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ABSTRACT

Many people maintain a deep connection to the settings in which they live, work, and play. This connection is known as a sense of place, a theoretical construct encompassing the meanings, experiences, behaviors, and identities that people ascribe to particular geographic spaces. This project uses qualitative social research methods to examine sense of place. Specifically, it develops a detailed understanding of important places, the experiences and meanings that give rise to that importance, and the ways in which experiences and meanings contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place.

The project utilizes two distinct data sets – one representing a setting context and one representing an activity context. The setting-based data was gathered from community members in Seward, Alaska, a town of 2,830 people located at the gateway to both Kenai Fjords National Park and Chugach National Forest. The activity-based data was gathered from Forest Service volunteers at the Russian River Campground, one of the most popular fishing and camping spots in Alaska.

The data gathered in Seward (the setting context) revealed that sense of place is organized in terms of the landscape, with particular emphasis on the beauty of the surroundings and perceived threats to important natural resources; the community, and its relationships with history, pride, and tourism; recreation spaces, and their importance in both social and solitary settings; and Seward as a homeplace, with unchanging landscapes, friends, and family.

The data gathered from the volunteers (the activity context) revealed that sense of place is organized in terms of the Russian River itself, with its unique landscapes and wildlife; interactions with like minded volunteers in and around the campground; recreation spaces at the Russian River and in Cooper Landing, and the campground as a place to teach and give back.

This project confirms the interaction of meanings and experiences with important settings in the creation of a sense of place; reveals threats and risk as important place meanings; demonstrates that the experiences and meanings described by the Forest Service volunteers were in large measure based on place, in addition to activity; provides additional examples of the creation of sense of place from both direct and symbolic experiences; and confirms the importance of community as an ingredient of sense of place.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Many people maintain a deep connection to the places in which they live, work, and play. This connection is known as a sense of place, and is built upon the meanings people create as they experience day-to-day life. The places in which people live their lives can be directly experienced, such as a hiking trail or a crowded city street, or they can be symbolic, such a far-away place that represents past experiences or shared values. A sense of place can be setting-based, representing the actual places in which people interact with one another. It can also be activity-based, characterizing the places where people earn a living, engage in leisure, or make their home. These setting-based and activity-based contexts, and the experiences and relationships that happen within, are the most useful frame through which the meanings of sense of place can be understood.

For example, imagine a small New England town that is experiencing growing pains as more and more tourists arrive to view the fall foliage and interact with local people. This rural tourism prompts rapid growth, providing the community with increased revenues and providing the local residents with amenities such as restaurants or theatres that may not otherwise exist. However, the influx of people has changed the community’s social, political, and economic landscapes - altering traffic patterns, challenging service providers, and driving up property values. How do the local residents perceive these changes to their community? How have these changes altered the ways in which local people respond to each other and the community as a whole? How are their lives different?

Also, imagine a group of volunteers who come together once a month to perform maintenance on a long distance hiking trail that runs the entire length of their home state.
As they work, they discuss not only the construction of the trail itself, but also their concern with the encroachment of timber interests, the development of lands surrounding the trail, and the growing demand for backcountry recreation opportunities that are seemingly at odds with the solitude and quiet of the woods. How do these issues influence the volunteers’ connection to the landscape? Does the simple act of volunteering change the way they view the places that are important to them?

The place meanings that answer these questions (in both setting-based and activity-based contexts) are a complex creation of social and individual interactions, one that impacts the ways in which people respond to the world around them. Therefore, understanding how people create a sense of place (or have it created for them by someone else) can ultimately help untangle the questions that arise as places, experiences, and meanings change. Put simply, sense of place provides insight into how people feel about social spaces, and also what people do in them – how they engage their community, each other, and the natural resources around them.

