

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Master's Theses and Capstones

Student Scholarship

---

Spring 2021

### Seeing the Forest for the Trees: A Social-Ecological Approach to Sustainably Managing Outdoor Recreation Visitation in Parks and Protected Areas

Georgia Ann Giles

*University of New Hampshire, Durham*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/thesis>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Giles, Georgia Ann, "Seeing the Forest for the Trees: A Social-Ecological Approach to Sustainably Managing Outdoor Recreation Visitation in Parks and Protected Areas" (2021). *Master's Theses and Capstones*. 1463.

<https://scholars.unh.edu/thesis/1463>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses and Capstones by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact [nicole.hentz@unh.edu](mailto:nicole.hentz@unh.edu).

**Seeing the Forest for the Trees: A Social-Ecological Approach to  
Sustainably Managing Outdoor Recreation Visitation in Parks and Protected Areas**

By

Georgia Giles

B.S., Recreation Management and Policy: Program Administration; Kinesiology:

Outdoor Education, University of New Hampshire, 2019

THESIS

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire

in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

in

Recreation Management and Policy: Recreation Administration

May, 2021

This thesis was examined and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Recreation Management and Policy: Recreation Administration by:

Thesis Committee Chair, Michael Ferguson, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor, Recreation Management and Policy  
University of New Hampshire

Robert Barcelona, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor, Recreation Management and Policy  
University of New Hampshire

Lauren Ferguson, Ph.D.  
Lecturer, Recreation Management and Policy  
University of New Hampshire

On April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021

Approval signatures on file with the University of New Hampshire Graduate School.

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to Dr. Michael Ferguson for serving as my advisor and thesis committee chair. Throughout this process you have encouraged me to push myself in ways I would not have otherwise, and I am grateful for the guidance and encouragement you have given. I would like to thank Dr. Robert Barcelona for serving on my committee, and especially for the help given regarding data analysis. Thank you as well to Dr. Lauren Ferguson for serving on my committee and contributing your measured and thoughtful input throughout this process.

I would like to give a special thank you to both the USDA Forest Service for providing generous study funding, and to Mrs. Marianne Leberman in particular for the assistance and information she supplied.

Thank you to my family and friends. Mom and Dad, thank you for believing in me. Bridget, Anna, and Elizabeth, thank you for your willingness to let me practice numerous presentations with you as my audience. To Forrest, thank you for your patience and support throughout this process.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the original peoples who inhabited the White Mountain National Forest including the Abenaki, Malecite, Passamaquoddy, and Penacook peoples.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	v
Abstract.....	vii
Management Implications.....	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	3
2.1 Social-Ecological Systems.....	3
2.2 Social Factors.....	4
2.3 Situational Factors .....	5
2.4 Ecological Factors.....	5
2.5 Satisfaction.....	6
2.6 Stress-Coping and Substitution Theories.....	7
2.7 Summary and Research Questions.....	9
CHAPTER 3: METHODS.....	10
3.1 Study Context- The White Mountain National Forest .....	10
3.2 Data Collection .....	10
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	13
4.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	13
4.2 Research Question One.....	14
4.3 Research Question Two .....	15
4.4 Research Question Three .....	16
4.5 Research Question Four .....	19
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	22
5.1 Theoretical Implications .....	22
5.2 Management Implications.....	25
5.3 Implications for Future Research.....	27
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION .....	29
LIST OF REFERENCES .....	30
APPENDICES .....	36
Appendix A: WMNF Visitor’s Sociodemographic Characteristics .....	37
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter.....	39

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. WMNF Visitation and Survey Response Information.....	12
Table 2. WMNF Influencing Factors and Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Structural Equation Model	14
Table 3. WMNF Coping Factors and Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Structural Equation Model.....	16
Table 4. WMNF Satisfaction and Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Structural Equation Model.....	17
Table 5. Logistic Regression Models Predicting WMNF Visitor Substitution Behaviors.....	21

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. SEM Model<sup>a</sup> ..... 19  
Figure 2. Positive Feedback Loop ..... 25

## Abstract

Parks and protected areas visitation in the United States has increased substantially over the past several decades, and dramatically within the past few years. This expansion in visitation raises concerns regarding the influence of social, situational, and ecological factors upon visitor experiences, natural resources, and adjacent communities. This study investigated the relationship between three influencing factors and visitors' behaviors and decision-making on the White Mountain National Forest (WMNF) of New Hampshire. A mail-back and online survey method was used to collect data from WMNF visitors from June to August of 2020 ( $n=642$ ). Structural equation modeling and binary logistic regression analyses suggest social factors (e.g., crowding and conflict), situational factors (e.g., litter and access), and ecological factors (e.g., weather and seasonality) were significant predictors of visitor decision-making and overall satisfaction on the WMNF. Moreover, a majority of the sample consistently employed behavioral adaptations such as resource and temporal substitution, and in some instances, permanently abandoned their recreation experiences altogether, all in an effort to maintain overall visitor satisfaction. This study demonstrates that in addition to social factors, situational and ecological factors should also be integrated when assessing the broader human-nature relationship. This research advances the social-ecological systems framework and validates the importance of integrating recreation, natural resource, and community considerations when sustainably managing parks and protected areas.

**Keywords:** Outdoor Recreation; Visitor Management; Social-Ecological Systems; Ecological Impacts, Parks and Protected Areas; Decision-Making



### Management Implications

This study found that social, situational, and ecological factors are driving the need for visitor substitution behaviors on the WMNF. Resource and temporal substitution were the most common. Results indicate visitors can effectively cope with situational and ecological impacts, partially cope with crowding impacts, and are unable to cope with conflict related impacts. Findings suggest visitor conflict, followed by crowding, should be prioritized by resource managers. Additionally, results demonstrate that pervasive coping behaviors may be driving a positive feedback loop. Thus, resource managers must work collaboratively to facilitate ideal outcomes for not only the visitors, but the wider system.

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Outdoor recreation has become increasingly popular in the United States with more than 153 million Americans participating annually (Outdoor Foundation, 2020). Between 2008 and 2019, this number grew by more than 16 million (Outdoor Foundation, 2020). This trend has been especially pronounced in the White Mountain National Forest (WMNF) of New Hampshire. Between 2005 and 2015, visitation to the WMNF has more than doubled, from 1.5 million annual visitors to 3.4 million annual visitors (USDA FS, 2005; 2015). As more and more visitors recreate in the same finite number of parks and protected areas, resource managers are growing concerned about the impacts upon natural resources, surrounding communities, and visitor experiences. These impacts may be social (e.g., crowding and conflict), situational (e.g., access, litter, parking), and/or ecological (e.g., ticks, weather, seasonality). In response to these impacts, visitors may alter their recreation behaviors in an effort to maintain their desired recreation experience and satisfaction, a process referred to as coping (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2021; Hall & Shelby, 2000; Miller & McCool, 2003). These adaptations are concerning for resource managers as the employment of coping behaviors are often indicative of larger systemic issues; namely, a decline in the overall quality of the outdoor recreation experience (Hall & Shelby, 2000; Manning, 2011; Miller & McCool, 2003). Moreover, coping behaviors themselves may cause unintended impacts upon visitor experiences, the natural resources, and the surrounding communities or regions (Cole, 1992; Starbuck et al., 2006). Thus, empirical examination of these issues, from a social-ecological systems perspective, is required to understand the interlinked impacts between visitors, resources, and communities.

A social-ecological systems (SES) approach provides an ideal framework for the sustainable management of parks and protected areas. The SES framework offers an interdisciplinary system-wide approach to resource management, considering the interaction of not only social factors, but also situational and ecological factors, upon recreation, culture, community, and natural resources. This ensures outcomes related to resource management decisions are not short-term and individualized but are long-term and system wide. This study examined the influence of social, situational, and ecological factors upon visitor coping behaviors, decision-making, and overall satisfaction on the WMNF. Study results demonstrate perceived social, situational, and ecological factors significantly influenced visitor behaviors and decision-making. Moreover, study respondents perceived resource and temporal substitution strategies to be the most effective behavioral adaptations for maintaining satisfaction. From a SES perspective, study results indicate that resource managers must be accounting for the potential impacts of visitor coping behaviors, in order to ensure the best outcomes for not only the recreation visitors, but for the social and ecological system as a whole. This study is one of the first to integrate and apply the SES and stress-coping frameworks to examine social, situational, and ecological factors within a parks and protected areas setting. Study findings highlight the importance of a systems approach to sustainably managing recreation resources.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### *2.1 Social-Ecological Systems*

The social-ecological systems (SES) framework is an approach which seeks to consider outdoor recreation research within a wider context. It combines both social and ecological systems and considers multiple levels of interaction (Morse, 2020). Parks and protected areas have historically been managed within a narrow focus, mainly concerned with single, siloed issues within a specific location (Morse, 2020). However, it is now understood that outdoor recreation often influences social, situational, ecological, economic, and policy decisions at local, regional, and national levels (Cole, 1992; Marion & Cole, 1996; Outdoor Foundation, 2020). Approaching the management of parks and protected areas from a SES perspective allows for a unique systems approach that models the ripple of interlinked interactions between visitors, resources, and communities.

