uses close together. A public transport network which encourages, obviously, things for walking really well. I And things like the double diagonal crossing experiment at Oxford Circus and Kensington high Street really been softened and made much more pedestrian friendly, but talking about genuine shared space. These are the headline schemes. When I was at living streets I did a huge amount of walking research on much lower profile schemes, which are really pushing the walking agenda in a way which is not happening up here. I came up here and immediately taken at 10, 20 year step back, in terms of where we were on this debate. There’s a scheme going on in Kendall at the moment, which I was involved in. I did some consultancy on it, looking at the making the
route more walkable. The coverage in the paper…it works really well, actually there are thirty five replies on the street, and only a couple really kicked off about it.

So they were complaining?

Only two of them. You dig up a street outside a retail outlet, it doesn’t matter what you do about it, they’ll complain...because immediately, it disrupts their business but we did a great deal of engagement with it. We came up with a compromise...a suggestion that everyone could buy into and inevitably can’t find a compromise that everyone is in favour of, but actually, out of the 35, there’s only two really who’ve been uneasy, and even those are not strongly opposed to it in terms of coverage in the local paper. I have to agree with the previous letter. What on Earth is the Council thinking? Narrowing the road in Kirkland basically making the pavements wider. Having flowers and seats, reducing average vehicle speed, reducing traffic content, narrowing the road where we have good natural space to maneuver. The whole letter is all about traffic. It’s got nothing to do walking. It completely missed the point, and that is absolutely typical of the response you get, saying we want to do something to make it better for pedestrians and no adverse impact on the traffic in that location at all. But that’s the state of play at the moment with this environment. For me it’s a real challenge. I find it fascinating actually. So the basic principles of making space more walking friendly. The benefits, massive range of benefits that come with it are not understood in the mind of Joe public.

By the people who make decisions

Council officers... especially traffic engineers understand it completely, because they’re at the sharp end. And in many ways, I’m absolutely convinced the traffic engineers want to be more radical. They want to do things that make places more pedestrian friendly – they’re actually held back by public opinion and the way it’s represented in the local media and by local politicians and local councils who don’t understand the agenda properly. So it’s a fascinating situation.

It’s very interesting to hear. Very interesting to hear – it’s the first interview where I’ve got an urban perspective on it and walkability of the street because it’s obviously important.

I think that it’s absolutely crucial that you don’t miss this point. That the quality of someone’s recreational walking holiday experience in the Lakes is as colored by the quality of the walking environment in the community, as it is by the experience on the fell. (23) Ambleside is a classic case in point with incredibly narrow footways, and on any summer day, you’re walking in the gutter, you’re walking on the road carriageways, way way massively undersized foot ways, and that comes from people’s...you go to London, walk on the Southbank...fantastic traffic free footway all over London...all over other towns and cities as well. We’ve created great public space where people can stroll and amble, boulevards, outside seating really pleasant environment... we haven’t got it here, even if in we’re conscious of that. It will colour their appreciation of that.

What you think is the root of distant because of the valleys and the geography of the place and the high density of cars. How easy would it be to make it walkable in? the main villages and towns?

Very easy I think it’s a two-pronged problem. Environments that have really been improved in urban centers are either depressed prestige locations, the classic ones for me is in Sheffield. They built the wall from the railway station to the town center. It’s is fantastic...and in London, it’s a complete transformation, in Trafalgar Square, the prestige environments. Where’s the prestige environment in the Lakes. It’s the countryside. We’re looking for world heritage status in the National Park. We have a world class landscape, it’s because we’ve got a world class landscape...not because we’ve got world class urban space. It’s the landscape. Our prestige environments are not the ones which are flawed. Our prestige environments are very closely...
managed to not withstand things like Fix the Fells, the issues there have been addressed. So, that’s the one of the two main environments, where I think you see big changes and improvements. The other one, which I was involved in much more so with living streets, are environments where there are high levels of deprivation in terms of the indices of deprivation these places score very highly and there was a great deal of public sector money...a great deal of regeneration money available for this place. Where there’s one of the key things you can do to improve the quality of people’s lives is to improve the quality of the urban realm that they live in. So those places have public money that can help fund them. Well here, the prestige environments is the Great Outdoors as a would have no... we don't score high...obviously there are puts pockets of deprivation in the National Park. Actually these are relevantly affluent communities that have problems not such that we can lever in public sector funding. And we also have, very low population numbers, very big landscape so our local authorities don't have the budget, because they're spending all the time just keeping...for example big issue with closing the public toilets, has had a big impact in quality of walking in our urban environments. The local authority has no mandate and is not required to keep public toilets open. They were effectively providing toilets for millions of visitors a year, and yet their funding is 450,000 residential population. So they can’t keep their toilets open and if they close them it’s going to cause uproar. So it’s about getting the budget to make the changes. I think perhaps the other thing which is holding us back, is a big population of people like me have moved here. The vast majority have moved on retirement. They come here to retire because they’ve been here 20 years previously, because they don’t want it to change. They actually want it to be like it was when they came 20 years previously, but the resistance to change is massively strong. People are very protective of this environment, they don’t want change of any sort. It is the same everywhere but I think it is particularly strong here. (24)

I’ve noticed that myself. I’m actually from Penrith, so the Lake District – I moved away, and I do want to come back and see it the same. So obviously I do understand that on a personal level.

Absolutely, but the problem is that everywhere changes, in the same way that the Fix the Fells addresses the change to the great outdoors. You can’t stop that change. What you can do, is let go of the reigns, and just let change happen. Places degenerate. Because of change anyway. When the public realm is heavily used, it wears out. As one of a series of urban locations we’ve worked seriously to try and transform those. Unfortunately, the funders also do not want to fund gentle subtle incremental change. They want big-budget transformation projects. That is fine if you’re doing Trafalgar Square, it’s no good if you’re doing Waterhead or Ambleside. I mean, that street that you walked through in Windermere – Crescent Road, not a brilliant scheme, but they’ve made a massive improvement in terms walkability. Very difficult to achieve that change... but there was a massive demand for those sorts of change. The materials are wrong and the detail is not great, but actually getting those changes was crucially important, and very hard to achieve. So you’ve got all of those things that actually pull against sensible improvements in the public realm in our towns and villages... and finally we seem to be tipping over towards recognizing this. So if you talk to Cumbria tourism, they will say, the quality of public realms in our towns and villages is one of their key priorities. They really recognize how important is to improve, to spend money on this, and they’re really pushing hard on it. We’ve still got some way to go to actually get public sector money available to do that. It might become pretty hard to do.

One of the people I talked to said that, as far as spending the money is concerned, it’s to make sure people are using routes. I think he was more talking about the urban routes.

I can certainly see that. Here the bigger problem is that public sector money tends to come with very clearly defined strings attached. You have to create jobs. You have to protect jobs. You have to leverage in private-sector funding. The public realm does all of those things in a way which is very difficult to quantify... and so is very hard to score sufficiently highly to win funding. The scheme at Waterhead. We’ve had two cracks in it. It gets 1 million visitors a year. A tiny little
hamlet. Totally traffic dominated. The first scheme, we followed the route of pleasing the funders. 6,000,000 pounds scheme, transformational. All the professionals were lapping it up. The locals went absolutely berserk. There was uproar. I nearly got strung up, because it seen as too big a change. Very fortunately, we were able to go through the whole process a second time. Second time round, we followed local opinion, we came up with a much more modest scheme. Half the price. A much more incremental change. The locals absolutely have accepted it, and have partly been softened up by the first process of something radical, and they’re actually focusing their minds on the need for change. And they went through the process of recognizing the process of recognizing the change, but not the change that was being suggested first time round. Second time they have lapped it up, the funders are saying, it’s not really. It’s not transformational.

You’re in the middle of it.

Yes, and the odds are we won’t get funding. Yet it is half the price, and will be a massive improvement... so there is a constant tension between local gentle incremental subtle change and big-budget transformational change the funders want. It’s difficult to win funding for it anyway because this is an affluent part of the country. But I do think it’s important to recognize the urban element of recreation even in somewhere as quintessentially about the liberation like this. I think it’s... miss that point at your peril.

How about the public transport and cars and car parks. How big a bearing does it have on the people walking? I think is linked.

It is, absolutely

Can you get the right bus service, trains. People seem to be very dependent on having a carpark at the start and end of the walk.

It is a massive issue. It is a very difficult one for me to comment on objectively, because I’m very biased. I’m tied into but also my background... I come from a place with, despite anyone complaining about London Council, fantastic public transport and I was stunned when I came here. About how poor the public transport network is. Inevitably I was coming from best of the worst in a way. At the local level the reality is that local people, most of the time, you drive everywhere. It’s very easy for locals complain about traffic jams. But you don’t get traffic jams, only on bank holidays, and then only due to the weather. So that encourages people to use cars. We’ve got a low-density dispersed population so that encourages people to use cars. In terms of visitors, the public transport offer is very poor. It’s not very joined up at all. To get... when I can I use public transport to get between Kendal and Windermere. The train journey is quicker and cheaper than the bus journey. The bus journey is antiquated. It’s very slow and it costs loads more than the train – completely daft. There is no integration. When you get off at Windermere, there are buses. When you get off the train and the bus is left from outside a minute earlier. There is no integration between service provided.

I tried to do Langdale once on integrated transport. It took about three or four hours. I wanted to go walking but it wasn’t every long walk.

It’s very, very poor. It is improving very, very slowly but again it actually needs massive injection of capital. It is changing. The National Park Authority, which has a very poor reputation, at a local level is seen as authoritarian and undemocratic and heedless of local needs, and historically it was all of those three things. It has changed its stripes recently in the last couple of years. There’s a new chief executive really trying hard to turn things around... much more responsible. It’s much more focused now on the local economy...the fact that this is a living, community place not just a landscape. They are really focusing on the needs of people, much, much more than they were. It’s incredibly hard still to actually do anything. It is easy to have the aspiration but they have started to move. One example, for example moving people around Windermere, the
Lake, is a real challenge. Last year they piloted a water taxi service to try and shuttle people backwards and forwards from this side to the other side. The lake shore access is very easy on the other side. Here, it’s all been brought up. You can travel for miles on this side of Windermere, and you never get to see water, because it’s all private big old Victorian buildings on the waterfront. On the other side, you can walk virtually the whole length of it right on the water’s edge. So, the idea is to create a whole series of these little shuttle water taxis taking people back and forth across, and that’s being done at the end of this year. It is being piloted last year. They learnt from it. They’re going to do it again this year. The National Park are looking to try and create a more joined up green transport network that will enable people to come and enjoy, to some extent, this environment without needing cars. But still, there is a massive dependence on cars, and it isn’t going away anytime soon, absolutely not.

Have you got anything else fundamental, that you have thought about whilst we’ve been talking here or just in general about walking.

I don’t think so. Very interesting talking to you, and as always…it’s a slightly different perspective, for me, compartmentalized the two (urban and rural) and functional and utility walking. I’ve always recognized they are interconnected…and just this conversation…I’ve recognized the extent of that.

I think a lot of walks people do tend to start in the town or run through the town so you have to look at the together.

Definitely. They are part of the same and we don’t fundamentally change between those two environments…we’re still the same people. And for all of us - if you’re bedridden and you suddenly realize that your day-to-day utility walking is what keeps you fit - and healthy nearest thing to perfect exercise... it’s been described as. And it’s got to be said, particularly on uneven surfaces, is what really... you don’t get nearly as footsore, and any decent walker knows the last 2 miles on tarmac kills you.
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  - Enjoying town walks
  - Urban walking experience in NP
  - Walkability in towns
  - Walkability in rural environments
  - Natural vs manmade

- **Using maps, compasses, guide books, GIS**
  - Needing a guide
  - Relying on technology
  - Using maps and guides to gain experience

- **Being an experienced walker**
  - Experience and hill walks
  - Seeking quieter routes

- **Safety**
  - Under-estimating safety on fells
  - False confidence
  - Confidence to avoid danger
  - Safety in urban environments

- **Confidence in decision making**
  - Using experience to navigate
  - No longer needing compass and map
  - Coping with bad conditions
  - Gaining confidence to design walks

- **Day tripping’ or a ‘way of life**
  - Pleasure from utility walking
  - Occasional walkers
  - Walking a lot, earlier in life
  - Living in a walking area

- **Casual and serious walkers**
  - Regular and non-regular walkers
Sample transcript 2: Fourth interview.