This project uses photo-based social research methods to examine sense of place. It develops a detailed understanding of important places, the experiences and meanings that give rise to that importance, and the ways in which experiences and meanings contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place. It utilizes two distinct data sets – one representing a setting context and one representing an activity context. The setting-based data was gathered from community members in Seward, Alaska, a town of 2,830 people located at the gateway to both a National Park and a National Forest. The activity-based data was gathered from Forest Service volunteers at the Russian River Campground, one of the most popular fishing and camping spots in Alaska.
Chapter Two reviews the literature and research surrounding the theoretical concepts of sense of place, community, and volunteering. Chapter Three, in addition to describing the project methods, illustrates both the community of Seward and an active volunteer program located at the Russian River Campground in the town of Cooper Landing. Chapters Four and Five present the results of the research, while Chapter Six uses the findings to assess the role of the work within the greater scholarships of sense of place, community, and volunteering.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

The purpose of this project is to understand the sense of place of people who live, work, and play in rural places. To do this, it will utilize two different sets of data: one that is setting-focused, gathered from people in and around a small community; and one that is activity-focused, gathered from people of different communities who join together to volunteer their time at a heavily-used recreation site. This chapter establishes the project’s underlying research questions by invoking the literature and theory surrounding sense of place, the local community, and volunteering.

Sense of place

Sense of place is a broad term used to “refer to the cognitions and affective sentiments held regarding a particular geographic locale” (Farnum et al., 2004, p.2). In its simplest form, sense of place is often defined using the equation of place = space + meaning (Tuan, 1977). Specifically, the meanings that are added to geographic space describe what a place means to an individual, rather than how much it means (Stedman et al., 2004). Research has found that these place-based meanings are created with input from natural forces, cultural forces, personal values, and symbolic perceptions, either on their own or working in tandem (Berger & Luckman, 1967; Grieder & Garkovich, 1994; Stedman et al., 2004). For example, Stedman (2003a) determined that the actual attributes of a high-amenity setting in northern Wisconsin helped predict a variety of place-based meanings. On the other hand, Eisenhauer et al. (2000) found that socially derived meanings, such as the importance of family and friends, work together with landscape characteristics to inform sense of place.
However, sense of place is more than just a set of socially constructed or landscape-based meanings. It also consists of evaluations, which are judgements that people make in regard to particular places. Evaluations are organized in terms of place attachment, place dependence, place identity, and place satisfaction. The first, place attachment, describes the emotional connections (both positive and negative) between people and place (Altman and Low, 1992; Williams, 2002). Specifically, these emotional connections are often used to reflect upon the importance of the setting (Altman and Low, 1992; Hummon, 1992; Moore and Graefe, 1994; Stedman et al., 2004; Williams et al., 1992). Some feel that place attachment is based strictly on the landscape: Shumaker and Taylor (1983) describe a “multilevel person-place bond that evolves from specifiable conditions of place” (p.221). However, others suggest that place attachment is driven by meanings and experiences: Stedman et al. (2004) suggest that “we attribute meanings to our settings, and in turn become attached to the meanings” (p.581). In some research (i.e. Moore and Graefe, 1994; Kyle & Chick, 2007), place attachment is a multidimensional concept, used to encompass many different evaluations of place. However, Jorgensen and Stedman (2001) found only mixed evidence of this multidimensionality, finding instead that place attachment is distinct from evaluations such as place dependence or place identity (Stedman, 2003a, p.683).

A second evaluation, place dependence, reflects the ability of the setting to help an individual achieve certain goals (Rubenstein & Parmelee, 1992; Stedman et al., 2004; Stokols & Shumaker, 1981). Place dependence arises from comparing one site to another: it is the “perceived behavioral advantage of a spatial setting relative to other settings” (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001, p.238). One’s place dependence then helps determines how
that place is valued. For example, place dependence is at work when a fisherman values her local lake more highly than other lakes in the area, because she sees it as necessary for her enjoyment in catching fish, operating a boat, or socializing with her friends and family.