Coping mechanisms, specifically substitution behaviors, are critical considerations within a SES framework as these behaviors affect not only recreation visitors, but also surrounding communities, natural resources, economies, states, and regions (Cole, 1992, Hall & Cole, 2000, Starbuck et al., 2006). For example, sub-optimal recreation experiences in parks and protected areas often lead to the pervasive employment of substitution behaviors (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2021; Miller & McCool, 2003). Behaviors such as resource substitution and displacement have been demonstrated to significantly damage the ecological, social, and economic integrity of not only the resources themselves, but also the surrounding communities and regions as well (Marion & Cole, 1996; Starbuck et al., 2006). It is therefore critical to understand the

ramifications of visitor decision-making from a systems level. Accordingly, a SES framework has been applied to this study as it broadens the applicability of recreation research and establishes a framework to facilitate the long-term sustainable management of outdoor recreation.

## ***2.2 Social Factors***

Social factors refer to human interactions that may influence visitor perceptions, behaviors, or experiences (Hall & Shelby, 2000; Manning et al., 2000; Miller & McCool, 2003). There are numerous social factors in parks and protected areas that may influence visitor behaviors and experiences, such as crowding and conflict (Ferguson et al., 2018b; Kim et al., 2019). Crowding is defined as a negative evaluation of the volume of visitors within a defined area (Manning et al., 2000). Conflict is defined as an interference in a visitor's goal caused by another's behaviors (Jacob & Schreyer, 1980). The social factors of crowding and conflict are prolific in the parks and protected areas literature and influence both visitor coping behaviors as well as overall satisfaction (Cole & Hall, 2005; Ferguson et al., 2018b; Hall & Cole, 2007; Johnson & Dawson, 2004; Schroeder et al., 2020). For instance, Hall and Shelby (2000) found just about half (48%) of visitors to Lake Billy Chinook had utilized various coping behaviors in response to crowding. Hall and Cole (2007) found wilderness visitors who were less satisfied also reported significantly higher levels of overall crowding than visitors who were more satisfied. Johnson and Dawson (2004) found coping behaviors such as resource and temporal substitution helped Adirondack Wilderness visitors maintain satisfaction when encountering crowding. Similarly, Schroeder et al. (2020) found coping behaviors amongst hunters helped maintain satisfaction when encountering crowding or conflict.

### ***2.3 Situational Factors***

Situational factors refer to interactions with the built environment that may influence visitor perceptions, behaviors, or experiences (Gartner & Lime, 2000; Miller & McCool, 2003). There are numerous situational factors in park and protected areas that may influence visitor behaviors and experiences such as site degradation (e.g., litter and garbage), public access (e.g., facilities, roads, and recreation sites), and energy development (e.g., offshore wind energy development, natural gas development energy development, and anthropogenic sounds) (Ferguson et al., 2020, 2019a, 2019b; Miller et al. 2020). Site degradation is defined as a negative modification of a resource due to human use (Buckley, 2004). Access is commonly described as the ease that services or areas can be obtained or reached (Kim & Nicholls, 2016). Situational factors such as site degradation and access have been well studied in the parks and protected areas literature and have been demonstrated to influence both visitor coping behaviors as well as visitor satisfaction (Blenderman et al., 2018; Cole & Hall, 2005; Hall & Cole, 2007; Johnson & Dawson, 2004). For instance, Miller and McCool (2003) found over one-third of visitors to Glacier National Park reported situational factors as a detractor to their experience. While Johnson and Dawson (2004) and Hall and Cole (2007) found visitors often employed coping behaviors when encountering litter trash, and/or waste.

### ***2.4 Ecological Factors***

Ecological factors refer to interactions with the natural environment that may influence visitor perceptions, behaviors, or experiences (Buckley, 2004; Ferguson et al., 2018a; Gartner & Lime, 2000). There are numerous ecological factors in parks and protected areas that may influence visitor behaviors and experiences, known as biophysical features (e.g., snowpack, water levels, and tick populations). Biophysical features refer to both living things (e.g., plants

and animals) as well as non-living things (e.g., soil and water) (Gartner & Lime, 2000; Whittaker & Shelby, 2002). Yet, the influence of ecological factors upon the visitor experience is a burgeoning area within the parks and protected areas literature which requires further investigation (Ferguson et al., 2018a). The limited available research has demonstrated various biophysical features can indeed influence both visitors coping behaviors as well as visitor satisfaction (Boyer et al., 2017; Ferguson et al., 2018a; Verbos & Brownlee, 2017). For instance, Lam-González et al. (2019) determined that biophysical climate change factors can play a role in both visitor decision-making and satisfaction. As visitor satisfaction with the climate increased, visitor engagement in recreation increased; when engagement increased, overall satisfaction increased. Likewise, Boyer et al. (2017) found that both water levels and air temperature impacted recreation visitation numbers. For instance, as water levels increased, recreation demand also increased; however, once these increases surpass normal levels, demand will then begin to fall.

## ***2.5 Satisfaction***

Historically, a primary objective of parks and protected area managers has been providing visitors with high-quality recreation experiences (Manning, 2011). Accordingly, satisfaction has emerged as the principal metric of overall experience quality (Bultena & Klessig, 1969; Williams, 1988). Satisfaction has been broadly defined as the congruence between expectations and outcomes (Ferguson et al., 2018b; Manning, 2011). Satisfaction has been assessed and empirically validated in myriad research (Hall & Cole, 2007; Johnson & Dawson, 2004; Manning, 2011). In many studies, however, visitor satisfaction has been shown to remain high, even in the presence of significant sub-optimal conditions (Manning, 2011; Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool; 2003). A plausible explanation for this phenomenon lies in the

stress-coping framework, where satisfaction may be preserved due to the employment of coping behaviors, which serve to mediate any negative influence upon satisfaction. Various research has explored the influence of social factors upon coping behaviors and satisfaction (Cole & Hall, 2005; Hall & Cole, 2007; Johnson & Dawson, 2004; Schroeder et al., 2020). However, limited research has investigated the effects of situational and ecological factors upon coping and overall satisfaction (Blenderman et al., 2018; Boyer et al., 2017; Ferguson et al., 2018a; Hall & Cole, 2007; Johnson & Dawson, 2004; Verbos & Brownlee, 2017).

### ***2.6 Stress-Coping and Substitution Theories***

Social, situational, and ecological factors have the potential to diminish visitor satisfaction in parks and protected areas settings. In an effort to preserve satisfaction, visitors may employ various coping behaviors to maintain their overall experience (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2021; Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool, 2003). Coping is a social-psychological concept commonly defined as any behavior meant to reduce stress or allow an individual to manage sub-optimal conditions (Sutherland, 1996). The stress-coping framework consists of three primary components: 1) influencing factors, 2) coping mechanisms, and 3) outcomes (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Recreation researchers have modified the stress-coping framework to also include behavioral adaptations germane within outdoor recreation settings, such as substitution behaviors (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2021; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995). In a modified stress-coping framework, influencing factors may consist of social, situational, and ecological impacts a visitor may encounter in a recreation setting. If a visitor appraises said factors negatively, their overall outcome of visitor satisfaction may decline. As such, visitors may employ various coping mechanisms, such as substitution behaviors, in an effort to mitigate impacts and maintain overall satisfaction (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2021).



A considerable amount of research has applied various forms of the empirically validated recreation substitution typology (Ferguson et al., 2018a; Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool, 2003; Shelby & Vaske, 1991). The substitution typology consists of several substitutive behavioral adaptations (Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool, 2003; Shelby & Vaske, 1991). There are four primary types of substitution behaviors: 1) resource substitution, 2) temporal substitution, 3) activity substitution, and 4) displacement (Anderson, 1984; Manning, 2011; Miller & McCool, 2003; Shelby & Vaske, 1991). Research suggests temporal substitution is often the most frequently applied substitution behavior, followed by resource substitution, and activity substitution (Greenaway et al., 2007; Hall & Cole, 2007; Hall & Shelby, 2000; Manning & Valliere, 2001). Moreover, studies suggest displacement is often the least frequently applied substitution behavior, as it is typically employed as a last resort when no other options to maintain satisfaction are available (Hall & Cole, 2007; Manning & Valliere, 2001).