Descriptive note:

This interview was undertaken with a town centre planner for towns in the national park, including Windermere. His background included work for Living Streets and research into the walking environment. As such, some of the conversation included talking about the towns in the Lake District, as important areas for walking tourist experiences.

‘And our towns... the public realm in our towns and villages in the national park is very poor. It is behind the times. It hasn’t had money spent on it. There’s a very poor quality of walking. The reality is people come up for recreational walking on the fells will spend most at times in the towns and villages.’

As an experienced walker, insights into the walking experienced in the Fells were also drawn, and the use of maps in the behaviour of walkers. The confidence element of walking was focused on in terms of understanding differences in behaviour. This came out of the public space and safety element, but also was discussed in the context of more rural walking experiences.

Researcher awareness note:

This interview and all those before it were characterised by the interviewee talking with very minimal prompting, and therefore the continuation of the method was justified.

Inferences:

Interviews at this point were building a picture of walkers; the fact that some are committed and experienced and others were more akin to ‘day-trippers’. The casual and serious definitions were beginning to form. Confidence was focused on much more heavily in this interview and discussed in the particular context of being aware or experienced of surroundings. This began from a point of discussing the wider walking environment in cities and town and then applying it to the national park.

‘Someone walks past an estate on a busy London street, you know not to turn around and look at them and treat it as if nothing happened, because there’s always this challenge. There are people around who may be looking to check whether you’re comfortable or not in that environment and clearly if you’re not then you can give out the wrong signals. So I think that relationship between person and environment is a strong one.’

‘When you say fear as well, I think that’s important – level of fear. I think some people need a guide or a Wainwright to tell them where to go.’

‘Absolutely, and I’ve been there too. And that’s a concern. I can remember when I stopped using guides. I’ve always used a map and compass, and a guide book. And I really used the guide book for the first one, or walking with someone else. Someone else determined that this is a walk, they use it so this is a walk. And of course, then although I’ve often used guide books as inspiration, to get the process started, I make my own routes.’
The map and compass / guide book / confidence link was originated in this interview, and developed in subsequent interviews. Other elements which were forming included the ‘functional / pleasurable walking paradox’ and the idea of a ‘walkability’ index for the countryside.
Interview 11: Recreation manager in the Lake District National Park

Outline of study, reasoning etc.....What is your own personal relationship with recreational walking? Both in your job and personally?

Yes, well, it definitely is both personal and professional. Professionally, I’ve worked with the national park for just over eleven years. For the last three and a half, my job title is: ‘Access and Recreation Developer’, which is a fancy way of saying that: ‘Trying to ensure access to the countryside’, not just for walkers, but obviously for all types of users....cyclists, mountain bikers, horse riders, people with mobility, diversity, obviously diversity is something you’ve got to think about.

Social inclusion?

Social inclusion, making sure ethnic minorities and other members of the population are included. There’s two of us who do the same job. I’m based in the North. I’ve got a colleague who’s actually based here day to day.

I see. So you section off the area?

We just found that there was so much of that kind of work going on, it needed more than one person to do it. North and South seemed an obvious split. So yes, I’ve been doing that for three and a half years. My previous job was a bit more specialised. It was actually looking at off road driving: 4x4s and trail bikes. Still recreation, but a bit different from what I guess we’re going to be talking about. So very much professionally it’s been a big part of what I’ve done over the years. Personally, I’m a hillwalker. I class myself as a serious walker.

That’s interesting. A lot of people will say this. Serious and casual walkers. So that’s interesting.

I do a lot of hillwalking in the Lakes, a lot in Scotland. I’m a Munro geek, I winter climb, I rock climb, I mountain climb. One of the reasons I work in an organisation like this, is because it’s what I do in my spare time.

Excellent. That is fantastic. So just to go back to that point serious and casual, because that is one of the things – something that seems to be coming from most of the interviews. There’s actually a distinction. And you’ve said hill walking. For yourself – if you could go into a bit more detail about serious walking – what you think, where you think the boundaries lie. I’ve identified lots of types of walking. Different people will do low level, there’s urban walking. It’s almost like a continuum of casual to serious. Any thoughts on that?

Yes. It’s obviously very difficult to have a dividing line. The lines are very blurred. There’s a lot of overlap. But I know that from work that we’ve done on the Rights of Way Improvement plans, something that came from the Countryside Rights of Way Act – all the local authorities have to have a Rights of Way improvement plan. We did quite a lot of research to underpin that. We worked with a consultancy company and they did a needs and preference research. And they categorised all the different types of users, and one of their categories was serious and casual walkers.

Was it? That’s interesting.

So the needs and preferences of each of them came out to be quite different. And I think, and it’s my opinion, but you look at serious walkers – you think of hill walkers. It’s not something that they just do as part of a day out, or as part of a general holiday. It’s something that is their primary purpose, especially when you’re in a national park like this. The reasons that people come here are different. Slightly different from sort of general places people visit. That
is their primary purpose for coming here. They’ve got the kit, they will specifically buy what they need to go and do that sort of activity. (8) They will spend all day from 9 o clock until 5, just going out on a hill walk. (9) They’ll go and buy the stuff – they’ll have the maps, the Wainwright books, and all that kind of stuff. (10) I think the casual walker, are probably sort of the general holiday makers who are on a weekend visit and they will fit to their itinerary. They’re here anyway, they have a bit of time on their hands. Sightseeing is still the number one activity, in the park. Driving there basically. (11)

In a car – sitting at the Lake but not getting out of the car?

Getting out at the car parks to go to the toilet or whatever. Go to a cafe and do a very very short walk. Most people (12)

It’s like a stroll almost

Yes, they don’t travel very far from their cars. But they may go for a mile or two, on a walk, if they know that it’s a circular route. (12)

Is a leaflet or something useful for that? So in these leaflets, that you get, say in tourist information centres, that kind of thing. I understand they are actually geared towards that market. Serious walkers don’t need these leaflets. Because they’re not interested in having it all mapped out for them.

Well, I printed off the research, you can take this away.

Oh fantastic – that is excellent

This is the whole thing. I’ve underlined the bits about walkers.

I’ve looked at the ROWIP, the actual document before, what year is it? It’s current isn’t it?

It’s 2005. Actually the plan itself was launched in 2007. This research that underpinned it is 2005. But what came out….this consultancy company interviewed people, urban residents in the park, as well as what they said are serious and casual walkers, and what came out from the urban and rural residents (13) and the casual walkers is that: they wanted short circular walks, of easy grade, well surfaced, but also a huge part of this was about information provision. It was signposted, well way marked, potentially maps or interpretation boards at the start and end of each walk so they know what they are doing. (14) They could be short but they could also be guided so there was that sort of welcome to an area. Better links with public transport, because not everybody has a car. Most people have, but in order to get to a short walk, the idea is to make better links with public transport. But also toilets and restaurants and all the other facilities like that. (15) So they had quite a lot, in terms of what we asked them, their preferences – what they wanted to do: all these sort of things came out.

Serious walkers – they basically said: ‘We’re alright, we don’t need anything.’ (6)

They actually prefer the experience of the wild.

We’ve got the hills, we’ve got the map. We know how to use them, we’ve got the compass, the GPS, we’ve got the kit. (16) The Lakes – it’s fine for us. So they feel that they are absolutely catered for. They don’t need anything else.

I almost see it as – at the moment – it’s almost two different activities. Almost, because of the skill level involved. You can’t expect someone who is always walking on a casual basis – quite short walk, to suddenly be able to tackle a more serious walk. And it’s interesting when we talk
about Scotland as well – I’ve been up some of the Munros as well and it becomes climbing. It’s almost a threshold at the top where walking stops and climbing starts. Scrambling, climbing.

Yes, up in Scotland. There’s not many places in the Lakes where it’s like that, but there are a few.

So for serious walking – it’s got that level of skill, it’s almost like a sport in that respect. Do you ever find that there are people who do both then?

I think yes, there are. There will be. I think serious walkers are very focused. They will have other days, where they go for a walk in the woods. I have...my preference is to be really active and steep, over the hills, whether it’s on bike or whatever or climbing. (18) I’m not so inflexible that that is all I will ever do. I like the rolling hills in the South Lakes, between Kendal and Windermere. You’ve got Grizedale and the area between Windermere and Coniston. It’s absolutely fantastic part of the Lakes for a walk. It’s a very different experience.

So, you can still do a casual walk, and see the things – if you’re in the Lake District particularly, then scenery is such a pull....so to do that walk is actually important. Do you find in the Lake District that is one of the key things for people to come and walk here?

Yes, the other piece of our research – if you want, you can take this away, is an open access facility. Open access is to change, when it came in to being – 2000, the CRoW act, the Lake District and North West 2005 is when it was finally rolled out. And we’ve done some research with Natural England. It’s their methodology. Because of the Lake District, there was also ‘defacto’ open access. (19) And in the last wall. The highest wall – and once you’ve gone that high you can ignore that. So it didn’t make a huge amount of difference. We only had about four percent of land that became open access.

Is this the land of the owners who want to be part of the agreement?

Yes, so it didn’t make that much difference. Compared to place like the Dales and the North York Moors, where there was a lot of private land where people weren’t allowed to go. Because the fell were so high there was basically accepted open access above the fell wall anyway. But what we found is that people don’t just wonder where they like. They stick to recognisable paths. They know. They’ve got their maps. They see a route on the map. They see it’s a public right of way. They feel it’s (20) They feel it’s easier going as well.

I suppose there’s less stress if you know you are allowed to be somewhere?

Yes. Walking on a path is much easier than walking on boggy ground. Or rough ground or steep ground. So for that reason... part of the research was asking about why...why were they here? What were the decisions they made? (21) When going to certain places. Certainly in the Lakes, it was about – it was actually a wide view that it was the scenery, landscape, remoteness, tranquillity: all the things that you associate with the National Park. And I think...the National Park...the findings were slightly different from the national sample. Nationally, some of the reasons for why - they were there were a lot more functional. Walking the dog.

Quite a lot of people? The local people I imagine are functional walkers?

Yes, much the attachment to the National Park and the scenery and the landscape.

Peace and quiet as well, I think. There’s also the alternate thing here. I’ve talked to people about this. You can find a place that everyone wants to go to. Catbells is an example. It’s so busy that you can’t get the peace and quiet. Is that something you’ve had to cope with?
Catbells is a really good example, because it’s not just getting to it and walking up the hill. There’s a huge amount of erosion and we have to deal with that. It’s actually how people get to Catbells. Most people drive. There’s chaos on the roads. And the county council have put double yellow lines on all the roads leading to Catbells to try and discourage parking but all that has meant is that people have tried to park elsewhere. (16)

Yes, alongside – buses find it hard trying to drive though

What we are trying to do and the county council, and anybody who is working the tourism agenda or sustainable transport is they encourage people to travel from Keswick and get the bus. Or even the boat. Keswick, Derwentwater has got a fantastic boat service. And there is a jetty right by Catbells. So we’re trying to encourage people not to drive there. (22)

Is that a kind of marketing thing?

It’s basically how you manage it, and how you promote different forms of access. Obviously, you’ve got control, like double yellow lines. And fixed penalty notices and other sorts of deterrent, but once you set one control in motion, it triggers other things and brings the potential need for a car park elsewhere. All these things are being looked at. So Catbells is a really good example. People are really drawn to honeypot areas. Catbells...the Langdales.(23)

It’s the romance? It’s the names. People have heard the names. They want to do the walk. The Lake District has that. I don’t know if it’s happened over time – I never remember it being as focal in the World. There’s programs, books – it seems to have really taken off.

I think one of the reasons why people come here. You mention Wainwright. Now it’s TV programs, Julia Bradbury. But 30 years ago – I’m from the North East originally, we’d just come up here on family holidays. We stayed in Kentmere and in Langdale....various other places. But my parents had the Wainwright books. I think it’s that sort of generation – when people started writing books in the sixties....once they were all published...(24)

They really do bring it to life.

You can’t blame him. He’s the reason – part of the reason why it’s become so popular. There’s obviously lots of other reasons. Increase in available time, increased mobility and so on. But the Lakes is just incredibly busy. Virtually all year round.