The third evaluation, place identity, is the extent to which a setting helps an individual develop and maintain a sense of self (Proshansky, 1978; Stedman et al., 2004). This sense of self, a “complex pattern of conscious and unconscious ideas, beliefs, preferences, feelings, values, goals and behavioral tendencies and skills” (Proshansky, 1978, p.155), informs how people see themselves in terms of the environment around them. For example, growing up in an area rich in lakes and mountains may help a young person develop a leisure identity founded upon boating and hiking.

The fourth evaluation, place satisfaction, is a definition of attitude (like or dislike) towards a setting (Stedman, 2003a). In terms of research, the concept has been affiliated with two different sociological contexts: landscape and community. In community sociology, satisfaction is the “utilitarian value (of a place) to meet certain basic needs” (Guest & Lee, 1983, p.234). These needs include (but are not limited to) one’s access to, and the perceived quality of, amenities, public services, or aesthetic appearance (Fried, 1982; Herting & Guest, 1983; St. John et al., 1986). In terms of landscape, satisfaction has been measured in terms of how satisfied one is with elements such as scenery, water quality or shore development (see Stedman, 2003a; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001). It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that the judgements that go into place satisfaction can include both the landscape and quality of the local community (Mesch & Manor 1998, Ladewig & McCann, 1980). It is important to note that the attitudes that make up place
satisfaction are not the same as the connections to the landscape that are described by place attachment (Guest & Lee 1983). For example, “one may be satisfied with the setting but not particularly attached, and the reverse may also be true” (Stedman, 2003a, p.673).

While the meanings and evaluations described above are useful tools for organizing sense of place, research has revealed interrelationships and interactions between the concepts. For example, Jorgensen & Stedman (2001) operationalized several meaning-based constructs, and tested them using data from a survey of lakeshore residents. Although there were clear distinctions between each of the four evaluations, it was concluded that a “general evaluative dimension [of sense of place] better explained observed responses than did the domain-specific constructs” (p.582). This suggests that evaluations such as identity, attachment, and dependence are not necessarily multidimensional (Jorgensen & Stedman 2001; Stedman, 2006).

Where does sense of place come from? Sense of place comes from 1) direct experiences with a landscape, both in terms of the natural environment itself and the activities that take place within that environment, and 2) symbols, both directly and indirectly experienced, that describe what the landscape represents (Farnum et al., 2004). Supporters of the first perspective argue that personal experience is necessary for the creation of place-based meanings (Clarke & Stein, 2003; Kaltenborn, 1998; Relph, 1976; Stedman, 2003a; Tuan, 1977). For example, the more one recreates in a specific place, the more opportunity they have to develop skills, meet people, and develop their own perspective regarding the makeup of their surroundings. These various experiences will then layer up and create a sense of place based specifically on that particular area and
one’s (potentially growing) experiences within it. On the other hand, supporters of the second, symbolically driven perspective suggest that sense of place is more fluid, and can be created from afar, either with or without direct experience with the symbolic object (Brown et al., 2002; Galliano & Loeffler, 1999; Hammit et al., 2004; Schroeder, 2004). Their point is that certain experiences lead to the creation of symbols, which in turn lead to meanings. For instance, a war veteran, who has never visited the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, D.C., may see it as an important symbol of his or her attachment to the military base in Arizona where they served. Therefore the place itself represents the meaning, instead of creating it.

In terms of direct experiences, a sense of place is often represented by the characteristics of a setting - in other words, the setting “produces” sense of place (Stedman 2003b). The settings in which experiences occur can be both natural or manmade, and can include both high and low levels of amenities. For example, a college student can convey a sense of place based not only on the mountain that includes her favorite hike, but also on the strip-mall where she went on her first date. J.B. Jackson, a noted architectural historian, referred to the latter manmade settings as the “vernacular landscape,” a concrete representation of reality shared by those who experience a setting (1984). However, Jackson refused to separate the natural from the manmade, specifically defining a landscape as “a portion of the earth’s surface that can be comprehended at a glance” (Jackson, 1984, p8).