Resource substitution refers to a visitor maintaining their preferred activity, but visiting a different location (Ferguson et al., 2018a; Greenaway et al., 2007; Miller & McCool, 2003). Temporal substitution refers to a visitor maintaining their preferred activity but visiting the location during a different time (Ferguson et al., 2018a; Hall & Cole, 2007; Hall & Shelby, 2000). Activity substitution refers to a visitor maintaining their preferred location, but changing their activity (Ferguson et al., 2018a; Greenaway et al., 2007; Miller & McCool, 2003;). Finally, displacement refers to a visitor permanently ceasing participation in both the recreation setting and the activity altogether (Ferguson et al., 2018a, Hall & Cole, 2007; Miller & McCool, 2003). Thus, the employment of substitution behaviors within a recreation setting are often indicative of significant systemic issues requiring further examination.

## *2.7 Summary and Research Questions*

A substantial body of recreation literature has focused on the influence of social factors upon outdoor recreation behaviors and experiences (Manning, 2011; Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool; 2003). However, outdoor recreation inherently takes place within both natural and built environments; thus, situational and ecological factors likely also influence visitor decision-making and overall satisfaction. While this premise has been suggested in the literature, to our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to use a stress-coping model to explore these combined influences within a SES framework. This study addressed these gaps by applying a modified stress-coping framework to explore the extent to which social, situational, and ecological factors relate to visitor coping behaviors and overall satisfaction at the WMNF. A better understanding of these relationships may help shape sustainable policies and strategies to facilitate long-term change. To that end, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

R1: To what extent are visitors impacted by social, situational, and ecological factors at the WMNF?

R2: To what extent are visitors employing coping behaviors at the WMNF?

R3: What is the relationship between influencing factors, coping behaviors, and overall satisfaction at the WMNF?

R4: What is the influence of social, situational, and ecological factors upon individual substitution behaviors at the WMNF?

## CHAPTER 3: METHODS

### ***3.1 Study Context- The White Mountain National Forest***

The White Mountain National Forest (WMNF) is a popular recreation destination that attracts more than 6 million annual visitors (USDA FS, 2020). The WMNF is a vital recreation resource for the state of New Hampshire and the New England region. It is an essential part of New Hampshire's economy, supporting more than 5,000 jobs and generating more than \$193 million in labor income (USDA FS, 2016). The national forest spans more than 800,000 acres in New Hampshire and Western Maine and is located within one day's drive of more than 70 million people (NFF, 2020). The WMNF offers more than 1,200 miles of hiking trails, 400 miles of snowmobile trails, 160 miles of the Appalachian Trail, 23 developed campgrounds, 6 ski touring areas, and 4 alpine ski areas (USDA FS, 2020). Broadly speaking, the WMNF management plans aims to sustain a healthy forest, restore the land, provide recreation opportunities, and support local economies, all while protecting the natural landscape (USDA FS, 2005). This combination of ecological diversity and high-quality natural resource management, in addition to an abundance of public access, has made the WMNF extremely popular amongst a variety of local, regional, and international visitors.

### ***3.2 Data Collection***

A modified drop-off/pick-up survey method (Allred & Ross-Davis, 2011; Jackson-Smith et al., 2016; Steele et al., 2001; Trentelman et al., 2016), referred to in this study as a knock-and-drop method, was applied to gather data from WMNF visitors from June to August of 2020. A zip code analysis of National Visitor Use Monitoring data was used to identify communities with

significant percentages of WMNF visitors (Table 1) (USDA FS, 2005; 2015). This methodology was created and selected for multiple reasons. First, this method was employed to comprehensibly assess local, state, and regional visitor perceptions from a systems level. Next, the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated the need to veer away from traditional on-site face-to-face intercept surveys in favor of a more socially distanced survey approach. Finally, this technique allowed for sampling of potentially displaced visitors who are not captured with traditional on-site survey modalities.

This knock-and-drop technique entailed trained researchers canvassing and approaching residential homes, hanging survey kits on doorknobs, knocking, briefly speaking to homeowners (if available), and then proceeding to more homes. Survey kits consisted of a clear plastic bag containing a cover letter, a paper survey, and a return envelope. Two options for returning the survey were provided: 1) a link to an online survey utilizing Qualtrics software, or 2) a printed survey and a postage-paid return envelope. Approximately two weeks after the first round of survey distribution, researchers returned to non-respondent homes and left a reminder postcard. Only consenting adults (18 years of age or older) were eligible to participate in the study.

The topics within the first portion of the survey included trip visitation patterns and sociodemographic characteristics. Next, respondents assessed items related to social, situational, and ecological factors as well as coping behaviors and overall satisfaction. Upon completion of the survey, respondents were thanked for their time and provided an opportunity to voluntarily enter into a prize drawing. In total, 3,000 surveys were distributed, yielding 642 completed surveys and a 21% response rate (Table 1). 65% of surveys were completed via the online modality and 35% were completed via the mail-back modality. This survey method response rate was consistent with similar research methods (Wallen et al., 2016; Westphal et al., 2014).

Finally, non-response bias was assessed using socio-demographic questions relating to gender, race, income, and education as well as survey modality. Respondents who declined to participate in the survey were asked to respond to the socio-demographic questions. Socio-demographics were then compared between both respondents and non-respondents. A chi-square analysis found no significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) for any variables between respondents and non-respondents. Therefore, a lack of non-response bias was assumed.

**Table 1.** WMNF Visitation and Survey Response Information

Community Name	% of WMNF Visitation <sup>1</sup>	Distributed Surveys	Completed Surveys	Response Rate
Conway	5.8%	277	56	20.2%
Concord	5.4%	271	66	24.4%
Littleton	5.4%	278	69	24.8%
North Conway	4.5%	274	63	22.9%
Berlin	3.7%	275	36	13.1%
Gorham	3.7%	277	59	21.3%
Franconia	3.7%	271	53	19.6%
Portsmouth	3.7%	248	62	25.0%
Campton	2.9%	275	70	25.5%
Plymouth	2.5%	279	72	25.8%
Groveton	0.4%	275	36	13.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>21.43%</b>

\*Note. Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Note<sup>1</sup>: 2015 National Visitor Use Monitoring data - White Mountain National Forest

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

All data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24.0 and Mplus version 7.11. To address research questions R1 and R2, frequencies, valid percentages, and measure of central tendency were used. To address research question R3, binary logistic regression was applied. Finally, to address research question R4, structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed.

### *4.1 Descriptive Statistics*

Of the 642 survey respondents, 47% identified as male and 46% as female (see Appendix A- Table 1). The average age of respondents was 56 years. A large majority of respondents (89%) reported their race/ethnicity as White. Other ethnicities included Spanish/Hispanic/Latino, African American, and Asian. Over two-thirds (71%) of the sample reported earning a four-year or graduate/professional degree. The political ideology distribution within the sample was moderate, but slightly liberal leaning ( $M=3.62$ ). Respondents noted hiking and walking were by far their most common recreation activities, representing approximately 50% of the sample (see Appendix A- Table 2). Downhill skiing or snowboarding (9%) was the next most popular, followed by sightseeing or viewing scenery (8%). Regarding trip visitation characteristics, the vast majority of respondents were New Hampshire residents (91%) who noted traveling a median distance of approximately 60 miles from their homes to the WMNF. These largely local and highly experienced recreationists noted visiting the WMNF an average of five days per month, 36 days per year, and 30 total years.

#### 4.2 Research Question One

To assess visitor perceptions of influencing factors upon the overall WMNF recreation experience, respondents evaluated a multi-item seven-point Likert scale (1=no impact, 7=major impact) (Table 4). These fourteen items represented four domains: 1) social factors- crowding (two items), 2) social factors- conflict (2 items), 3) situational factors (six items), and 4) ecological factors (four items). Each of these multi-item domains have been previously validated to assess impacts in outdoor recreation settings (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2019a; Hall & Cole, 2007; Manning, 2011; White et al., 2008). Overall, respondents noted their recreation experiences have been significantly impacted by crowding (M=4.15), moderately impacted by situational factors (M=3.14), and slightly impacted by ecological factors (M=2.90) and conflict (2.57). Moreover, the items with the highest perceived impacts were related to parking or traffic (M=4.22) and crowding (M=4.17).