It’s not just Great Britain, it’s other countries isn’t it? Do you know anything about the proportions of residents and international visitors?

There’s 42,000 people who live in the Park. And we get 8 million day visitors a year, but something like 15 million overall. It’s a lot. I think the Peak District is the only one which gets more. Because of visitors from Manchester, Leeds and all sorts of places. It’s a heck of a lot. So the proportion of visitors from other places to residents – it’s a heck of a lot.

So it’s a massive job then. That’s why you need all these people to manage it.

Yes

So, in your job, what contact do you have with recreational walkers? Do you have to go out and interact with them? I know certain jobs, like countryside officers have a degree of this. Everyday....sometimes finding people who are lost and setting them the right way...that kind of thing.
In terms of the access staff that we’ve got. I mentioned the day to day job, but we’ve got a team of rangers. Twelve rangers in the park. So they cover a selected number of parishes in the area. We do a lot of rights of way and access work. We’ve got 4, what we call, field rangers. They do a lot of access work, a lot of practical stuff, building things, repairing stiles...gates. We have a field team, with machines, diggers and all sorts of things to do the bigger stuff. Bridges and all kinds of things. Then on top of that, we’ve got the legal teams – 4 people doing the legal work, making sure that footpaths and bridle ways are in the right place, where they should be. If it’s the legal process they get them moved. So we’ve got a big team of people working in access, I don’t know the numbers off the top of my head – I think it’s about 25. If you add in the field team, it’s nearly 40. So there’s a lot of people toiling away to make sure everything’s all right.

We don’t have a lot of close contact with members of the public. So me and my colleague who do this job don’t. The area rangers have a bit more contact. The field rangers certainly have a lot more contact. Rather than just with individual members of the public it does tend to be with organisations. It’ll be with farmers and landowners and parish councillors. Obviously sometimes we need their approval – their permission to do things. Whereas we don’t tend to consult with individuals, we tend to consult with the Rambler’s Association.

They’re quite instrumental aren’t they? There’s a local one here. There must be a few groups around here.

There’s a lot. There’s very active groups in the Lake District.

So it’s a useful interface between yourselves and the walking world?

Yes

Do you do surveys?

We have a bi-annual survey, on footpaths and Rights of Way. It’s called an ‘ease of use’ survey. It’s a random survey. We just get maps and say: ‘These are the footpaths you have to survey.’ It’s mainly them, but it’s a whole list of criteria about whether it should be said that it’s an easy to use footpath. So we do that twice a year, and we also have our own cyclical survey. We’ve got a huge volunteer list, and our volunteer service is about 300 people. So they do a huge amount of work. They will work sections of the footpath for example and make sure things are ok. (26)

And that’s how you can get an idea of how well used the routes are?

Yes

So what are the main places? Is it always near to Keswick? Penrith?

In terms of the hills, the fells. I guess the exterior is the area north of Skiddaw. Skiddaw and Blencathra are really popular. They’re really iconic hills anyway. Skiddaw is 3000 feet so that’s a big big draw. Blencathra is just a phenomenal mountain, it’s got Sharp Edge as well but those hills behind – they’re out of the way a bit. You can’t really see them. They’re not that dramatic, they’re moorland hills, high moorland hills not the big craggy peaks of the central Lakes. So they are probably the ones that are least used. But really, apart from those, there’s hardly anywhere in the Lakes, in terms of fells that aren’t busy. (28) We’ve got Fix the Fells program

I’ve heard bits about this

It’s been brewing for years
Is it National Park Authority?

Yes it’s the National Park, the National Trust and Natural England. Through the National Park, it’s all been H&F funded, we’ve had two blocks of five years H&F funding. We’re in our tenth year. It ends next year. We’ve got a project officer working for us. National Trust have got another one, so there’s two project officers, and that is just solely to repair the footpaths. And it’s an ongoing piece of work. (29)

And you get the volunteers – people who walk to help

We have, we’ve recruited what we call Fix the Fells volunteers. They’ve had a lot of training. They’ve had first aid, health and safety, and obviously, path care techniques. They basically almost adopt a number of paths and they will go out and check it. Make sure it’s ok, make sure the drains and the ditches are working.

Excellent

That’s a huge area of work and something that will obviously keep going and going. It’s incredibly funding dependent. And the fact that we’ve had two lots of H&F... well we’ve applied again and didn’t get past stage 1. So the project as it stands ends in December 2011. Just over 13 months to go. And we need to find millions of pounds from a source other than H & F, and it’s going to be really difficult. But we definitely need it. Because people aren’t going to stop coming.

It’s not going to decrease the numbers of people coming is it?

No. There are always paths that need repairing. It’s just an ongoing process. (29)

The walkers are putting something back in. That’s the angle if you can get them to realise that?

And that’s in many ways, how other people associate walking in the Lake District. This Land profile. Obviously the Fells are a big draw. And they see engineered footpaths. But there’s obviously a hell of a lot more to the Lakes besides that. There are other areas, low lying areas, walks across the Lakes. And that’s what a lot of other people do. It probably just doesn’t get as much attention as hill walking. (30)

I think one thing about hill walking or something iconic, as you said, it’s almost like a memory. If you have a path of your walking career, walking up Snowdon might be the one thing one remembers. I think that’s maybe the draw to the hills rather than the other walks, but it’s probably good for you, to make sure you can spread people around as much as possible on different walks. There’s one thing I’ve come across, if you imagine a gage of casual and serious walkers – it’s a confidence level. I’m probably talking in more abstract terms now. Is there anything you think about this? As an example, if you have a low level of confidence, you’re more likely to do something guided, you don’t want to use a map, you’re going to choose a shorter or low level walk. It’s almost like a gradation. The more confident you are, the more you will walk unaccompanied.

That’s what this research told us, is that...the casual walkers are for residents and for what we call latent users. People who had done it in the past, but hadn’t done it for a while. The barriers that they faced, and the things they were telling us was that they needed better information and much more information. They needed somebody to help them to start with, whether it was a guided walk to start with, whether it was a bit of training to use a map and compass, so it is – it’s building up their confidence. (31) Quite a lot of people that come here, just aren’t used to the open spaces that we’ve got. We know that some people living in the cities never see fields. They’ve never been to the countryside, and occasionally when they do, it’s completely alien to
them. It’s very easy for people like ourselves with all the wages and access staff. We don’t tend to be outdoorsy sort of people at one level of another. It’s very easy to forget that there are people who aren’t like that. And those people are probably the vast majority of the people who come to the park. There will be more people in Kendal and Ambleside and Keswick than there is on the hills. So they want to just do their little walk and get out in the park. It’s really important that we cater for them. So one of the things that we are doing, and have started doing...we’ve got a legal duty to signpost a footpath or bridal way where it leaves a road. That’s a legal duty. So where, there is tarmac, there has to be a signpost there. In the past it would just say...there’s a public footpath or public bridal way. What we do now is put the destination on, and put mileage on. We don’t put time on, because there’s a big range.

I think that’s too up in the air isn’t it.

But we put destination and miles, so that helps. We’ve produced what we call...it’s really for people with limited mobility...that’s the target audience but basically anybody could use it. It’s called Miles Without stiles. It’s our brand name. And it’s a series of walks that are suitable for people with limited mobility.

SO gates rather than stiles?

Gates rather than stiles. There will be a standard surface, a standard width. Everything will be ramped. There won’t be steps. The gates will be wide enough and two way to make easily opening. They will be a certain grade. It is aimed at people with limited ability, people with pushchairs, young family with pushchairs. Even younger families who have got the papoose or backpack. It’s really difficult to climb over a stile or can’t get through the squeeze – kissing gates. It can be a pain. So we opened those up. And it’s also for those who maybe elderly, infirm, maybe coming back from ill health. They can’t climb over a ladder stile like they used to thirty years ago. So not every route that you promote is wheelchair accessible, and in terms of length it can be from only ½ a kilometre to 7, 8 or even more kilometres. So that’s promoted. But one thing we did do, when we were advised on this. It was very easy to start putting our own judgements on things: ‘It’s a guide dog so we need to put that in a description’...and some of the early drafts we wrote were: ‘wheelchair users should turn around here’, and that kind of judgement...

You almost have to do the walk with someone in a wheelchair?

Yes, we were basically advised, all you should do is present the facts. Don’t say wheelchair users should turn around here, you should say; ‘the path surface is getting rougher from this point onwards’. People make the judgement call themselves. And that’s coming from people who do a huge amount of work with people with disabilities

And they think it’s actually the right thing to do?

Yes, we can’t put our own spin or our own judgement on it.

I can see why. Definitely it’s up to them – they’ll know. When they see it as well they’ll probably realise

So again, some people – the thing with some people with limited mobility – they do feel like they want to be able to make decisions for themselves. They don’t want to be mollycoddled and told: ‘You need to turn round here.’ Some able bodied person like myself telling them that they shouldn’t go any further. So there’s a big streak of independence. In some ways even more so than an able bodied walker. We’ve been told that they like to be lead around. They want to be given a map. Want to be given way marks and sign posts. Maybe want to be given something out of the ground like interpretation boards. Or information boards – so they know
that they can’t go wrong. So I can imagine it’s actually quite difficult. Having to work out how to put people into groups, because people have a hugely different divisions.

Yeah, I think in order to group them – I will think of the grouping later. I trying to get more of an idea of the different factors. We’ve talked about confidence. There’s another thing associated with that which is a sense of adventure, which, you can’t say it’s a hard and fast rule, but I think as you get more confident, you want to kind of go off and do that. Push yourself off

Which is what I did. I started on family holidays as a kid. We would do (the family) low level walks. Walking round the lake, walking through a bit of woodland. As I started getting older I’d think: ‘Oh, I’d like to go there’ and I’d force my Dad up into some of the hills, and once I’d got that under my belt, I’d say ‘Oh, I want to scramble or go up that difficult way’ so for me it was always a different challenge.(18)

Yes, next one’s got to be

Progression, that’s right. It’s kind of harder in Winter as well. That’s why I do it. It’s one of the main reasons why I do it. But then in terms of challenge. There’s a load of challenges in the hills or walking there I just don’t get – long distance walks – I don’t do them. (35)

There are this subset of people who will do them.

Yes it’s been a long time since I’ve done something like the 3 peaks (Ingleborough, Whernside and Penyghent), or even the 3 peaks (Ben Nevis, Snowdon and Scafell). I don’t get that. That is not what I go hillwalking for. Whereas my brother is well into that sort of thing. He’s done the three peaks, he’s going to do the Yorkshire three peaks. So it’s really difficult to generalise isn’t it.(5)

Well one thing that’s interesting, which I’ve heard about, is if you’re doing these fast walks, with your head down, it’s almost as if you don’t perceive your surroundings as much. So you can’t get, that big motivation to walk in the hills is to see everything, to be in nature, and see the tiny intricacies of everything, and you don’t get that when you’re going fast. You can almost say that’s another factor as well. Is there anyone who misinterprets the challenge? They think they can do the walk but they can’t.

Definitely. People are drawn to certain hills just because they’re well known. And I think the one more than any other is Helvellyn. Even though it’s not the highest, Scafell Pike is the highest, but Helvellyn has got this massive edge, Striding Edge, it’s just so well known, it’s over 3000 feet. And I’ve climbed Pillar god knows how many times, and every time, probably apart from the very middle of Winter, there were people up there who had probably never set foot on a hill in their lives. And, I’m not criticising, but they’re not wearing any hill walking whatsoever. They’re wearing jeans and trainers. They haven’t got a water proof or a warm fleece, and very little food. No map. They’re just basically following everybody else. Unless it gets really misty you can’t really go wrong, but you find people scrambling up the face of Helvellyn, between the edges, it’s a wild climb. But more than anywhere else it’s Helvellyn that seems to attract that kind of person. I think in Snowdonia, Snowdon gets all sorts of people. You can start from quite high. You can start from near the pass. And again, I was down in Snowdonia in September and it’s exactly the same as Helvellyn. You see people who’ve never set foot on hills, bent over. Ben Nevis in Scotland is the same, because it’s the highest. You see people on those hills – they will never set foot on any other hill. And the reason is that association. They want to give it a go. They don’t even think about what they might need or what the consequences are. Mountain rescue certainly tend to deal with that. You don’t. We’ve got information on our website. Our website just has it.
You’ve got to have it in as many places as possible.