When sense of place is built upon direct experiences, in both natural and manmade settings, people will report a more specific sense of place based on their memories, activities, or relationships with others. On the other hand, when sense of place
is constructed around symbols (that represent the meaning), people will be less specific, relating ideas that are connected more to their own identity. For instance, people who feel strongly about hiking will give specific examples of the trail, past hikes, or their hiking companions. People who are connected to a less-specific notion of “home,” on the other hand, will give broader examples of family or growing up. Additionally, a particular symbolic object or place can invoke broad, non-personal concepts and meanings such as freedom, justice, or equality (Rokeach, 1976).

On what levels does sense of place work? Sense of place can be created at 1) a personal, individual level, or 2) a social, group-based level. For example, sense of place can be created at the personal level by the interaction of age or gender, which are intrinsic motivators encouraging people to engage in behaviors (such as joining a senior center or participating in a women’s hiking group) that ultimately strengthen their place-based connections (Pelletier et al., 2002; Reis et al., 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Personal emotions, encompassing psycho-physiological, motivational, clinical and evolutionary perspectives, also play a role (Plutchik, 2003). For example, Lee and Shafer (2002), in a leisure context, suggest an interactional relationship between emotion and place. Their ‘affect control theory’ suggests that a person’s initial feelings about his/her setting, after several permutations, will result in the creation of the type of emotions that could end up contributing to sense of place (Lee & Shafer, 2002).

Sense of place is created at a social, group-based level through the process of social interaction. Some researchers (e.g., Eisenhauer et al., 2000) suggest that these social interactions are formed around specific activities, people, or community connections. These connections within and between social groups create new place-based
meanings and symbols (Gieryn, 2000; Greider & Garkovich, 1994; Yung et al., 2003). Kyle and Chick (2002) searched for these meanings and symbols among a group of tenters at a Pennsylvania agricultural fair, and found that social relationships “with family and friends were the primary source of personal relevance and were identified as the most important element of their experience” (p.426). This confirmed the relevance of social symbolic interactionism, a theoretical construct based upon the idea that people create sense of place through their interactions with others (Kyle & Chick, 2002).

These interactions are further elucidated by Grieder and Garkovich (1994), who suggest that definitions of natural landscapes are constructed “through social interactions among members of a culture as they negotiate [their own] meanings of nature and the environment” (p.5). The definition of a landscape, in their view, is indistinguishable from the social context in which it was created. As a result, “cultural groups socially construct landscapes as reflections of themselves” (p.8). This social constructionist perspective reveals the importance of understanding the various roles and identities of a group: “what is important in any consideration of environmental change is the meaning of that change for those that have incorporated the physical environment into their definition of themselves” (p.21).

Social interactions between people from different backgrounds also contribute to sense of place (Williams & Patterson, 1999). For example, place-based meanings can be created when someone from one culture tells someone else from another culture how they “ought” to feel, as in the case of interpretative signs at a national park telling people what is “important” about a particular place. Additionally, these cultural differences that emerge from differences in group identity are often a major reason why participants
encounter a wide array of structural, intrapersonal, and interpersonal constraints (Livengood & Stodolska, 2004; Shaw & Henderson, 2005; Shinew & Floyd, 2005) which in turn can prevent the creation of the meanings necessary for the development of sense of place.

Social, group-based interactions at the community level also contribute to sense of place. Social researchers have measured these types of social interactions in particular settings (Stedman et al., 2004) and are in the process of connecting sense of place to the features and interactions of the community in which it occurs (Stedman et al., 2006). Work on sense of place and community is still emerging. Although, as noted above, interactions between people are not necessary for creating attachment, the connections and distinctions between community and sense of place are important, and will be described in detail later in this chapter.