**Table 2.** WMNF Influencing Factors and Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Structural Equation Model

Code <sup>a</sup>	Item	Loading <sup>b</sup>	Item M (SD)	Domain M (SD)
<b><i>Social Factors- Crowding</i></b> <sup>c</sup> ( $\alpha = 0.96$ )				
V1	Crowding	.96	4.17 (1.92)	4.15 (1.94)
V2	Too many other visitors	.98	4.13 (1.96)	
<b><i>Social Factors- Conflict</i></b> <sup>c</sup> ( $\alpha = 0.76$ )				
V1	Conflict with other visitors	.71	2.02 (1.52)	2.57 (1.72)
V2	The actions or behaviors of other visitors	.90	3.13 (1.92)	
<b><i>Situational Factors</i></b> <sup>c</sup> ( $\alpha = 0.85$ )				
V1	Trail degradation (mud, social trails, erosion)	.75	2.95 (1.71)	
V2	Visible litter, garbage, or vandalism	.82	3.15 (1.94)	3.14 (1.79)
V3	Overall sanitation and cleanliness	.80	2.86 (1.80)	
V4	Availability of restroom facilities	.56	3.04 (1.79)	

V5	Parking or traffic	.63	4.22 (1.90)	
V6	Site access (road conditions/closures, site closures)	.57	2.62 (1.65)	
<b><i>Ecological Factors<sup>c</sup></i></b> ( $\alpha = 0.80$ )				
V1	Diminished natural snowpack	.63	2.72 (1.93)	
V2	Increased tick population	.64	3.46 (2.00)	2.90
V3	Changing seasonality	.69	2.77 (1.87)	(1.88)
V4	Changing water levels (streams, rivers, lakes)	.73	2.65 (1.75)	

<sup>a</sup>Note: Variable code refers to SEM model, see Figure 1.

<sup>b</sup>Note: Standardized factor loadings. All loadings were significant at  $p < .001$ .

<sup>c</sup>Note: Crowding, conflict, situational, and ecological latent variable items (1= no impact, 7= major impact)

### ***4.3 Research Question Two***

To measure coping behaviors, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which eleven substitution items described their response to sub-optimal conditions on the WMNF (Table 5). Respondents rated the multi-item coping battery using a seven-point Likert scale (1= never, 7= always). The eleven coping items represented four unique domains: 1) resource substitution (two items), 2) temporal substitution (four items), 3) activity substitution (two items), and 4) displacement (three items). This multi-item coping construct has been previously validated to assess the employment of coping behaviors in outdoor recreation settings (Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2021; Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995). Respondents largely agreed the presence of various sub-optimal conditions on the WMNF caused them to employ coping behaviors, with mean scores ranging from 4.35 to 1.31. The highest rated was resource substitution (M=4.35), followed closely by temporal substitution (M=4.13), and activity substitution (M=2.23). The domain which received the lowest mean rating was displacement (M=1.31).



**Table 3.** WMNF Coping Factors and Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Structural Equation Model

Code <sup>a</sup>	Item	Loading <sup>b</sup>	Item M (SD)	Domain M (SD)
<b>Resource Substitution<sup>c</sup></b> ( $\alpha = 0.96$ ; $R^2 = 0.61$ )				
V1	Visited different areas of the WMNF	.95	4.40 (1.91)	4.35 (1.90)
V2	Visited a different location within the WMNF	.97	4.31 (1.89)	
<b>Temporal Substitution<sup>c</sup></b> ( $\alpha = 0.80$ ; $R^2 = 0.71$ )				
V1	Visited WMNF during a different season	.65	3.27 (2.09)	4.13 (2.13)
V2	Visited WMNF during a different day of week	.87	4.20 (2.11)	
V3	Visited WMNF earlier or later in the day	.77	3.92 (2.12)	
V4	Avoided visiting the WMNF on holidays	.60	5.13 (2.21)	
<b>Activity Substitution<sup>c</sup></b> ( $\alpha = 0.79$ ; $R^2 = 0.35$ )				
V1	Began a new recreation activity at the WMNF	.75	2.18 (1.50)	2.23 (1.55)
V2	Changed my recreation activity at the WMNF	.88	2.29 (1.61)	
<b>Displacement<sup>c</sup></b> ( $\alpha = 0.77$ ; $R^2 = 0.05$ )				
V1	Stopped visiting the WMNF entirely	.73	1.47 (1.19)	1.31 (0.96)
V2	Never visited the WMNF again	.70	1.16 (0.72)	
V3	Abandoned my experience at the WMNF	.83	1.30 (0.98)	
<b>Coping<sup>d</sup></b> ( $R^2 = 0.44$ )				
V1	Resource substitution	.78	---	4.35 (1.90)
V2	Temporal substitution	.84	---	4.13 (2.13)
V3	Activity substitution	.60	---	2.23 (1.55)
V4	Displacement	.23	---	1.31 (0.96)

<sup>a</sup>Note: Variable code refers to SEM model, see Figure 1.

<sup>b</sup>Note: Standardized factor loadings. All loadings were significant at  $p < .001$ .

<sup>c</sup>Note: Resource, Temporal, and Activity substitution, and Displacement latent variable items (1= never, 7= always)

<sup>d</sup>Note: Coping is a second-order latent variable created from four first-order latent variables that capture different categories of coping behavior.

#### 4.4 Research Question Three

To assess overall trip satisfaction on the WMNF, visitors were asked to indicate their agreement with three satisfaction items (Table 6). Respondents rated the multi-item overall trip satisfaction construct using a seven-point Likert scale (1= completely disagree, 7= completely agree). This multi-item satisfaction construct was created based on previously validated recreation satisfaction literature (Burns et al., 2003; Ferguson et al., 2018a, 2018b; Lee et al.,

2004). Overall, respondents noted they were highly satisfied with their experience on the WMNF (M=6.20).

**Table 4.** WMNF Satisfaction and Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Structural Equation Model

Code <sup>a</sup>	Item	Loading <sup>b</sup>	Item M (SD)	Domain M (SD)
<i>Satisfaction</i> <sup>c</sup> ( $\alpha = 0.85$ ; $R^2 = 0.10$ )				
V1	I have thoroughly enjoyed my trips to the WMNF	.92	6.38 (0.81)	
V2	I cannot imagine better trips to the WMNF	.72	5.89 (1.14)	6.20 (0.95)
V3	My trips have been well worth the money and time	.84	6.33 (0.91)	

<sup>a</sup>Note: Variable code refers to SEM model, see Figure 1.


<sup>b</sup>Note: Standardized factor loadings. All loadings were significant at  $p < .001$ .

<sup>c</sup>Note: Satisfaction latent variable items (1= completely disagree, 7= completely agree)

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to examine the relationships between influencing factors, coping behaviors, and satisfaction amongst WMNF visitors. A measurement model for crowding, conflict, situational, and ecological factors was created via a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Table 4). Next, measurement models for satisfaction and the second order factor of coping were created via CFA (Tables 5 and 6). The researchers then specified theoretically justified structural regression pathways (see section 2.0) to link these latent variables. This process determined significant relationships between influencing factors, coping behaviors, and overall satisfaction, all with sufficient factor loadings.

The final SEM, using maximum likelihood estimation, with all CFAs and structural regression pathways, is displayed in Figure 1. The SEM showed a good fit to the data ( $\chi^2:751.6$ ;  $df=328$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  $CFI=0.957$ ;  $TLI=0.950$ ;  $RMSEA=0.045$ ;  $SRMR=.054$ ). Results indicate influencing variables explained a significant amount of the variance in coping behavior among visitors ( $R^2 = 43.7\%$ ). The latent variables for crowding, situational, and ecological factors had strong positive relationships with coping behaviors (standardized parameter estimates of 0.318, 0.285, and 0.167 respectively). The effects of situational and ecological factors on satisfaction

were fully mediated by coping behaviors. The effects of crowding on satisfaction were only partially mediated by coping behaviors, and also had an indirect negative relationship with satisfaction (-.148). Finally, conflict was unable to mediate via coping behaviors and instead had a direct and negative effect upon satisfaction (-.261).

**Figure 1. SEM Model<sup>a</sup>**

<sup>a</sup>Note:  $\chi^2=751.6$ ;  $df=328$ ;  $p<.001$ ; CFI=0.957; TLI=0.950; RMSEA=0.045; SRMR=.054

\*Note: All relationships and error covariances were significant at  $p<.05$

\*Note<sup>1</sup>: SEM included several error covariances between latent variables based on theoretical constructs: Ecological index with situational index, crowding index, and conflict index; Situational index with crowding index and conflict index; Conflict index with crowding index; Displacement index with activity substitution index.