Yes, and our website isn’t great, how it’s signposted

I’ll have a look at it.

It’s not the greatest actually. There’s bits of information in different places. But we do have stuff about hillwalking and it’s just common sense. If you’re thinking about going, plan your route. Make sure you’ve got your food and equipment. Think about your fitness and whether you can do it. Check some guide books if you need to. But again, what we do, is in the winter months, December time next week, through to usually the Easter holidays, we have a couple of guys who go up there every day

Oh do you?

They’re called fell top assessors. But basically we use Helvellyn as the indicator of conditions on the hills. So they record snow cover.

The weather is quite changeable in different parts of the Lakes.

It is. So they go up there. They work different shifts. They go up there seven days on the trot, and they report on weather conditions, snow conditions and stuff like that, and so because last winter was a heck of a winter, it was serious on the hills. So we give out that kind of information and that gets posted on the website every single day. And there’s also a recorded telephone message that people can phone. What the snow cover is, what the weather is. What the wind direction and speed is.

That’s really helpful if you’re planning to come here for a day, you’ll know whether or not to come.

They will use that. Again I would imagine it’s probably serious walkers that know everything. The casual walkers probably don’t. You do occasionally see people who are trying to get along Striding Edge in winter, on the snow and they are just wearing trainers. And a jacket you’d walk along the high street with, and you just think what on Earth are you doing? But it’s not your position to say anything. I’ve got friends who do. I don’t. Each person has their responsibility. But stop people and say: ‘Do you really think you should be going on the fells like this?’

I suppose maybe if you do say something, they could walk off and fall?

But the fell top assessors is probably one area where we do try and provide information and tend to help people make the decision about what to do

Yes. A couple of things to come back to: general sort of age profiles and gender profiles. Is there anything you can give me?

It’s the whole range. I think again, I would imagine in the Lakes, that they were probably more biased towards older people. That’s what we have been finding

I think that’s generally right

It’s called the grey market, silver surfers. Whatever you want to call the people who have retired. Just an observation: they are here in the week often because they don’t work. I think you do get an awful lot on the hills. The walkers do tend to have an older profile. Mountain bikers it’s younger, generally guys, some fit women, but not a lot. It’s heavily biased. Blokes between 20 and 45-50.
It’s almost like people stop walking. They may have gone out with their parents, they get to 20 and they want to do more serious sports and they come back to walking?

Yes. They will do something a bit less dangerous. So I would say it’s definitely an older profile in the Lakes. It’s not general

So public transport. I know you’ve said something about using public transport for walks. Have you got that here? I know in some places they have bus and train walks for linear walks. Where you’ve actually got a train or a bus service which links to the walk.

There’s various things. And again it’s not just us that does it. And in many ways it can be actually quite confusing. The public transport and the way that is marketed and promoted. Probably needs a bit of an overhaul. You can pick up leaflets from an information centre or a hotel. And you just get bewildered with the amount of attractions or facilities, you can give information about how to get there and that sort of stuff. But there are other leaflets. We’ve got a series of leaflets called: ‘Give the driver a break’. (16)

I’ve heard of that. Is it Friends of the Lake District?

Yes. We’ve worked together on that. We’ve only actually produced two paper leaflets this year. The rest of them are PDFed for financial reasons. It’s based on 8 bus services. And we encourage people to get the bus to walk. We put in a couple of short walks, and a leaflet so people could do, based on the bus

Oh yes. Back stage or something

Mark Richards

I interviewed him. He mentioned it but I can’t remember much about what he said.

So it’s the main bus service that goes through the centre of the Lakes. The 555 basically from Windermere to Keswick. It’s based on that

It’s a Stagecoach service. Comes to Lancaster actually.

So it’s based on that. You can stop at various points and do a walk and pick the bus up at the end. So they do that. There’s also Camra who have the Real Ale Trail based on buses and trains, and you can stop off in various pubs.

I suppose they are all working to reduce those cars, but I suppose the cars are always going to be the problem.

It’s a big issue. It’s a huge issue. We’re working with the county council now on sustainable transport. We’ve got a traffic and transport officer here. And we are looking at ways. We know that we aren’t going to stop people driving, because obviously when you come on holiday you’ve got a lot of stuff and people aren’t going to put all that on the train. And then obviously when you get here the train stops at Windermere, so we know that aren’t going to drive at the start of the holiday. Our big push is to get people to leave their cars behind. Once they get here. So we’ll be looking at establishing transport hubs. It will be Keswick in the North and Windermere in the South. It tends to be Coniston just getting to the South West. And it will be things like trying to improve routes out of the centre. For cycling or for walking. And that’s where we would potentially way mark routes out of Ambleside
Okay. So it makes sure that it links to Ambleside. It’s like in Keswick, there’s that car park at Borrowdale at Seatoller. Everybody would drive to get there. There are lots of walks that start there.

There’s a bus. And it’s that kind of thing that we’re trying to work on. We’re trying to encourage people to leave their cars behind. The buses are so expensive here.

That’s the problem. People were saying that, people who use the bus.

It’s something that Stagecoach are aware of, but obviously they are under commercial pressure. To make money, to keep their overheads right. So it’s not going to be an easy task. But it is about trying to provide something that will enable people to leave their cars at home, and either walk from somewhere or get on a bike and cycle somewhere to then do what they want to do.

One last thing: it’s all things that you’ve said before that have come back to me. I wanted to know a little bit more about grading walks. How do you grade them? What are your criteria?

In terms of the Rights of Way Network, we don’t grade anything. So it’s either easy, moderate or hard or whatever. For the miles without stiles, they are promoted for people with limited mobility. We have rated them as routes for all, many and some. The routes for all is the highest standards – that’s wheelchair. Able to push themselves. They know that there’s going to be a reasonable surface and it’s going to be as flat as we can possibly get it. A route for many is potential someone who is accompanied in a wheelchair, or someone who is being pushed. This includes pushchairs or all terrain buggies. A route for some isn’t really a wheelchair route, because it will be a rougher surface, put it could be for people with good pushchairs, it could be for motorised scooters, basically...trampers or whatever they call it. Or for people who are just a bit infirm.

So it’s ability really?

It is really. So we do that. That’s the classification that we have. It’s very similar to Natural England’s classification of limited mobility routes as well. They are called slightly different things but they are basically the same. The only other times when we classify walks is the died water programme, that is primarily run by our volunteers and it ranges from short walks through to four day walks. I think it’s easy, moderate, difficult, strenuous.

I think that covers it. I think people will know if it’s a strenuous walk, then they’ll know what to expect.

We have an events guide, which has all guided walks in a little booklet, which displays altitude, distance, time, for example it takes six hours. People have got that basic level of information to know what they are actually doing.

It’s strange how they want to know hours. If you don’t tell them it’s 12 miles, and say it’s 6 miles they’re more likely to do it? Anything else to add?

In terms of the research that we’ve done, it has been based on open access and needs and preferences. It hasn’t really been based on psychology. We haven’t drilled down to that level of why people do certain things. It would be interesting to know that. Why we’ve decided to do a certain amount of work – why we’ve focused on certain improvement work – is kind of based on this and that. People tend to want short routes and better information, we’re trying to keep up on the ground with signposts. We probably haven’t managed that on our website. But that’s been the level – this kind of evidence base is our drive to talk about what we do. But anything else that we can pick up on might help in the future, it will be useful.
Figure B2: Coding and themes at time of analysis: Interview 11

- Casual and serious walkers
  - The holistic experience, weather and nature
    - Increasing confidence to choose more adventurous walks
      - Independence of serious walkers
        - Supply networks
          - The management of walkers / understanding needs
            - The management of environment
              - The management of environment
Sample transcript 3: Eleventh interview

Descriptive note:

This interview was conducted with a recreation area manager in the Lake District National Park. It reaffirmed much of the ongoing picture of recreational walkers by looking into the management of them within the national park context. The casual and serious walker distinctions were characterised further in terms of their management in a tourism environment, and their characteristics were explored by an experienced observer of the phenomena.

Researcher awareness note:

At this point, with ten interviews already undertaken, and a large amount of analysis, thinking and idea-forming under my belt, the interview was in danger of becoming more of an active discussion between two people who had their own ideas, and I was very careful to make sure that the thoughts of the interviewee came out, but in accordance with the grounded process, my cumulative knowledge and experience of the research situation affected the prompting.

Another trail regarded the supply perspective and the need of the researcher to divert the conversation back to the walkers themselves at times, rather than the management of them.

Inferences:

Some concrete definitions of casual and serious walkers were given which backed up the line of thinking which had been developing since the literature review:

‘And I think, and it’s my opinion, but you look at serious walkers – you think of hill walkers. It’s not something that they just do as part of a day out, or as part of a general holiday. It’s something that is their primary purpose, especially when you’re in a national park like this. The reasons that people come here are different. Slightly different from sort of general places people visit. That is their primary purpose for coming here. They’ve got the kit, they will specifically buy what they need to go and do that sort of activity. They will spend all day from 9 o clock until 5, just going out on a hill walk. They’ll go and buy the stuff – they’ll have the maps, the Wainwright books, and all that kind of stuff. I think the casual walker, are probably sort of the general holiday makers who are on a weekend visit and they will fit to their itinerary. They’re here anyway, they have a bit of time on their hands. Sightseeing is still the number one activity, in the park. Driving there basically.’

These characteristics related to walkers’ outlook on the activity, experience, and expectations and were very helpful in order to start to develop more clearly an idea of route-choice decision making.

The contextual background regarding the supply and demand perspectives coming through in the research was also building. A lot of understanding on the supply networks for walking and how it is positioned in the ‘world of walkers’ was gained from this interview, and was a theme taken forward in the forthcoming analysis.
Interview 17: Walking magazine editor

So I’m looking at the motivations to walk for recreation, and I’m also looking at why people choose certain routes. So I start every interview the same way and ask: what is your relationship with walking, personally and professionally?

Professionally, my connection is: I’m editor of Country Walking magazine. The UK’s biggest selling walking magazine. Personally, it’s my biggest pastime, so I’m lucky to combine the two.

Excellent. I’ve found that’s quite similar across the board. A lot of people who work in recreation.

It’s like the gear trade – people move into it because of their passion for the outdoors.

So your magazine is pitched towards quite a wide audience – I know there is also The Great Outdoors?

Yes – the one thing that unifies our readership is a love of every step they take from the outdoors. So they’re not on a mission to reach a summit, or bagging the Munros. (1)

So it’s not about the most serious type of walk?

Well quite frequently it is – they are visiting Everest base camp (2) they’re walking the Pennine Way (3) But they’re doing it with an idea...the magazine’s ethos is to enjoy every step of the way. So if the tops of the mountains are smothered in clouds, then they’ll stay to the valleys to enjoy a walk. They won’t go through the cloud to get to the summit for the sake of it.

Sure, so that’s quite interesting actually, because one of the things I’ve looked it is that there are characteristics inherent in certain people, but there is also situational things like weather which change the way that people walk.

The thing that’s been very helpful for us, to get away from the demographic definition of our readers, they are Mr and Mrs X that are age Y, and instead look at the spirit that unites them. Because our readership. Something like ¾ of our readers are aged between 35 and 65. So they could really be parent and child, but actually put them together and you’ll find huge amounts of common ground. In terms of the walks, why they enjoy them, what they look out for. (4)

Okay, lets just go to why they enjoy them, what are common motivations to walk?

It’s unadulterated quality time. Escaping the chores of daily life. The demands of that. It’s an absolute love of the views that they see, the connection with the countryside, that they only really get by prolonged exposure, so driving through it isn’t enough. You’ve got to be walking through it. So it’s a closeness to nature (yes, completely, and how that changes through the seasons. There are string elements about, in terms of relationships, with partners and friends and family, that’s the one time they are uninterrupted by the things that they have in normal life. So celebrating those moments is cherished time. There’s a powerful health aspect to it, but I think if walking were bad for them they’d still go and do it.

So the experience of the walk itself is the main pull

Completely

So, that’s fantastic, so in your job do you get the chance to interact with the walking market?
Readers?