Distinguishing between a sense of place created by an individual social actor and a sense of place influenced by larger social structures is difficult because individual and social perceptions inform one another (Mills, 1959). Specifically, people tend to perceive social issues as a proxy for their own personal troubles by connecting their daily experiences to the social order (Mills, 1959). A good example of this “sociological imagination” is a person in poverty, who connects their situation to the social forces (prejudice, discrimination) that work to keep them there. Sense of place researchers must, therefore, study people within whatever social context informs their perception of the world around them.

*How has sense of place been studied?* The ontological nature of sense of place is multifaceted. According to Patterson & Williams (2005), place-based research has
conceptually emerged from ontologies emphasizing “behavior as a means of satisfying underlying goals, the nature or meaning of experience as a basis for understanding behaviors, or the invisibility of person-world intimacy” (p.367). As a result, research programs have ranged from those with multivariate, single reality assumptions to those assuming “multiple, holistic realities” (Patterson & Williams, 2005, p.367). Because of this multiplicity of frameworks, “it is more appropriate to view place as a domain of research informed by multiple research traditions” (Patterson & Williams, 2005).

As with all research endeavors, the two most fundamental research traditions informing place research are the phenomenological and positivist traditions (Farnum et al., 2004). Phenomenology, emerging from the notion that “social theory in a range of disciplines is being transformed to demand an account of subjectivity, culture and ideology lived within determinate social and economic conditions” (Jones, 1989, p.19), can be defined as the telling of specific experiences from the lives of people who experience a specific phenomenon (Creswell, 1998). In sense of place contexts, phenomenological approaches consist of qualitative analyses that consider “place” as a whole instead of separating its individual ingredients (Hummon, 1992; Kruger, 1996; Cheng et al., 2003; Patterson & Williams, 2005). The phenomenological approach to place research marks an important distinction between the idea of sense of place as a singular, unified “thing” versus the idea of sense of place as the sum total of measurable attributes.

The positivist perspective, created initially by the sociologist Auguste Comte, suggests that only knowledge derived in a scientific fashion is accurate and “true” (Coser, 1977; Jary & Jary, 1991). Furthermore, whatever research emerges from this perspective
“presumes that history repeats itself; that what can be learned from past events can
generalize to future events – in the same setting and in different settings” (Erickson,
1986, p.116). In the context of place research, Stedman (2003b) suggested that a sole
focus on phenomenology can limit the discourse by hindering the creation of principles
and hypotheses that are more commonly applied in management contexts. As examples
of insightful work, he cites numerous quantitative attempts to assess sense of place in
terms of strength of attachment and identity (Cuba & Hummon, 1993; Kaltenborn, 1998;
Shamai, 1991), multidimensional interactions between identity and dependence (Lalli,
1992; Williams et al., 1992), and analytical separations of meanings, settings, and
behavior (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001).

The usefulness of both quantitative and qualitative approaches has fertilized a
large measure of innovation in sense of place research. A primary example is the use of
photographs (Farnum et al., 2004). Researchers have either asked people to photograph
their own special places (Stedman et al., 2004; Stewart et al., 2003), or showed them
existing photos (Jones et al., 2000). Participants in these types of photographic research
are usually interviewed, with their stories and reasoning either qualitatively (Stedman et
al., 2006) or quantitatively (Beckley et al., 2007) analyzed to determine why the place in
the photograph is important.

*Frames of thought.* Place researchers have put sense of place to practice by
creating a variety of interesting research agendas. For example, one area of research is
referred to by Farnum et al. (2004) as the “politics of place.” This approach considers the
role of place meanings and local emotions in broader socio-political conflict discourses
such as resource allocation, authority, and globalization (Cheng et al., 2003; Farnum et
al., 2004; Gieryn, 2000; Stokowski, 2002). A practical example of the “politics of place” at work is the notion of environmental justice. Based primarily upon dominant power structures, the concept of environmental justice invokes research describing how landfills, dumps, and other environmentally unfriendly industries are located in poor, predominantly African-American communities (Bullard, 2000; Byrne et al., 2002; Lester et al., 2001). This state of affairs is driven by the conflicting externalities of power, voice, affluence, education, and in some cases, racism (Timney, 2002).