\*Note<sup>2</sup>: SEM included several error covariances between latent and measured variables based on theoretical constructs: Crowding index with parking/traffic; Conflict index with litter/garbage/vandalism.

\*Note<sup>3</sup>: SEM included several error covariances between measured variables based on theoretical constructs: Changing seasonality with diminished natural snowpack and changing water levels; Restroom facilities with sanitation and cleanliness.

#### 4.5 Research Question Four

Four separate binary logistic regression analyses were conducted as post-hoc analyses to further explore the relationship between crowding, situational, and ecological factors and WMNF visitor decisions to engage in specific substitution behaviors (Table 7). All of the hypothesized variables were included in the model based on results from the SEM. It should be noted that conflict was dropped from subsequent models, as it demonstrated no direct effect upon coping in the SEM. The seven-point substitution constructs (1= never, 7= always) were recoded into dichotomous dummy dependent variables: 1 was recoded as 0 (i.e., no a coping behavior was not initiated) and 2-7 were recoded as 1 (i.e., yes a coping behavior was initiated). The

decision was made to include insignificant variables to better explore the nuanced relationship between influencing factors and substitution behaviors; a common occurrence in recreation research (Casola et al., 2020; Lyon & Vaske, 2010). The resulting models were used to determine the likelihood of visitor engagement with each coping behavior. When determining the likelihood of engagement, mean scores for crowding, situational, and ecological factors were held constant to account for the average WMNF visitor.

In the first model, crowding, situational, and ecological factors were associated with a higher likelihood of engagement in resource substitution. Situational factors were the strongest predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.98:1. Crowding factors were a moderate predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.44:1. Ecological factors were the weakest predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.34:1. This model suggests that at the reported mean levels for all three factors, there is 95% likelihood of visitor engagement in resource substitution. This model correctly classified 88.4% of visitors into the “had not initiated coping behavior” or “had initiated coping behavior” categories. The second model determined crowding and situational factors were associated with a higher likelihood of engagement in temporal substitution. Situational factors were the strongest predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.84:1. Crowding factors were a moderate predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.49:1. This model indicates that at the reported mean levels for all three factors, there is 96% likelihood of visitor engagement in temporal substitution. This model correctly classified 90.6% of visitors into the “had not initiated coping behavior” or “had initiated coping behavior” categories.

In the third model, situational and ecological factors were associated with a higher likelihood of engagement in activity substitution. Situational factors were the strongest predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.52:1. Ecological factors were a moderate predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.44:1. This model suggests that at the reported mean levels for all three factors, there is 60%

likelihood of visitor engagement in temporal substitution. This model correctly classified 68.3% of visitors into the “had not initiated coping behavior” or “had initiated coping behavior” categories. In the final model, only situational factors were associated with a higher likelihood of engagement in displacement. Situational factors had an odds ratio of 1.27:1. This model indicates that at the reported mean levels for all three factors, there is 13% likelihood of visitor engagement in displacement. This model correctly classified 85.1% of visitors into the “had not initiated coping behavior” or “had initiated coping behavior” categories.

**Table 5.** Logistic Regression Models Predicting WMNF Visitor Substitution Behaviors

	<i>Nagelkerke R Square</i>	$\beta$	<i>Wald</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>
<b>Resource Substitution Model<sup>a</sup></b>				
Situational factors	0.319	0.684	13.284***	1.982
Crowding factors		0.368	14.798***	1.444
Ecological factors		0.297	4.180*	1.346
<i>Constant</i>		-1.649	17.548***	0.192
<b>Temporal Substitution Model<sup>b</sup></b>				
Situational factors	0.272	0.611	8.933**	1.842
Crowding factors		0.405	13.775***	1.499
Ecological factors		0.176	1.266	1.193
<i>Constant</i>		-1.042	6.393*	0.353
<b>Activity Substitution Model<sup>c</sup></b>				
Situational factors	0.220	0.418	19.388***	1.519
Crowding factors		-0.013	0.047	0.987
Ecological factors		0.365	22.302***	1.440
<i>Constant</i>		-1.947	51.102***	0.143
<b>Displacement Model<sup>d</sup></b>				
Situational factors	0.095	0.241	4.433*	1.273
Crowding factors		0.125	2.258	1.133
Ecological factors		0.162	3.272	1.176
<i>Constant</i>		-3.592	81.546***	0.028

\*Note. Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

\*Significant at .05 level, \*\*significant at .01 level, \*\*\*significant at .001 level

\*C=level of crowding factors, S=level of situational factors, and E=level of ecological factors.

<sup>a</sup> $Ln(odds) = -1.649 + 0.368(C) + 0.684(S) + 0.297(E)$

<sup>b</sup> $Ln(odds) = -1.042 + 0.405(C) + 0.611(S) + 0.176(E)$

<sup>c</sup> $Ln(odds) = -1.947 + -0.013(C) + 0.418(S) + 0.365(E)$

<sup>d</sup> $Ln(odds) = -3.592 + 0.125(C) + 0.241(S) + 0.162(E)$

## CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Outdoor recreation has established itself as a powerful industry and sector in the United States. The recent explosion in visitation to parks and protected areas creates both opportunities and challenges for the social and ecological systems that provide and depend upon outdoor recreation. SES provides an ideal framework for sustainably managing visitation and providing high-quality outdoor recreation opportunities. This approach considers the multiple scales of visitors, ecosystems, and communities which rely upon the outdoors for their social, cultural, ecological, and economic wellbeing (Morse, 2020). This study examined the relationship between influencing factors, coping behaviors, and satisfaction on the WMNF from both a SES and stress-coping perspective. Results indicate social, situational, and ecological impacts significantly influenced both visitor decision-making and overall experience quality. This study advances the SES and stress-coping frameworks and validates the importance of integrating recreation, ecological, and community considerations when sustainably managing parks and protected areas.

### ***5.1 Theoretical Implications***

From a theoretical perspective, this study offers insights into the theory of stress-coping. While the outdoor recreation literature has largely focused on the influence of social factors upon the recreation experience (Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool; 2003), this study explored the combined influence of social, situational, and ecological factors upon coping behaviors and satisfaction within a combined SES and stress-coping framework. Study findings indicate both crowding and situational factors were robust predictors of coping behaviors, while


ecological factors were a moderate predictor of coping behavior. Crowding had an additional, indirect negative influence on satisfaction. Moreover, conflict had a direct negative influence on satisfaction, bypassing coping behaviors altogether. Study findings corroborate the literature and suggest coping behaviors partially and/or fully mediated the relationship between influencing factors and outcomes (Ferguson et al., 2018a; 2021; Miller & McCool, 2003). This study additionally extends previous literature, indicating that factors beyond crowding have strong effects on coping behaviors in visitors. The effect sizes within the SEM demonstrate that both crowding and situational factors have equally strong influences on coping behaviors. Therefore, situational factors are similar to crowding in their ability to drive coping behaviors.

A series of binary logistic regression models explored the more nuanced effects of various influencing factors upon individual substitution behaviors. Results determined crowding, situational, and ecological factors are robust predictors of visitor decision-making for both resource and temporal substitution. These findings validate the literature (McCreary et al., 2019; Miller & Vaske, 2003) and suggest crowding, situational, and ecological impacts are driving the need for both resource and temporal substitution on the WMNF. The application of activity substitution and displacement are less pervasive. Moreover, within all four models, situational factors were consistently the strongest predictors of substitution behaviors. This further suggests situational factors (e.g., litter, parking, restrooms) rival social factors (e.g., crowding and conflict) in their influence upon coping behaviors. When integrating SEM and binary logistic regression results, crowding, conflict, and situational factors have the most robust influence upon visitor decision-making and overall experience quality on the WMNF.