*Readers, feedback, that sort of thing*

We receive 3 or 400 emails a month, in terms of photographs they have taken when they are out, letters, comments. We have a mini competition in the magazine too. We hide a dog called Millie somewhere in the pages, and we’re getting 4 or 500 entries to that. Many of them will put comments about the magazine on there.

*What about walking themselves – what do they share?*

Golden moments, I think a lot of the time, the walk is very enjoyable and they will go out almost as a routine, but the moments they want to share are they have spotted a stag.

*One memory – if they were to recount a moment of one walk if would be this moment?*

Yes, we call it the bath moment, when you’re soaking in the tub at the end of the day. What comes back to your mind – you might have walked 8 or 10 miles, but is it a rainbow, is it a cloud formation? Is it a wild flower. There’s something generally on every walk that produces that trigger.

*That’s really interesting. It’s very much a visual thing regarding people’s experiences?*

It could be. Sometimes it’s just someone falling in mud, it’s just something about that walk is unique, so if they were to do it the following day, that moment might not necessarily be there.

Okay, that’s brilliant. That’s something which I’ve not got to. Normally people talk about generic things, it’s off road, it’s away from people – that kind of thing.

There are a lot of things people struggle to articulate when they are standing on a hilltop, or they have an astonishing view they can’t say more than amazing. So it’s very important to be there with someone they know, who they know loves walking as much as they do. Because I know they’re sharing this moment. They can’t see why it’s so important. But it’s very important. And that’s why you can connect a 35 year old with a 65 year old. You’ve got both things at the top of a certain hill, and it’s summer or mid winter. You can hear them saying ‘Isn’t it magical’ without really articulating it.

That’s something that hasn’t been said in other interviews: the shared things across the board. Do you notice anything about serious or casual walkers? I’m looking at typologies so can’t get away from that. Is there anything you can think of which characterises this?

Simply a degree of commitment. If you were to draw your diagrams between somebody who nips out on a Sunday, and someone who heads off to the Lake District at a weekend, they’d all say we like the fresh air, the views, the escape, that mini sense of achievement, when you come back and you feel good about yourself. I think the measure is that trigger point where: actually I want to get out of this country park, near my house. I’ve seen this, in a magazine, in a poster, in a book, on television. I want to go and see that for myself.

So the magazine itself might push someone to say ‘that’s for me, I’m going to go and try it’?

It’s an unfortunate phrase, but it’s a bit like walking porn. They see an image and they just think – I really want to be there. I have an instance that just happened this morning. At the start of
2010, we just had a calendar, but we tied it up with ‘Welcome to Yorkshire’ so all the scenes were Yorkshire scenes, and I had an email today from someone who made it his mission with his family to visit each scene(7) and try and recreate the photos, from the calendar – every single scene from the angle that we took it, so some of them they’re shrouded in mist or they’ve got their hoods up covered in rain, it’s that kind of fun. This has shown me this could be successful. There’s a sense of fun about it.

It’s like an adventure – it’s almost like a mission isn’t it? People who want to do all the Munros

Yes

Okay, as far as the information on walks in here goes, is it step by step instructions to take people through their walks?

We do these route cards at the back of the magazine, just with a map and step by step. Such as ‘right at the stile’.

Okay, one thing I’ve found, is another way of gradating walkers, is a confidence thing. People at one end will need step by step instructions of where to go. But there will be another group of people who have a general level of confidence who won’t need to be led at all. And then at the other end, you’ve got people who have to be guided by an actual guide. Is that something that you’d agree with.

Absolutely, I think you could draw a pyramid, and at the bottom, you’ve got people who go to a National Trust property, and people who follow the Way marks round the red route for a mile and another half who are navigating largely with a map and compass.(8)

And the routes here: a lot of people rely on cars to walk and for them they can’t think of doing the walk without a car – is that the case?

Generally. It depends. There are people who go to the Lake District on holiday for a week. So they’ll drive to the Lake District and leave their car and do their walking on foot. So is that a car driven walk or a walking walk. And a walk comes first for our readers. You’re not going to sacrifice a walk for an easy walk which you can get to by public transport.

In terms of the walk itself some people have said they like walking for other reasons – such as an interest in wildlife or photography. I don’t mean to put percentages onto it, but how many people are doing the walk just for the sake of the walk?

Of our readers? Probably 90+ per cent. They’ll take a camera, they’ll take binoculars...

But the main thing is the walk?

Yes. I think the key thing is – we don’t have a very high readership among walking groups, and I think the walking groups. You have one or two activists in each group. On walks in England, because it’s a very social experience. So they are chatting about daily life.(9)

Solo walking and group walking are a very different experience.

The person at the front of the group will say: ‘Oh look there’s a badger’, and then pass it on 20 people back, and it’s gone by the time they get over there. And then you’ll get to a stile and... You don’t see many mammals when there’s that many people. (10)
As far as the routes themselves are concerned is there anything that stands out? To do with landscape or proximity to places? Wilderness vs near towns?

I think you need to divide your walks between a single day at the weekend, where our readers – we’ve had some research done. Quite a while ago, that they travel up to 50 miles to go for a walk and going away for a walking break, in which case distance is not as important. (11)

So it will be some of the practical elements of it that will be part of why they have chosen to do it. Okay, I’m looking particularly at the Lake District, because in my mind you’ll get the most diverse range of people. Is there anything about the Lake District which you personally feel is relevant in terms of walking, people’s choices, locations, or as in the people that go there.

Well it depends how you categorise, because the Lake District National Park had some figures that the average person walked no more than 200 yards from the car park. (12) Which is allot of readership. So you’ve got plenty of coach tours, Wordsworth tours that are of note. Very casual walkers.

They’re pottering. But are they walking? (12) In terms of the walks that people do. It is one knockout landscape. The feedback we get from our readers. Whatever peoples favourite landscape. There are plenty that don’t put it top, but you won’t have anyone dismiss the Lake District as anything which isn’t utterly amazing. Personally I adore coastal walking. The Lake District still, I have to say, a good day there is difficult to rival anything anywhere

How about the sheer numbers of people on walks?

20 yards from the car park, it thins out. I think you have to separate it. If you go up Snowdon, on a bright Saturday, and there were about 1500 people on the side. But that’s a particular mountain, and there’s a train service up. There’s about six routes up. But I’ve walked in the Lake District and had holidays there...and the Peak District. Even somewhere like Dovedale in the Peak District, which is beautiful. And the stepping stones. And there’s a colossal car park. But you can get down to the stepping stones where it is scenic. You’re sharing it with 30-40 people. It doesn’t trouble me. I don’t feel as though I need it exclusively to myself.

Would that be something that’s reflected in general with walking? Do you think that a lot of people would share that as well?

I think it’s a bit like traffic. Everyone will say that it’s not the people on the paths that are the problem. They’d love it all to themselves. But actually I don’t think that... You know. Places are congested. I think it’s certain routes get seriously eroded, and I think that’s more of an issue.

Catbells.

Yes Catbells, but also the challenge walks, to do Scafell, Scafell Pike, Ben Nevis. Ben Nevis is different because it’s got the path up. But then there’s Snowdon, and the Yorkshire Three Peaks. You’ve got lots of people in a single day doing it for charity. And that can be an issue. If you turn up on your own, and you find yourself amidst a thousand people, the paths get churned up, the toilets are full, there’s nowhere to park, then it becomes an issue.

OK, any other factors which determine walks. If person a decides ‘I’m going to have a walk today’ what things do you think they would think about?
I think it depends who they are going with. So the walk has to be appropriate for your partner or your kids or whoever you are walking with. How far it is to get to. The bolt-on which makes it a special day is a nip out now...a spontaneous thought: ‘it’s looking like a good day, let’s go’ and there’s the other type: ‘It’s Friday evening, Sunday’s all clear, let’s plan.’ I think if it’s ‘Sunday evening, let’s plan’, you get your maps out, you plan your walk. You get your route book, or one of the routes that we produce, in our magazine. You might select a pub, that’s been recommended, to build in at the end of the day, or lunch.

So there might be a certain objective in the walk?

Yeah, but if there isn’t a pub there, it’s not going to stop you from going. Somewhere like High Kup Nick, people will make a conscious decision to go there and there’s nothing for 4-5 miles, it’s pretty barren.

But the walk itself is part of the experience. Okay, I’ve got Rights of Way and Access on the list. Do you think people like to know where they can go?

I think there’s a slight fear of having to get off people’s land. And I think there’s a real perceived fear about cattle in fields. I think people think it’s a real danger.

Is it something to do with dog owners? Fearing problems from the land owners?

No I think dog walkers tend to be more confident. In my experience. Because they walk daily with their dog. Whether it is at home or what have you. But I think there is a fear of trespass and aggressive farmers. The rights of way at present are well way marked. Access land is completely different.

I see. You said something before about people doing a route regularly. Do you think that gives people more confidence?

I think people have favourite walks. So you go and revisit one where you had a lovely time before. If you’re walking with a different person you might want to show them your favourite walk, or for social reasons, for repeating. I think we’re also creatures of habit so if you go to the Peak District or the Yorkshire Dales or the Lakes every year on holiday, you know which part you like, there’s always a walk there. However you may want to broaden your horizons.

So there’s also a motivation of adventure if it’s not a familiar place?

I think. A lot of the fun of walking for the more committed is that planning process, mug of coffee, maps out. Where are we going to go. How are we going to plan this? Our next issue is going to be called ‘Planning your adventure’. It’s just about turning it up a notch in terms of enhancing or intensifying the experience. Like doing something that’s slightly beyond. ...not going out of your comfort zone in terms of peril and risk, but going outside of where you would normally go and how you would approach it.

So I guess you do quite a lot of stuff in your magazine about walking gear. Do you think there is a market for certain types of gear? I did speak to one guy. From Brasher, and he said that sometimes people would go and buy the gear but won’t actually need it. Because it’s pitched at that market. Is that right?
I think there are lots of people out there who are over specified when they go out. You walk down a high street...at the moment walking kit is quite cool. Brands like the North Face, Haglofs have got a cool image. I think that wearing walking kit gives you a sense that you are vital, that you’re an outdoorsy person. (18)

But then perhaps does this mean that people do start to walk? Acquire the kit then start to walk?

No.

Acquire it then not use it?

Well there’s 1001 reasons. You’re watching your kids or going to a bonfire night – you’re outdoors. if you want to be warm and dry, you can be warm and dry. Good on you. I think walking kit, for the performance it gives, offers a lot of very good value. Yes. It depends on the performance you’re after.

Do you think that the more committed you are, the more of a relationship you have with that kind of thing?

Again it’s a fallacy to think that someone who is a ‘walker’ goes into an outdoor shop and goes: ‘Here’s £800, I want a rucksack, boots, trousers, baselayer, and so on.’ I think you start off with your jacket and footwear. Then you upgrade perhaps to a back pack. You buy some specialist trousers, the baselayer. And it’s a long process of accumulation. And you don’t necessarily reject it until it’s worn out. (19)

It’s maybe to do with the frequency people can get out to walk as well?

Sometimes. I think it can be a substitute. Say on particularly wet days in the Lake District, the gear shops are full. It’s something to do. You’ll potter and then you’ve got purchases.

Do you think that programmes on the Lake District, walking programmes that have been around for a while....magazines and books....do you think they have a big effect on people.

Yeah, I do. The Wainwright Walks (Julia Bradbury) and the Coast series, have done a phenomenal amount to showcase what we’ve got in Britain. As you mentioned earlier, these are World Class landscapes. 80 miles from Manchester or Liverpool. You know. You’ve got the Peak District. You look at the cities around there. This is on the doorstep. I think they’ve done a wonderful job.

Do you think there’s any changes? Gradual changes in the way people do their walks?

I think the challenge is the pressure the school teachers are on because of the duty of care and insurance issues. Previously where you might have anticipated – you’d be taken on a geography field trip or whatever, and if your parents did walk, you’d have some exposure. I don’t think people have that. I think there are opportunities declining therefore, students, children they have family walks. (20)

It seems that my kids don’t seem to go on the outdoor pursuits things that I used to go on. Anything else about walkers, types of walkers or the choices they make? Anything in general you could say? I could show you the aims of my PhD, does this make sense?
Well I think you’ve just got different categories in the Lake District. You’ve got some of the historical or ecological walks. You’ve got low level lakeside walks, which are fabulously beautiful. You’ve got the Wainwright walks which was in danger of declining. But I think 19...2000....2001? The publishers said: ‘We’re not going to publish the Wainwright guides any more.’ And suddenly it got such a second wind in the press that it took off. The TV series went on from there.