Sense of place is also becoming integrated into management research (Farnum et al., 2004). An example of management research into sense of place (that is closely related to experiences) has to do with “local versus nonlocal” attachment to public lands (Farnum et al., 2004, p.19). Research has found that people who live in close proximity to public lands can be strongly connected to them, especially when their economic well-being is connected to the use of those lands (Beckley, 2003; Bonaiuto et al., 2002). Similarly, local residents may be more interested in the environmental impacts that result from local land management than those who live away (Kaltenborn & Williams, 2002; Smaldone, 2002).

In summary, sense of place is ultimately constructed around what a particular place means, and how people evaluate it based on these meanings. It is a complex recipe that includes settings, behaviors, (including interactions with others and with the local landscape), and evaluations of interwoven personal and social contexts. Sense of place is highly personal, because it incorporates our individual interactions with the world around us. Yet because people connect the events of their own lives to the workings of society, sense of place has a social component as well. What’s more, even when built upon shared
places, people, or experiences, sense of place will be felt and understood differently by different people.

So far, the geographic boundaries that people use to organize important places and meanings have been the primary focus of sense of place research. However, these boundaries encompass many aspects of people’s lives. On the one hand, place research has focused on natural areas and wilderness, including parks and recreation areas (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Moore & Graefe, 1994; Stedman et al., 2004). On the other hand, place research includes areas germane to people’s day-to-day lives, such as the local community (Corcoran, 2002; Hummon, 1992; Karsada & Janowitz, 1974; Kemmis, 1990; Oldenburg, 1999; Stedman, 2002). Other research connects both - for example, Stedman et al. (2006) proposed a matrix of interaction describing the relationship between sense of place and community in terms of not only the specific setting boundaries but societal interactions and interpersonal action as well. By asking questions such as “what sort of behaviors maintain place-based meanings” (p.399) they infer that sense of place is based not only on where people are, but who they interact with and what they do. Ultimately, there are distinct community contexts and activity contexts within sense of place. Therefore, it is necessary to unpack these contexts, and understand what they contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place.

Community and sense of place

What, exactly, is a community? To begin, theoretical conceptions of community are not always defined around a territorial referent. While Agrawal (1999) defines community as having spatial (in addition to social and normative) components, Theodori (2005) distinguishes between territory-free communities (groups of people, i.e. “the
internet community”) and territory-based communities (Theordori, 2005). A third category, occupational communities, consist of people who identify with one another in terms of work (Carroll, 2000; Carroll & Lee, 1990; Jackson et al., 2004). Despite these and other ways of conceiving community (i.e. communities of interest), this research focuses on territorially-based communities, which are the localized settings in which people live their day-to-day lives.

Some consider communities to be functioning systems involving humans. This functionalist theory, attributed to Durkheim (1956) and Parsons (1951) suggests that society is a system in which different actors and institutions perform different functions. Each of these functions then contributes to the smooth operation of the social system as a whole (Coser, 1977; Jary & Jary, 1991). An example of a functioning system is the natural environment, considered a “community” because of the interdependence between plants, animals, and people (Catton, 1994; Endter-Wada et al., 1998; Halstead et al., 1984; Poplin, 1979).

Other concepts of community are concerned not so much with the system as a whole but rather with which of the relevant actors in a community hold positions of power (Halstead et al., 1984). In their most common form, these conflict-based theories describe a social structure predicated upon ongoing battles among groups and classes over scarce resources (Coser, 1977; Jary & Jary, 1991). Although conflict theory is widely attributed to Marx, important contributions were made by Mills (1959) and Coser (1967). A good example of conflict in a community setting is the “growth machine” (Molotch, 1976). In this case, community governments are seen as being run by elite groups who focus on the value of community lands, often at the expense of the general
public who are more interested in how that land will be used. Although “growth machines” contribute to economic growth, population growth, and higher land values, there are often negative impacts upon the quality of life of community residents, such as sprawl, congestion, and low-wage employment.