A SES framework was applied in this study as an approach to more broadly understand the visitor decision-making process and the impacts of those decisions downstream. This



research explored the premise that visitor behaviors do not exist in isolation. In other words, this study validated the SES literature and explored the concept of interlinked interactions between visitor decision-making, ecosystems, and communities (Morse, 2020). Study findings suggest the presence of a positive feedback loop which may serve to increase the magnitude of impacts and further destabilize the overall system (Figure 2) (Miller et al., 2012). For example, visitors may encounter sub-optimal conditions which force them to employ coping strategies to preserve their overall recreation experience. As a result of coping strategies, visitors may choose to recreate within lower-use areas (e.g., resource substitution) or during shoulder seasons (e.g., temporal substitution); both of which increase the potential for significant social, situational, or ecological site and community impacts. That is, as visitors change their behaviors in response to influencing factors, they are not simply maintaining their own satisfaction. Rather, recreation behavioral adaptations also significantly influences both social systems (e.g., other visitors, proximate communities, stakeholders) and ecological systems (e.g., site biodiversity and resource quality) (Cole, 1992; Starbuck et al., 2006; Morse, 2020). These impacts may serve to further intensify sub-optimal conditions, with the cycle repeating itself with increased intensity each time. Thus, the applications of a SES framework in parks and protected areas management provides a broad and interconnected understanding of human-nature relationships. Moreover, SES provides resource managers, communities, and stakeholders the opportunity to reduce impacts, stabilize the cycle, and facilitate long-term proactive planning.

**Figure 2.** Positive Feedback Loop

## 5.2 Management Implications

From a management perspective, study findings suggest a series of unique challenges and opportunities that may be of interest to natural resource managers. First, the most pervasive impacts upon WMNF visitor experiences are related to crowding (e.g., too many other visitors), situational (e.g., litter, parking, restrooms), and ecological (e.g., diminished snowpack, tick populations) factors. Yet, findings demonstrate visitors are able to effectively cope with both situational and ecological factors. This is helpful for resource managers as ecological and situational impacts can be particularly difficult to manage and control. However, results also indicate visitors are unable to cope with conflict related impacts, and only partially cope with crowding related impacts; both of which lead to significant decreases in satisfaction. In other words, WMNF visitors are fully capable of handling situational and ecological impacts, but less capable of managing conflict and crowding related impacts. These findings suggest visitor conflict, followed closely by crowding, should be a top priority for resource managers.

This implication is even more pronounced when considering the dramatic increases in visitation to parks and protected areas due to the COVID-19 pandemic as well as management trends towards multiple use recreation areas and diversifying recreation opportunities (Manning et al., 2000; Marcouiller et al., 2005; Rice et al., 2020). Resource managers might consider implementing policies to further manage increasing visitation and specifically combat the prevalence of crowding, conflict, and situational impacts. These policies may manifest as direct management actions (e.g., law enforcement presence, citations/fines, area restrictions, activity prohibition) or indirect management actions (e.g., visitor education, interpretive programming, entrance fees, limiting parking infrastructure). Direct management actions may enhance recreation quality and be supported by visitors when implemented in order to specifically control the impacts of increasing recreation visitation. However, indirect management has been demonstrated to be preferred by visitors over direct management, especially in dispersed recreation settings (Manning, 2011). Moreover, various direct and indirect visitor management approaches may have distinct downstream influences upon the broader social-ecological system. Thus, resource managers must consider and account for the potential impacts of behavioral adaptations from a SES perspective to facilitate the ideal outcomes for recreation visitors, natural resources, and surrounding communities, states, and regions.

Furthermore, this study suggests that in the presence of various sub-optimal conditions, WMNF visitors are most likely to employ resource and temporal substitution strategies in an effort to preserve and/or increase overall experience quality. For instance, at the current reported levels of social, situational, and ecological impacts on the WMNF, there is an approximate 95% likelihood of visitor engagement in both resource or temporal substitution. The pervasive application of both resource and temporal substitution behaviors is likely to impact the visitors,

ecosystems, and communities surrounding the WMNF. As a result of resource substitution, visitation often spreads from high- to low-use areas, leading to significant social and ecological impacts. With temporal substitution, visitation may shift to different times of the day, week, month, or year; potentially alleviating conventional high-use periods (e.g., summers, holiday weekends), while increasing overall visitation, especially during off-peak periods (e.g., shoulder seasons, weekdays). These scenarios create unique visitation management challenges, especially for ecosystems and surrounding communities. Additionally, this study has demonstrated that both crowding and situational factors are significant drivers of coping behaviors. Therefore, resource managers should proactively and systematically work with local communities and stakeholders to minimize the presence of sub-optimal conditions and prioritize communication and engagement strategies, especially in areas proximate to recreation sites known for crowding, conflict, and situational impacts.

### ***5.3 Implications for Future Research***

This study has several implications for future research including segmenting recreation visitors, further investigating the influence of various exogenous and endogenous factors, broadening the study sample, and applying a mixed-methods study approach. This study focused on WMNF visitors as a whole, but there may be merit in examining the influence of individual outdoor recreation activities upon the stress-coping process. Future studies might consider segmenting visitors by primary activity, focusing on those activities more susceptible to sub-optimal conditions (e.g., downhill skiing). These segmentations could help identify and rank order recreation activities in terms of their vulnerability. Next, there may be other exogenous factors outside of social, situational, and ecological factors that may influence coping behaviors. For example, displacement was the weakest of the four models, implying there remains a need to

identify which variables may influence visitor decisions to completely abandon their recreation experiences. Future research might consider examining the influence of factors such as motivations, experience use history, and specialization upon coping behaviors.

Further, there may be other endogenous factors, aside from satisfaction, that can serve as an outcome variable in the stress-coping model. Future research might consider utilizing endogenous factors such as intention to return, health outcomes, or management preferences. This study focused on in-state residents as they made up the majority of WMNF visitors, which may be a limitation. Future research might consider broadening the study sample to allow for further generalization of findings. Due to funding limitations as well as COVID-19 related travel restrictions, the study sample consisted of only New Hampshire residents. Future research could benefit from the expansion of the sample into surrounding and adjacent states. Finally, future studies should consider the application of a mixed-methods and multi-discipline approach to SES. Applying mixed methodologies and multi-disciplinary approaches to assess social, situational, and ecological impacts upon visitors, ecosystem health of the landscape, communities, and entire regions may aid in a further assessing the operation of the entire system.

## CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest social, situational, and ecological factors significantly influenced visitor decision-making and overall experience quality on the WMNF. Findings indicate visitors were able to effectively cope with situational and ecological impacts but were largely unable to cope with crowding and conflict related impacts. Study results suggest a positive feedback loop may be ongoing; one which continues to increase the magnitude of impacts and further destabilize the overall system. When visitors first employ coping behaviors in response to influencing factors, these behavioral adaptations may introduce new impacts, or exacerbate existing ones. As visitors continue to encounter these magnifying impacts they often then employ additional coping behaviors. If left unchecked, these impacts may increase the prevalence and severity of substitution behaviors, leading to significant downstream effects upon the visitors, communities, and regions who rely upon the WMNF. Recognizing that parks and protected areas serve as vital ecological, social, cultural, and economic hubs, resource managers and policymakers should consider a SES approach towards the sustainable management of these priceless resources. This research advances the SES framework and validates the importance of integrating recreation, natural resource, and community considerations when sustainably managing parks and protected areas.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allred, S. B., & Ross-Davis, A. (2011). The drop-off and pick-up method: An approach to reduce nonresponse bias in natural resource surveys. *Small-Scale Forestry*, 10(3), 305-318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11842-010-9150-y>
- Anderson, D. & Brown, P. (1984). The displacement process in recreation. *Journal of leisure research*, 16(1), 61-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1984.11969573>
- Blenderman, A., Taff, B. D., Schwartz, F., & Lawhon, B. (2018). Dog guardians' perceptions and behaviors related to the disposal of pet waste in city of Boulder open space and mountain parks. *Final Report prepared for City of Boulder, Colorado, Open Space and Mountain Parks by Pennsylvania State University and the Leave No Trace Center for Outdoor Ethics*. From <https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/catalog/15315aib10>
- Boyer, T. A., Melstrom, R. T., & Sanders, L. D. (2017). Effects of climate variation and water levels on reservoir recreation. *Lake and Reservoir Management*, 33(3), 223-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402381.2017.1285375>
- Buckley, R. (2004). *Ecological impacts of ecotourism*. CABI publishing. DOI: [10.1079/9780851998107.0000](https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851998107.0000)
- Bultena, G. L., & Klessig, L. L. (1969). Satisfaction in camping: A conceptualization and guide to social research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1(4), 348-354. DOI: [10.1080/00222216.1969.11969749](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1969.11969749)
- Burns, R.C., Graefe, A.R., & Absher, J.D. (2003). Alternative measurement approaches to recreational customer satisfaction: Satisfaction-only versus gap scores. *Leisure Sciences*, 25, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714044496>
- Casola, W. R., Peterson, M. N., Pacifici, K., & Moorman, C. E. (2021). Public support and visitation impacts of Sunday hunting on public hunting lands. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 26(1), 94-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871209.2020.1811923>
- Cole, D. N. (1992). Modeling wilderness campsites: Factors that influence amount of impact. *Ecological management*, 16(2), 255-264. DOI: 10.1007/BF02393831
- Cole, D. N., & Hall, T. E. (2005). Wilderness visitors and experiences in Oregon and Washington: Trailhead surveys in thirteen Forest Service wildernesses. [Unpublished paper]. From <http://leopold.wilderness.net/research/fprojects/docs7/TrailheadSurvey.pdf>.
- Ferguson, M. D., Evensen, D., Ferguson L. A., Bidwell, D., Firestone, J., Dooley, T. L., & Mitchell, C. R. (2021). Uncharted waters: Exploring coastal recreation impacts, coping behaviors, and attitudes towards offshore wind energy development in the United States. *Energy Research and Social Science* 75(1), 1-10. 10.1016/j.erss.2021.102029.
- Ferguson, M. D., Lynch, M. L., Miller, Z. D., Ferguson, L. A., & Newman, P. (2020). What do outdoor recreationists think of fracking? Politics, ideology, and perceptions of shale gas