Didn’t he leave them not being published?

Potentially that reanimated the public interest about the guides. The TV series confirmed it. And so more people are ticking off Wainwrights and so on and having an idea of it.

Do you think it’s opened up walking in areas other than the Lakes as well? The Lake District gem is the place rather than the act of walking?

Yes, I think once someone has been to the Lake District, they will enjoy walking, and perhaps look more locally. The curiosity...it’s about breaking down the percentages. For every hundred people that go there maybe 10 become absolutely smitten with walking, and say: ‘well I like this high level walking. I’m going to do some Munros.’ Others: ‘Well I really like waterside walks, I’m going to take this further.’

So you could progress from a non walker to being a casual walker to being a more serious walker in some respects?

There’s definitely a spectrum that you can move along.

But some people might not I guess. I was talking to someone today about health walking. And they said that people come along and do short walks for health. And that’s enough for them. But if you’re committed towards walking you might get into it earlier in life? Look for more challenges?

Perhaps. It’s growing as an activity. The modern family. Friends going away for a weekend. Rather than going to Meadowhall or Bluewater. They go for three days to a national park. A nice break because the whole experience is very rewarding. I wouldn’t get hung up on this idea of a spectrum of walkers though. There are people whose first walk is Snowdon. Their just: ‘Let’s go and do it.’ If you go to Snowdon on any given Saturday, there’s people in wellies and trainers and flip flops. There’s stag parties and hen parties and all sorts. So I think the barriers to entry aren’t formal in any way. So I wouldn’t consider it’s a natural progression along.

I think individuals all have...my idea of it is that individuals all have a range of motives. So there’s your family, your upbringing, where you live, your free time, geographical things. There’s certain natural barriers to walk. Where you live. Do you live in a particular walking area? There might be more walk-specific things as well. Why did you choose that walk? Is there value of being near to a place?

There are people who particularly have an interest in history or geology, or geocaching is a growing activity.

OK. Nobodies mentioned this, but it’s almost like a treasure hunt isn’t it. With different geographical places and you use technology.

GIS yes.
Technology, is it on the rise?

I think it’s on the rise in terms of people that have it. I don’t think many people use it.

*Not as a substitute for a map and compass*

Completely. I think it gives confidence, but ultimately lots of people buy it. The number of times I see people out walking. They have a GPS attached to their rucksacks. They’re not very into it.

*It’s there. It’s like a gadget.*

It’s a back up. If you get lost it will tell you where you are.

*You can’t rely on it.*

No I don’t think anyone would rely on it if you got into hazard, but 99% of walkers don’t need to do that.
Sample transcript 4: Seventeenth Interview:

Descriptive note:
This interview was conducted with the editor of Country Walking Magazine, and gave a reflection of the people who buy magazines on walking. It concentrated on the ideas of the editor on peoples’ preferences, from the letters, stories and photographs they contribute to the magazine, and the research the magazine does on its readership. The interviewee was also a keen walker himself and was able to give reflection on a life of walking and his own experiences with people. He was able to provide a detailed picture of the experiences of a dedicated walker and reflect it back on his audience.

Researcher awareness note:
The approach at this point was to fill in the remaining gaps on what was already a diverse array of data, with a considerable depth of understanding on the phenomena. Although some questions were targeted, the interviewee was providing a lot of context from a personal point of view. This was needed at the time, because many of the main themes had already been established, and it was useful to reflect back both of our ideas on his readership – a national magazine for walkers.
Inferences:

In between interview 11 and this one a few niches of walkers had been explored including the Long Distance Walkers’ Association and the Ramblers’. The depth of the activity and the subtle nuances in different motivations of different niches was emerging, suggesting that ‘seriousness’ might not a catch-all term and that the characteristics pertaining to ‘seriousness’ are perhaps a more useful research focus. The holistic nature of the experience for people who look on walking as a hobby or a way of life was characterised in-depth. This was related back to the idea of confidence which had been a feature in many of the interviews at this point.

‘I think. A lot of the fun of walking for the more committed is that planning process, mug of coffee, maps out. Where are we going to go. How are we going to plan this?’

The ideas of the casual / serious continuum were being developed and the role of confidence in challenging comfort zones to try more adventurous walks.

It’s just about turning it up a notch in terms of enhancing or intensifying the experience. Like doing something that’s slightly beyond. ...not going out of your comfort zone in terms of peril and risk, but going outside of where you would normally go and how you would approach it.’
Interview 23: Researcher of walking

So I sent an email after the first email, just explaining a little bit about the study. Did you read that one?

Yes, I’ve had a look through.

That’s good, because it explains a little bit about what I’m doing. Generally every interview is different. I’ve not got a set way of asking the questions, because I’m trying to build up a picture really. So, to begin with, I’ll ask a general question which I ask to everyone. What’s your relationship with walking? Can you explain it a bit?

Yes, we’ve been doing some ethnographic research on different kinds of recreational users. And particularly walkers and mountain bikers in fact. Very much looking at...well there was two strands. One’s looking at people’s experience of walking or cycling. And one is looking at the actual practice. So looking at what people are doing, as opposed to what they say they are doing, which I can expand upon in a moment. And the other is looking at access rights in particular. And the context of that is the access rights achieved in Scotland, with the Land Reform act. So what we were doing is looking at how the law is being put into practice. So you’ve got the actual law, the formal law at the top of the pile, and then right down to the informal laws and values that is, what people consider to be appropriate behaviour. So I guess in a nutshell there’s an experiential side that follows on from it. And a legal right to the public stateside as well?

Okay, so is it more targeted towards access than general patterns in walking? General motivations?

Yes, I would say so, the motivations come into it, because as soon as you get walking or any kinds of tension of users. It’s quite hard to understand that without looking at what’s leading people to look into that situation in the first place. But we haven’t set out to look at motivations per se.

Okay, so just to go to that work a little bit, what did you find then? In terms of why people wanted to walk and the places they wanted to go?

Well, there’s a huge range of variables at work, and quite a few of them are appearing in your notes already. (1) But I guess to add to that, the things that we found. It’s actually very very fluid – what motivates people. And what motivates someone one day, doesn’t necessarily motivate them the next day. (2) So I think sometimes past studies have acted as if people were quite fixed in their characteristics. Whereas things like people’s health, people’s mood, energy, (3) who they’re with, (4) what events they’ve got coming up in their life, that can affect their motivations, (5) and...which makes it an extreme research challenge, trying to build up a profile, and understanding people’s motivations, because, you can’t just say this person is a woman of this socio economic group, therefore they will do this activity. It seems to be very very complex. And as soon as you’re getting into habitual behaviours and maybe even subconscious...what would you say? (6) Dimensions, it becomes very very difficult to actually...understand it ion a way where you could predict what’s happening. Some people go out for a walk and it actually just unfolds. As they are doing it. You don’t actually have a plan. And then you get in contrast, other types of walkers who have a very very strict plan, and will
almost follow it to a fault. Which can actually get people into trouble because part of good mountain craft means you have to be flexible in your plans and adapt it to certain conditions and so on. So I guess there’s some kind of contention there of how much people envisage and advance what kind of experiences that they have.

So it seems that there are some things that are character specific to the individual, but there might be some things on the day which are actually... it just depends. Is that what you are saying?

Yes. I think one of the interesting things that we found was you refer to casual versus serious... walkers, and one thing that we were finding was that it’s actually quite hard to stay with that category too far into the analysis. And it actually made more sense to look at it as casual versus serious walks. One particular person might do a very casual walk one day, dog walking or just walking to the shops. And then, at the weekend they’re doing a round of five Munros or something. Very much at the serious end. And they’re the same person. So analytically that’s quite a challenge.

Yes. I don’t disagree with that at all, because someone gave another analogy about the parent who takes a child out for a walk, so it has to be a casual walk, and then, when they get a bit of time away, they might go off and do a bit of mountaineering or doing something a lot more challenging, because they can.

Definitely

So a lot of it depends on what is constraining them, what’s available and what they feel like on the day as you’ve just said before.

Yes, I think the other aspect which I don’t think is being tackled enough in the literature is how much this expresses peoples cultural and sub cultural contexts. As in, within their peer group, what’s the acceptable way to do things? What’s cool, and if you’re going to get the acceptance of your peers to do something, obviously that’s kind of motivating. And that may or may not be aligned with the experiences you want to have... in terms of your actual bodily experience of it. You can consider so-called adrenaline sports as an example. Some people might actually genuinely seek out feeling those kind of experiences, whereas other people might find themselves doing those types of activities because they’re expected to. They maybe doing care that much about experiencing that adrenaline. So that’s a very interesting one to explore further as well.

Upbringing as well has come into a few interviews, people have said that if you walked with your parents, it’s maybe more likely that you will walk as well.

Yes, definitely, in some of the work, we actually go more into the area of looking at participation and social inclusion. And what we’re finding there is that to be motivated to do something, it has to be on their radar in the first place. And a lot of people’s background... it’s just not on the radar. And it’s not to say that they wouldn’t be interested to do it... maybe they already are a walker but it’s not to say they wouldn’t be interested in walking in another style, but it’s not on their radar to do it, or they don’t know anyone that walks that way. Then they don’t necessarily think they can achieve it.

Yes. So they’re not exposed to it so it doesn’t happen. Is there anything... have you noticed anything in the way of the media playing a part, because another thing that has come up is...
magazines...walking magazines and things like programmes on walking. Certain areas, that kind of thing. Is that another influence as well?

Yes, that’s an interesting one actually, because I think there’s two schools of thought on that one. Some people would read a magazine and be fairly motivated to do something straight off the back of it, and perhaps even use some of the route cards or perhaps some of the suggestions there, whereas some people might almost have vicarious enjoyment of reading the magazines and that might actually scratch an itch, so they might not be likely to get off the sofa, but in terms of...well the evidence that we have might point to the former actually, that being exposed actually leads you...it’s why you picked up that magazine in the first place. That kind of reinforces that this is an enjoyable or pleasurable thing to do.

One of the central themes out of the first few interviews was confidence. It’s almost like you can link confidence to quite a few other things. So if you’ve got low confidence in what you want to do when you go out walking, then you’re less likely to be able to read a map, you’re less likely to navigate, you’re more likely to be led, you’re less likely to try the most serious routes, that kind of thing. Is there anything that you could expand on on that theme?

Yes, well I absolutely agree. We’ve definitely found confidence to be a major factor and sometimes it needs to be more acknowledged I think. And there are different aspects to that, because some of it is about tangible skills: map reading, basic techniques or knowing about equipment and so on. And other aspects of confidence are quite intangible and almost about cultural expectations. And particularly on the gender side of things, there are studies...not on walking as far as I’m aware, but other types of activity such as climbing and so on...that show that people’s expectations of themselves...or for example women’s expectation of themselves, or other people’s expectations of them, can really be affected by gender. And sometimes for example, people will have lower confidence if they are not with their partner. For example. Because they know it’s up to them to take the lead or to get themselves out of trouble or so on. And if there’s someone else more experience, sometimes don’t develop the confidence because it’s always left to the same person to read the maps, read the routes, whatever. So I think beyond that, there’s quite a lot of complex dynamics going on there...that can make people more or less confident. And I guess there’s the whole cultural capital issue as well. Where...so far, outdoor participation was skewed towards higher socio-economic groups, and aligned with that, there’s the cultural capital that is about how to read a map...having a good pair of boots...having the right kit, knowing how to use it. So I think what I’m trying to say is how confidence is actually then further differentiated is quite pressing.

That is very interesting actually, because that links to something else. When I talked to someone who is part of...he markets Brasher boots. Because he looks at it a lot. He thinks that a lot of the kit is pitched at people who aren’t even doing the walks, they don’t need that kit. It’s almost a kind of – ‘Yeah, if I use those boots then I’m a serious mountain walker, or that kind of thing. Would you say that what linked to it?

I think that’s an interesting because kit can also...it’s not just about its function, it’s also about part of belonging to this tribe...this subculture. So I think anyone who says that equipment is just about function, is probably missing part of it. Especially the way it is marketed now. So it’s in the companies interest to try and get people to change their kit more often...than they really need to. You get some people who are often than they really need to. You get some
people who are perhaps overkitted, but then on the other hand you get people...you find in extreme situations...and they’re making do with little kits, or quite old kits.

So just to go back to the work you’ve done, what kind of techniques have you used. I’ve noticed it’s things like phenomenology. Is it stories and people’s accounts of walking? Or interviews?

Yeah, we’ve done a combination of mobile rtd methods, ethnographic methods, partly talking whilst walking, so just, linking people up to a recorder that’s joined onto their lapel, then talking to them about the activity, whilst in the context and situation of that activity. And that can be really really rich, because there’s things that urge them...while they are out doing it. Not what they would think of telling you back at an office or interview. And actually the in situ approach, you can get very very rich data. A bit more resource intensive but very fruitful.

It does sound like an interesting way of capturing an experience.

The other thing we have is something similar but using headcam, and sometimes that’s also goes on a scenario, like what I was was describing a moment ago but with visual as well as audio, in terms of materials, and sometimes it would be part of wearing the headcam, and the researcher not being there. But in both cases we tend to do a sitting down interview afterwards, where we work through the footage, and talk through the footage – use it as a prompt, to ask them things about how they were actually experiencing that...why were they making the decisions that they were making? Lot’s of questions of we had actually tried to explore all those issues while we were doing that activity. We would have actually prevented the activity from happening in the first place. It would have been a very different activity. Just a case of trying to get at those spaces and times that can be quite fleeting, or...lot’s of movement involved. It doesn’t really lend itself to being able to talk about it at the time very well. It’s really just a way of recording it so that you can then go back and understand it a bit more.

Just to go back to that a bit more, how long after the walk were you doing that?

That’s a very good question actually, because it tended to vary, because logistically, it’s very very hard to interview people at the same time afterwards. You know across the board. And in terms of research budget, you know money’s actually running out. You have to start interviewing people very soon afterwards. Sometimes even on the same day. But our findings are showing that it does change...the information that comes out of all of it, that if the person has only just had the experience, they actually view the video information in front of them less as a prompt , because they’ve just done it. I’m not necessarily saying it’s better or worse. It’s just different. And if we take into account that we’re actually just interpreting what they tell you.

Right...that’s interesting. So if you say they were going to do a travel diary, it would be better to do it just after. But with the videos, would that...I’m just trying to think of different mediums – how it works. With videos, you’d be able to get visual images, which you wouldn’t have thought about as well. Is that right?

Can you explain that again?

I’m just thinking about the method of showing them different pictures if there had been a bit of time after the event. Did that prompt things that they wouldn’t have thought of other wise?
Yeah, definitely. It definitely prompted things they would forget, but it also allowed the researcher to ask things that are so commonplace to the participant themselves but always taken for granted, that we never would have thought of mentioning to them, which actually would have been very important. Especially because of...you were talking about skills and confidence and so on. Lots of that happens at quite a...taken for granted level, and you need to a way to try to...have a way in to talk about it because by its very definition, people find it difficult to talk about the blatantly obvious. Its so...they almost don’t know where to start telling you about it because...its so automatic for them. They don’t go their whole life thinking about it.

So one thing I’ve discussed with people is that...some people have a golden moment from each walk, so if you can remember a walk from a year ago, it would be because of one thing that happened. Is that something you’ve noticed?

I wouldn’t definitely say there was a singular moment. Sometimes it would be particular moments that did punctuate it then would have been memories that will have come back, but there wasn’t actually one. It wasn’t necessarily positive either. Sometimes what people seem to remember sometime after the event, was maybe something a little negative that had happened. Like, for example if they’d had an encounter with a landowner that had been a bit fraught, or if they’d fallen, or if they’d got blisters or something like that....that would come up as much as the happy things would.

Yes. Particularly access, is that one thing that people worry about with landowners? Being able to know where you’ve got to go and that kind of thing?

I think so. Something that seems to have been changing after the access laws in Scotland, is people have more confidence in terms of their access rights. Because there’s a lot more clarity about what the rights actually are...and that is effecting people’s quality of experience, because they don’t have to worry so much about these kind of encounters. They can be more certain about where they go. And if they meet somebody they can actually say ‘no I know that I am within my rights’, they actually have a starting position in the conversation about it. Whereas before, it was a very clouded issue and it could be quite an ugly exchange really...so that’s another thread to the confidence part that we were talking about before.

Yes, it does seem to have lots of different threads. I think we’ve mentioned it a little bit, but experience...do you think confidence and experience are two things that go hand in hand?

Yeah, I would say so, and when people don’t have much experience themselves, the people that they are with or the social context becomes even more important...because they will be learning. They’ll be going on quite a steep learning curve, learning from people they’re with, and rolemodels and so on.

Okay, so people who have never walked at all, what do you think are the things that you think make them think: ‘I’ll start walking then’.

That’s a hard one, because then you get into the whole territory about when does a walk first start and stop. When is a walk just a walk to the bus stop and when is it a pleasure walk. Because there are studies which have shown similarities between utilitarian journeys and pleasure journeys, it’s quite a false dichotomy. And usually there is a bit of a mixture and usually people’s
Routine journeys are actually a source of pleasure. (11) And they’ll create features to make it more pleasurable. So I guess that’s a hard one, because most people do walk somewhere...at some point. I guess if you were asking, what makes them take it a bit more seriously...

Yeah, maybe if you say, if you’ve already walked once or twice, why do people then continue to walk?

Well one thing I have heard of...we’ve done a lot of field work in the Cairngorms National Park. There is some talk about, if people have had some positive experience on holidays, for example if they come to the Cairngorms and there has been quality walks, good signposting and they’ve had a really good experience, they’re actually then motivated to do something similar when they get home. But that enthusiasm can very quickly dwindle if they don’t...if they’re not...if they don’t very easily find the hook to hang that on. If they don’t see where they can walk back home. Or if it’s not well signposted, or if for two weeks after their holiday it rains every day...that can be enough to dissipate that momentum that they might have had.

Yeah.... so what kind of things would make people not want to walk again? If they’ve had a bad experience...what sort of things?

Well weather has to be a big one...because almost again by definition if you don’t walk regularly, you’re probably not likely to have the kit that would make weather less of an issue for you. I think there’s some Scandinavian phrase like: ‘there’s no such thing as bad weather, there’s only bad equipment’, and I think for the novice walker, that’s a really big hurdle actually. They might have a bad experience in rain that really might not be that bad if you have a good jacket you probably wouldn’t notice. But if you don’t have those things, it’s quite a different experience. But yet, if you’ve not committed to doing that as an activity, why would you buy a jacket and boots. It’s slightly chicken and egg there.

You’ve got the other side as well where some people may actually like that side of it. Some people who are really into their walking see the weather as part of the holistic experience of being out

Yeah definitely

So if it does rain a bit it’s no bad thing

No, that’s very very true and I think part of that comes from, having that experience and knowing how to handle the certain conditions. So it’s not actually something to worry about.

Okay, so I’m also looking at the design of walks and what people plan on a walk. Is there anything you’ve found in your studies from that side of things? Why people choose routes...what would be the ingredients of a good walk?

Well I think one point to note is that any particular person may not be the chief planner in their outing and some people are never ever in charge of the route. At all. Some people love to do it. Some people almost assume that they are going to be the leader(4)...and if you get two such people in the same group, you can actually have some difficulties if there’s any differences of opinion. But I don’t know. There’s just so many variables at work there. I know that’s not a very helpful answer.
No, it’s fine. There is a lot of variables. People answer that question differently in terms of what they do…in terms of walking. Some people just say things like logistics…so, ‘Is there a car park?’…‘Is there refreshments…that kind of thing…’…and again something I’ve found…and I don’t want to say it’s set in stone, but coming back to the casual /serious thing again. Car parks, refreshments, nice manicured paths are on the more casual end of the scale, and then if you go onto wilderness experience it’s over the other end of the scale.

Yeah, the other thing that’s come up…it sort of relates to weather, but the actual conditions anticipated on the ground…for example, if it’s been raining a lot, in the last two weeks…particularly more experienced walkers, or people who walk a lot in their local area and do the same walks regularly, they get to know areas, that might be particularly boggy for example. And so that would affect their route choice until the ground dries up again. Or other people might not necessarily care, they might just wear the right equipment. But for some people they might definitely change their route. Depending on hat the conditions had been. The other thing that’s come up, that affects people’s route choice is how busy they anticipate it to be. With some people purposely going to choose at certain times, either because they want to bump into people, because they want to be sociable, or welcome the interaction. And the complete opposite where been will purposely choose a time when they know a particular area will be less busy, so they can have it to themselves. Or they’ll choose…if they only have a certain time for an outing they’ll choose to go somewhere else if they know…that their first choice will actually be too busy.

Definitely. I’ve heard people will go for honeypot sites deliberately because it’s easy, or they’ll avoid them because it’s not what they want at all. Or they might get up at the crack of dawn to do a certain mountain if they knew it was going to be busy later on in the day.

I think there’s also a bit of a safety element there as well. Where if one person is there on their own, one day they might choose somewhere a bit busy because…from a safety point of view. But if they’ve got their own companion with them they might choose somewhere a bit more isolated.

Absolutely. So there’s the safety element as well. So I think that also comes back to confidence again. It’s safety and risk and other parts of that. And another thing in terms of…maybe not route itself, but the location…is sort of an attraction to the place. Maybe a sense of the place itself. Is that something that you’ve seen?

Yes, undoubtedly location plays a part, and I think one of the interesting things here is actually just to look at how walking actually fits into the rhythm of people’s days. And the rhythm of people’s weeks. And what they are actually able to access…and what they’ve got…the time and the inclination to travel to. Some people will drive quite far of an evening…to go somewhere in particular, depending on the light….other people will just go with whatever they can do from the door. So you definitely can’t get away from the geography…I don’t think.

Yes…at the very start I had a few variables that I was trying to put together and…there were situational variables which were things on the day such as: ‘Do I have time to get out now to do this walk?’…‘Is it raining?’…‘Is the path blocked?’…and then there were things like: ‘Where do I want to go?’…push and pull factors. I’m still trying to draw it out in a way that makes sense.
Yes. I think also what can be different is people’s priorities. Some people might think: ‘If I’ve got any time left over today, I might like to go for a walk’. Whereas other people might actually make sure they will get their walk in. And make other things fit around it. An obvious category will be dog-walkers. But not just them. And I think that can be a quite different approach and mindset almost. How much this is a part of their life. And how much it is a part of who they are. That they want to do this walk, at this time, because it’s a daily walk or a weekly thing. (5)

So it’s sort of leisure time, ‘What do I do with my leisure time.’ But some people say if they do have a dog, then they have to…it’s not quite leisure because they have to take the dog out, so it’s built into their life.

Yes. It’s absolutely true. And you get people. Well actually, especially with dogs, but also with other utilitarian trips, where once people actually get out doing it that they actually find that they do have an interest in things, and it’s mainly not raining as heavily as when they went out, and sometimes the thought of doing it can be worse than the actual doing it. And they’ve actually reported that if they haven’t had a dog or whatever, they wouldn’t have gone out, and then they would have been really sorry to miss the experience that they had.

So it’s played a big part in the development of their walking life in a way?

Yes

But some people could take the dog wherever they go I suppose, so they could be quite avid walkers and ‘We’re going to go up this peak’ and the dog’s coming. So, is there anything else you can think about, having looked at the study…is there anything else on recreational walking you’d like to add.

Probably just to make sure that we’ve covered the point about how much of the actual access rights do people’s choice of route…and that’s from a point of view of their confidence with interaction with other people…for example, landowners and so on. Because their unsure if there’s a known-to-be-unfriendly landowner, they might choose to not do that particular route or not do it without a friend for example. Because they’re a bit intimidated or it also might change their behaviour because…in Scotland the rights…it’s not spatially delineated to any great degree. It’s primarily delineated by behaviour. So it’s not like footpaths or bridal ways, it’s actually that you have to be responsible, and as long as you’re acting responsibly you have the right to be there. So that becomes part of people’s route choice. ‘Where can I go today and how can I go there, that can actually enable me to be responsible? Are there going to be livestock in the field? Can I take my dog through there? Is this area going to be really muddy? Will I chew up the ground?’ Lots of these things are going on in people’s heads, sometimes at a very conscious level of planning, but also for a local person, I think a lot of these things go on in their head. They’re processing these decisions almost without thinking about it. If it’s a daily route or a regular route. You can link that to so many things that we’ve talked about. How familiar you are with the area, your level of experience, your confidence, so it is obviously the access, knowing whether you can be responsible there. People who’ve done it more often might be more educated in that?