- energy development in Pennsylvania State Forests. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 62(1), 1-9. 10.1016/j.erss.2019.101384.
- Ferguson, M. D., Lynch, M. L., Powers, S. L., Barrett, A. B., Evensen, D., Graefe, A. R., & Mowen, A. J. (2019b). The Impacts of Shale Natural Gas Energy Development on Outdoor Recreation: A Statewide Assessment of Pennsylvanians. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 27(1), 1-10. 10.1016/j.jort.2019.100230
- Ferguson, M. D., Powers, S. L., Trautvein, N., Jacquet, J. B., Graefe, A. R., & Mowen, A. J. (2019a). Winds of Change: Predicting Water-Based Recreationists' Support and Opposition for Offshore Wind Energy Development in the Great Lakes. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 45(1), 187-195. 10.1016/j.jglr.2018.10.006
- Ferguson, M. D., Burns, R. C., & Smaldone, D. (2018b). Innovations in Outdoor Recreation Visitor Use Management: Applying Market Segmentation at the Timberline Lodge Recreation Complex. *International Leisure Review*, 7(1), 108-131. 10.6298/ILR.201806\_7(01).0006
- Ferguson, M. D., Mueller, J. T., Graefe, A. R., & Mowen, A. J. (2018a). Coping with climate change: a study of Great Lakes water-based recreationists. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 36(2). <https://doi.org/10.18666/JPRA-2018-V36-I2-8296>
- Gartner, W. C., & Lime, D. W. (Eds.). (2000). *Trends in outdoor recreation, leisure, and tourism*. Cabi. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unh/detail.action?docID=314290>
- Greenaway, R., Cessford, G., & Leppens, J. (2007). An exploration of recreation displacement in New Zealand. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 10(2), 146-167. DOI: [10.1080/11745398.2007.9686759](https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2007.9686759)
- Hall, T. E., & Cole, D. (2000, May 23-27). *An expanded perspective on displacement: A longitudinal study of visitors to two wildernesses in the Cascade Mountains of Oregon*. [Manuscript]. Wilderness science in a time of change conference—Volume 4: Wilderness visitors, experiences, and visitor management; 1999 May 23–27; Missoula, MT. From [https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs\\_p015\\_4/rmrs\\_p015\\_4\\_113\\_121.pdf](https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_p015_4/rmrs_p015_4_113_121.pdf)
- Hall, T. E., & Cole, D. (2007). Changes in the motivations, perceptions, and behaviors of recreation users: Displacement and coping in wilderness. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. <https://doi.org/10.2737/RMRS-RP-63>
- Hall, T. E., & Shelby, B. (2000). Temporal and spatial displacement: Evidence from a high-use reservoir and alternate sites. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(4), 435-456. DOI: 10.1080/00222216.2000.11949926
- Jackson-Smith, D., Flint, C. G., Dolan, M., Trentelman, C. K., Holyoak, G., Thomas, B., & Ma, G. (2016). Effectiveness of the drop-off/pick-up survey methodology in different neighborhood types. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 31(3), 3. From <https://grove.olemiss.edu/jrss/vol31/iss3/3>



- Jacob, G.R., & Schreyer, R. (1980). Conflict in outdoor recreation: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12(4), 368-380. DOI: [10.1080/00222216.1980.11969462](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1980.11969462)
- Johnson, A. K., & Dawson, C. P. (2004). An exploratory study of the complexities of coping behavior in Adirondack wilderness. *Leisure Sciences*, 26(3), 281-293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400490461963>
- Kim, J., Ferguson, M. D., Hickerson, B. D., & Mowen, A. J. (2019). The Association of Constraints, Negotiations, and Social Influences with Recreation Specialization among Recreational Participants. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 37(1), 40-58. 10.18666/JPra-2019-8794
- Kim, J., & Nicholls, S. (2016). Influence of the measurement of distance on assessment of recreation access. *Leisure sciences*, 38(2), 118-139. DOI: 10.1080/01490400.2015.1071211
- Lam-González, Y. E., León, C. J., & de Leon, J. (2019). Assessing the effects of the climatic satisfaction on nautical tourists' on-site activities and expenditure decisions. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 14, 100372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100372>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lee, J., Graefe, A. R., & Burns, R. C. (2004). Service quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intention among forest visitors. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 17(1), 73-82. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v17n01\\_05](https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v17n01_05)
- Lyon, K. M., & Vaske, J. J. (2010). Predicting hunting participation in response to chronic wasting disease in four states. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 15(3), 208-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871201003770004>
- Manning, R.E. (2011). *Studies in outdoor recreation: Search and research for satisfaction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Manning, R., & Valliere, W. (2001). Coping in outdoor recreation: Causes and consequences of crowding and conflict among community residents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 33(4), 410-426. DOI: [10.1080/00222216.2001.11949952](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2001.11949952)
- Manning, R., Valliere, W., Minter, B., Wang, B., & Jacobi, C. (2000). Crowding in Parks and Outdoor Recreation: A Theoretical, Empirical, and Managerial Analysis. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration*, 18(4). From <https://unh.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=31722652&site=eds-live>
- Marcouiller, D. W., Scott, I., & Prey, J. (2005). *Addressing recreation conflict: Providing a conceptual basis for management* [Manuscript in preparation]. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin.

- Marion, J. L., & D. N. Cole. (1996). Spatial and temporal variation in soil and vegetation impacts on campsites. *Ecological Applications*, (6), 520–530. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2269388>
- McCreary, A., Seekamp, E., Larson, L. R., Smith, J. W., & Davenport, M. A. (2019). Predictors of visitors' climate-related coping behaviors in a nature-based tourism destination. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 26, 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2019.03.005>
- Miller, B. W., Caplow, S. C., & Leslie, P. W. (2012). Feedbacks between conservation and social-ecological systems. *Conservation Biology*, 26(2), 218-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2012.01823.x>
- Miller, C., & Vaske, J. (2003). Individual and situational influences on declining hunter effort in Illinois. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 8(4), 263-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/716100421>
- Miller, T. A., & McCool, S. F. (2003). Coping with stress in outdoor recreational settings: An application of transactional stress theory. *Leisure Sciences*, 25(2), 257-275. DOI: 10.1080/01490400306562
- Miller, Z. D., Ferguson, L. A., Newman, P., Ferguson, M. D., Tipton, N., Taff, B. D., & Sparrow, V. (2020). Developing Visitor Thresholds of Sound from Natural Gas Compressors for Motorized and Non-Motorized Recreation Users in Pennsylvania State Forests. *Applied Acoustics*, 157(1)1-8. 10.1016/j.apacoust.2019.107012
- Morse, W. (2020). Recreation as a social-ecological complex adaptive system. *Sustainability*, 12(753), 1-16. doi:10.3390/su12030753
- National Forest Foundation. (2020). *White Mountain National Forest*. Nationalforests.org. <https://www.nationalforests.org/our-forests/find-a-forest/white-mountain-national-forest>
- Outdoor Foundation. (2020). Outdoor Participation Report. Outdoorindustry.org. <https://outdoorindustry.org/resource/2020-outdoor-participation-report/>
- Rice, W. L., Mateer, T., Taff, B. D., Lawhon, B., Reigner, N., & Newman, P. (2020). Longitudinal changes in the outdoor recreation community's reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic: Final report on a three-phase national survey of outdoor enthusiasts. SocArXiv Papers. DOI: [10.31235/osf.io/gnjcy](https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/gnjcy)
- Schneider, I. E., & Hammitt, W. E. (1995). Visitor response to outdoor recreation conflict: A conceptual approach. *Leisure sciences*, 17(3), 223-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409509513258>
- Schroeder, S. A., Fulton, D. C., Cornicelli, L., & McInenly, L. E. (2020). Recreation conflict, coping, and satisfaction: Minnesota grouse hunters' conflicts and coping response related to all-terrain vehicle users, hikers, and other hunters. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 30, 100282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2020.100282>