Okay, thanks for the interview, it’s helped my knowledge of it.

No problem
I’ll share findings, when I get the results together and hopefully a paper at some point.

I’d be really interested to see what you come up with, so keep me posted.

Figure B5: Coding and themes at time of analysis: Interview 23

Nuanced decisions on route choice: subject to mood / weather etc

1) Large range of variables
2) Fluid interaction of variables
3) Phenomenon too complex to predict
4) Classify walks or walkers as casual or serious
5) Walking confidence intangible and complex
6) Utility / pleasure spectrum

Problem of generalisation

Sample transcript 5: Twenty-Third Interview.

Descriptive note:

The interviewee was an experienced outdoor recreation researcher and participant and gave reflections on the research of this study in the context of their own findings from previous studies. As such no new categories were added, but the complexity of understanding walkers, their differences, creating a typology and predicting route-choice were discussed in depth.

Researcher awareness note:

The categories had become saturated at this point and no new information was being developed in this sense. The interview helped to demonstrate the complexity of the research process, but as the saturation point had been reached, it was at this point decided that this should be the final interview. The key questions to take forward in the survey were largely established by the time of this interview. A concern was the chance of being influenced too much by the findings of another reviewer and therefore there was a concerted effort on my part to guard against this and concentrate on my own findings. Additionally, by referencing my own findings, it was important not to affect the responses of the interviewee too much.

Inferences:

The complexity of the walking experience and the choices made by walkers was illustrated by the discourse in this interview, which was important to take on board as a researcher performing the analysis of the interviews. As such, this helped the process because on making assumptions on the interview data and also the forthcoming survey analysis, I was aware of the need to explain outcomes on the basis that individuals have individual reasons and thought processes and therefore generalisation of results is just that – the individual context must always be considered.
Appendix C: Linkages of main themes from interviews to survey design

Table C1: Schematic flowchart of interview themes and survey design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 1 (1st sample)</th>
<th>Interview 2-4 (2nd sample)</th>
<th>Interview 5-11 (3rd sample)</th>
<th>Interview 12-17 (4th sample)</th>
<th>Survey design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Walking choices and behaviour</td>
<td>Characteristics of walkers</td>
<td>Research perspectives</td>
<td>Supply side perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the walking experience</td>
<td>Preferences for landscapes</td>
<td>Differences of opinion on landscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td>The research in context of supply / demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual experiences</td>
<td>Preferences for management level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or country</td>
<td>Using maps, compasses, guide books, GIS</td>
<td>Being an experienced walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>‘Day tripping’ or a ‘way of life’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The holistic experience, weather and nature</td>
<td>Confidence in decision making</td>
<td>Casual and serious walkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of serious walkers</td>
<td>Increasing confidence to choose more adventurous walks</td>
<td>Seeking quieter places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of maps part of the experience</td>
<td>Group context of making a decision</td>
<td>Other niches of walkers, LDWA, Ramblers’ etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of decision making process</td>
<td></td>
<td>A continuum of casualness / seriousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of research process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem of generalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert questions on attitudes, preferences, past experiences</td>
<td>Question on decision making</td>
<td>Questions on group composition</td>
<td>Questions on walking attributes: experience, casualness and seriousness</td>
<td>Questions on situational variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions on walk type: hill walk, length, time etc</td>
<td>Questions on past and current walking activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions on navigation preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Field notes from survey days

Table D1: Field notes taken on the day
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Notes on people</th>
<th>Notes on place</th>
<th>Notes on conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/01/2012</td>
<td>Walna Scar Car Park, Coniston</td>
<td>Some people just parking up to be at spot / exercise dogs but most walking, some quite serious. Some people walking through</td>
<td>Car park leading to walks on Coniston fells.</td>
<td>Relatively quiet day but car park filled up. Ended up standing at gate to let pedestrians through. Most people friendly and interested in the survey. Only a couple of refusals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/02/2012</td>
<td>Thirlmere Reservoir</td>
<td>A few people, some working on site</td>
<td>A series of car parks around Thirlmere managed by UU</td>
<td>Terrible weather - nobody out walking. UU worker told me it had been busier earlier. A few 'die hards' who I surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/2012</td>
<td>Brockhole Visitor Centre</td>
<td>Many families or visitors to the centre doing short walks. Some people passing through from ferry</td>
<td>A quiet day apparently - still saw a fairly constant stream of people</td>
<td>Chose one place to stand near an intersection of gates. Walked around at times. Quite a few refusals, and missed quite a few as there wasn’t one place to intercept people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/04/2012</td>
<td>Aira Force</td>
<td>Lots of short walks, tourists, families on holiday. Gave advice on which bits to look at</td>
<td>Mostly contained although longer fell walks continue past the top of the waterfall. There is a tea shop and access to Lake</td>
<td>Relatively busy (although probably a quiet day for AF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/03/2012</td>
<td>Haweswater</td>
<td>Mostly friendly, walking some distance. Some people unlikely to return survey, but quite a few should. A couple of people camping, some just parking up</td>
<td>End of long road round the Lake, walks around the Lake and to High Street and other nearby hills.</td>
<td>There was a road block at the start of the Lake road, but people were driving through (maybe not all). I surveyed a few people who had parked up the top end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>People Description</td>
<td>Walks Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2012</td>
<td>Dungeon Ghyll Car park</td>
<td>Mostly short distance walkers or Langdale Pikes. Hardly any refusals - around 10 people who were in groups (ie 1 person taking the survey for 2 of them). A group of volunteers.</td>
<td>Stickle Ghyll car park. Next to pub. Walks to locations in Langdale. Bus route</td>
<td>Quiet survey day. People friendly. Changeover day and lull after school holidays, therefore NT officer expected quiet day. On advice of NT officer I left car park at around 2.30 to walkers’ car park 1/2 mile away to catch long distance walkers. Dungeon Ghyll fills up usually by 10 but I had spent most of my time in Stickle Ghyll. It had got slow by around 1-2 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/04/2012</td>
<td>Seatoller</td>
<td>Some serious walkers, A few people just visiting tea shop. Most in cars but one or two on bus</td>
<td>Walks to Catbells and longer fell walks. Quite small. Other car parks along Derwentwater provide access to Lake, and low level walks (ie Bowderstone - a point of interest)</td>
<td>A quiet and slow day. After 2 I went to all the NT car parks along the way but didn’t catch many people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/05/2012</td>
<td>Elterwater</td>
<td>Sunday, lots of families, a large walking group in 10-12 cars turned up at 10:30. Short walks but some people passing through the village on higher level longer walks</td>
<td>Short walk to Lake, small village centre. Walks into Langdale, Skelwith or over the tops to Grasmere and other valleys.</td>
<td>As it was so busy I either missed quite a few or could only give out 1 between a group. Averaged about 1 in 6 because of this. Died down at 2ish. Some refusals (tourists, non walkers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/05/2012</td>
<td>Grasmere Red Bank</td>
<td>Nearly all 'visitors'. Around Lake 'picnickers' and low level walkers. A few more adventurous. Caught some walkers at the end of the day.</td>
<td>Busy in Grasmere. Low level walks in general and some higher which start from there.</td>
<td>Lots of refusals. People walking in village for a few hundred metres to shop or have lunch etc. Walked perimeter of Grasmere and Rydal Water, using tracks, some height near Loughrigg. Stopped in all car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Weather Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/06/2012</td>
<td>Wasdale Head</td>
<td>A large percentage were participating in the 3 peaks challenge and had started in the night sometime. As I arrived I caught some of the leaders returning from Sca Fell. As the morning went on I caught slower groups. From mid morning onwards tourists and fell walkers, but weather prevented many from turning up. Remote and a gateway to the largest fells and some of the more challenging Lakeland walks. Weather limited respondents to 3 peakers in the main. Many were groups who took a handful of surveys but the conditions and tiredness suggests they may forget about the survey (they had Snowdon still to do).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/06/2012</td>
<td>Glenridding (near visitor centre)</td>
<td>Tourists and visitors to Glenridding. Some school groups and short walkers. Busy and one of the main villages in the area. Routes to Helvellyn, and the Lake. Weather had been bad all week and prevented people from coming to the Lakes. Arrived too late to catch Helvellyn walkers. No real place to stand so kept moving on main street and road up to Helvellyn, but mostly stayed in car park area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/2012</td>
<td>Whinlatter</td>
<td>Some families and walkers. Many mountain bikers and some people just visiting the visitor centre. Forest park with a number of different walks around the side of Lords Rake. Parking, visitor centre and coloured routes. Difficult to find place to survey. Walked round large car park to limited success. Walked around red and blue routes and gave out a few.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/07/2012</td>
<td>Ennerdale</td>
<td>Families, couples and one or two fell walkers. One group parents and children. Some people staying at Black Sail. Remote and wild area in the Western Lakes. Access to Pillar and Red Pike. Lakeside walk and valley which restricts cars. Sporadic, but quite enclosed car park area. Remained in car park until mid day and then walked up lakeside road - gave out quite a few by doing this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2012</td>
<td>Buttermere Car park</td>
<td>Tourists, walkers, people camping and staying in Buttermere. People got off a bus (broke down and stayed in the centre)</td>
<td>Started in Nat Trust car park. Walked to Lakes car park giving out surveys in between. Quiet for first couple of hours. Walked between car parks then stayed outside pub round about 11am as it became really busy. Gave out quite a few by doing this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/2012</td>
<td>Tarn Hows</td>
<td>Families, groups of friends, tourists</td>
<td>Stood where directed near Lake and caught most people on their way round (or back). Even though quiet I missed a few people as I was talking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/09/2012</td>
<td>Langdale car parks</td>
<td>Some dedicated walkers, holiday makers determined to walk in very heavy rain. School groups</td>
<td>Usually busy at Tarn Hows, quiet on the paths through to Coniston. Tourists usually to be found in the villages, but the weather prevented this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/09/2012</td>
<td>Tarn Hows and Coniston</td>
<td>Torrential rain. Saw some people but couldn’t approach them at times</td>
<td>It was extremely difficult to talk to and engage with walkers due to terrible weather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/10/2012</td>
<td>Windermere, Orrest Head and Brant Fell</td>
<td>People doing short walks which probably fit around other activities. Tourists and locals and some trail walkers</td>
<td>Quiet - out of season</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/2012</td>
<td>Borrowdale</td>
<td>Rain, and a generally quiet day on the route chosen.</td>
<td>Poor weather, and respondents were not generally willing to take surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/11/2012</td>
<td>Elterwater, Skelwith Bridge and Loughrigg</td>
<td>Fairly busy. Mainly couples or groups of adults. Some local walkers</td>
<td>As the weather was ok, a lot of people seemed to be out. Opted for Loughrigg as a means of catching other people, rather than those who stayed in the vicinity of Elterwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2012</td>
<td>Ullswater</td>
<td>Dog walkers, two hill walkers, and the odd tourist. Very Quiet</td>
<td>Walked from National Trust car park south around lake and back. A quiet day in the area. Expected to find more people, but as it was a reasonably non-descript weekday before Christmas it was quiet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/2012</td>
<td>North of Coniston, Tilberthwaite etc</td>
<td>Some tourists and casual walkers, plus hillwalkers past Tilberthwaite and in the valley</td>
<td>Walked from Tom Gill Car Park around North of Lake Coniston, up Tilberthwaite and through the valley under Wetherlam to the road below the Old Man, and into Coniston village. Specifically timed to catch hill walkers and tourists. Relatively busy, as weather was holding in the morning. Rain came in the afternoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/12/2012</td>
<td>Ambleside and Rydal</td>
<td>Tourists, and families</td>
<td>Walked from car park near Rydal, up Loughrigg, via Grasmere lakeside path, back to Ambleside along ridge and down. Usually reasonably busy and a few car parks on the way. Quite quiet and before Christmas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>