- Shelby, B., & Vaske, J. J. (1991). Resource and activity substitutes for recreational salmon fishing in New Zealand. *Leisure Sciences*, 13(1), 21-32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409109513122>
- Starbuck, C. M., Berrens, R. P., & McKee, M. (2006). Simulating changes in forest recreation demand and associated economic impacts due to fire and fuels management activities. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8(1), 52-66.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2004.05.004>
- Steele, J., Bourke, L., Luloff, A. E., Liao, P. S., Theodori, G. L., & Krannich, R. S. (2001). The drop-off/pick-up method for household survey research. *Community Development*, 32(2), 238-250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330109489680>
- Sutherland, S. (1996). *The international dictionary of psychology*. New York: Crossroad.
- Trentelman, C. K., Irwin, J., Petersen, K. A., Ruiz, N., & Szalay, C. S. (2016). The case for personal interaction: Drop-off/pick-up methodology for survey research. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 31(3), 4. From <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jrss/vol31/iss3/4>
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2005). *Visitor use report White Mountain NF*.  
[https://apps.fs.usda.gov/nvum/results/ReportCache/2005\\_A09022\\_Master\\_Report.pdf](https://apps.fs.usda.gov/nvum/results/ReportCache/2005_A09022_Master_Report.pdf)
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2005). *White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*.
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2015). *Visitor use report White Mountain NF*.  
[https://apps.fs.usda.gov/nvum/results/ReportCache/2015\\_A09022\\_Master\\_Report.pdf](https://apps.fs.usda.gov/nvum/results/ReportCache/2015_A09022_Master_Report.pdf)
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2016.) *Jobs and income: Economic contributions in 2016 at a glance*.  
<https://www.fs.fed.us/emc/economics/contributions/documents/at-a-glance/published/eastern/AtaGlance-WhiteMountain.pdf>
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2020). *White Mountain National Forest: Facts about the forest*. fs.usda.gov.  
<https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/whitemountain/about-forest/?cid=FSEPRD580336>
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2020). *White Mountain National Forest: Forest Discovery Trail Curriculum*. fs.usda.gov.  
[https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5262234.pdf](https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5262234.pdf)
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2020). *White Mountain History and Culture*. fs.usda.gov. <https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/whitemountain/learning/history-culture/?cid=stelprd3794287>

- Verbos, R. I., & Brownlee, M. T. (2017). The Weather Dependency Framework (WDF): A tool for assessing the weather dependency of outdoor recreation activities. *Journal of outdoor recreation and tourism*, 18, 88-99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2017.02.005>
- Wallen, K. E., Landon, A. C., Kyle, G. T., Schuett, M. A., Leitz, J., & Kurzawski, K. (2016). Mode effect and response rate issues in mixed-mode survey research: implications for recreational fisheries management. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 36(4), 852-863. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02755947.2016.1165764>
- Westphal, L. M., Watkins, C., Gobster, P. H., Heneghan, L., Ross, K., Ross, L., Tudor, Madeleine., Wali, Alaka., Wise, D. H., Vining, J., & Zellner, M. (2014). Social science methods used in the RESTORE project. *Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-138*. Newtown Square, PA: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 116 p., 138, 1-116. <https://doi.org/10.2737/NRS-GTR-138>
- White, D. D., Virden, R. J., & Riper, C. J. (2008). Effects of place identity, place dependence, and experience-use history on perceptions of recreation impacts in a natural setting. *Ecological Management*, 42, 647-657. DOI 10.1007/s00267-008-9143-1
- Whittaker, D. & Shelby, B. (2002) Evaluating instream flows for recreation: Applying the structural norm approach to biophysical conditions. *Leisure Sciences*, 24:3-4, 363-374, DOI: [10.1080/01490400290050808](https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400290050808)
- Williams, D. R. (1988, January 13-14). *Great expectations and the limits to satisfaction: A review of recreation and consumer satisfaction research*. [General technical report]. Outdoor recreation benchmark 1988: Proceedings of the National Outdoor Recreation Forum, Tampa, Florida. <https://doi.org/10.2737/SE-GTR-52>

APPENDICES

## Appendix A: WMNF Visitor's Sociodemographic Characteristics

**Table 1.** WMNF Visitor's Sociodemographic Characteristics

<b>Variable</b>	<b>% or Mean</b>	<b>n</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	47%	302
Female	46.6%	299
<b>Age</b>		
Average age	56 years	
18-35	10.6%	63
36-50	22.8%	135
51-64	30.6%	181
65 and Older	36%	213
<b>Race/Ethnic Background</b>		
White	88.9%	571
Other	11.1%	71
<b>Education</b>		
Less than High School	>1.0%	2
Some High School	>1.0%	1
High School Graduate	9%	54
Some College	9.8%	59
Two Year College	9.8%	59
Four Year College	31.6%	190
Graduate or Professional Degree	39.4%	237
<b>Political Ideology<sup>a</sup></b>		
Mean	3.62	591
Liberal	46.7%	276
Moderate	29.4%	174
Conservative	23.9%	141

\*Note. Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Note. Political Ideology (1= extreme liberal, 4= moderate, 7= extreme conservative)

**Table 2.** WMNF Visitor's Trip Visitation Characteristics

<b>Variable</b>	<b>% or Mean</b>	<b>n</b>
<b>Primary Activity Type</b>		
Hiking/Walking	50.1%	326
Backpacking	2.2%	13
Mountain Biking or Bicycling	2.4%	14
Non-motorized boating	1%	6
Hunting or fishing	3.7%	22
Downhill skiing/snowboarding	9.3%	55
Cross-country skiing or snowshoeing	2.4%	14
Snowmobiling	1%	6
Sightseeing or viewing natural features/wildlife	8.4%	50
Picnicking or family day gatherings	>1%	4
Driving for pleasure	6.6%	39
Relaxing and hanging out	2.7%	16
Camping (Developed, underdeveloped, etc.)	2.5%	15

Other	2%	12
<b><i>Residency Status</i></b>		
New Hampshire Resident	91.2%	551
<b><i>Experience Use History</i></b>		
Average days per month recreating	4.9 days	581
Average days per year recreating	36.1 days	553
Average total years recreating	30.8 years	571
<b><i>Distance Traveled from Home</i></b>		
Median distance traveled	59.51 miles	604
Visitors traveling 50 miles or less	68.2%	412

\*Note. Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

## Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter

## University of New Hampshire

Research Integrity Services, Service Building  
51 College Road, Durham, NH 03824-3585  
Fax: 603-862-3564

13-May-2020

Ferguson, Michael D

**IRB #:** 8309

**Study:** Informing Visitor Use Management and Displacement on the White Mountain National Forest

**Approval Date:** 13-May-2020

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB) has reviewed and approved the protocol for your study as Exempt as described in Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 46, Subsection 104(d). Approval is granted to conduct your study as described in your protocol.

Researchers who conduct studies involving human subjects have responsibilities as outlined in the attached document, *Responsibilities of Directors of Research Studies Involving Human Subjects*. (This document is also available at <http://unh.edu/research/irb-application-resources>.) Please read this document carefully before commencing your work involving human subjects.

Note: IRB approval is separate from UNH Purchasing approval of any proposed methods of paying study participants. Before making any payments to study participants, researchers should consult with their BSC or UNH Purchasing to ensure they are complying with institutional requirements. If such institutional requirements are not consistent with the confidentiality or anonymity assurances in the IRB-approved protocol and consent documents, the researcher may need to request a modification from the IRB.

Upon completion of your study, please complete the enclosed Exempt Study Final Report form and return it to this office along with a report of your findings.

If you have questions or concerns about your study or this approval, please feel free to contact Melissa McGee at 603-862-2005 or [melissa.mcgee@unh.edu](mailto:melissa.mcgee@unh.edu). Please refer to the IRB # above in all correspondence related to this study. The IRB wishes you success with your research.

For the IRB,



Julie F. Simpson  
Director

cc: File