Still others have suggested that the ultimate purpose of a community is to serve as an interface between the individual and the larger society (Rubin, 1969; Warren, 1978). This interface is jeopardized, however, if an area grows to the point where people can no longer feel a sense of community. Community in this sense also requires both people and structures to exist long enough to be of use to one another; and the continued existence of like-minded people to interact and identify with each other (Rubin, 1969).

A more commonly known (among both academics and the general public) construct that is often confused with community is “social capital”. Attributed to (Putnam, 2000), social capital is the sum-total of all the positive features of social life, “often characterized by norms of reciprocity and mutual trust” (p.34). These features in turn provide people with the impetus to engage in mutually beneficial behavior (Flora & Flora, 2003; Putnam, 2000). Social capital requires active community members, since its creation and maintenance is reliant on citizen engagement in government and other social institutions (Putnam, 2000).

Social capital theory, while useful in some contexts, has several features that differentiate it from community. First, according to Luloff and Bridger (2003), it ignores altruistic individuals (such as volunteers) who may contribute to their community or to others out of a sheer love for each other and their surroundings, rather than a rational and calculated decision process based on the expectation of return. Second, social capital fails
to account for pre-existing social structures and the emergence of collective action to solve community problems (Bridger & Luloff, 1999).

The most over-arching and fundamental definition of community, however, suggests that social interaction is the key ingredient in the emergence of a true community. This point of view was advanced by the work of Kaufman (1959), and later Wilkinson (1986, 1991). These authors created an interactional model of community theory built upon three elements: 1) the development of a local ecology, described as a “collective organization through which residents of a small territory meet their daily needs;” 2) the organization of social life - more specifically a local society consisting of “structures such as groups, firms, agencies, and facilities to meet all of the daily needs and express all the major categories of the common interests of people;” and 3) areas of community action, or “collective efforts to solve local problems and collective expressions of local identity and solidarity” (Wilkinson 1986, p.3).

However, community theory is not strict about whether or not one must actually live within a community in order to be an integral part of it. This is obvious when considering communities that are non-territory based, like Theodori’s example of the “internet community.” However, interactional and territory based communities have also made allowances for people who interact in ways that contribute to the community even thought they may only spend limited time within those community boundaries (Krannich and Luloff, 2002).

*The parallel structure of community and sense of place.* Sense of place and community parallel one another in terms of the two paths (described above) through which people interact with the landscape and each other. Sense of place is created
through cumulative, direct experience with a place, through processes such as recreation, home life, or work. It is also created symbolically, using ideas such as “a last frontier” or “a place apart” as a basis. Community is much the same way - people can maintain strong connections based either on direct experiences with others (social interactions, community development, etc) or symbolic representations (the “academic community” or the “internet community”). In both cases, these attachments are created regardless of whether a person has lived someplace their entire life, visited briefly, or never spent time there (Krannich and Luloff, 2002).

However, there is an important difference between the theories of sense of place and community. Social interactions, required for the existence of a community, are not necessary for the creation of sense of place. While sense of place can indeed be created through interactions with others (Brandenburg & Carroll, 1995; Eisenhauer et al., 2000), it can also be created through interactions with the natural and manmade environment (Relph, 1976, 1997; Tuan, 1977). Interactional community theory, on the other hand, is built upon collective organizations of people, who are in most cases territorially bounded. Put simply, sense of place can be an important ingredient of community, but community is not necessary for the creation of sense of place.

Despite this, people often use their perceptions of “community” as a frame of reference when describing their sense of place. They use political boundaries such as a town or city to more easily specify places of importance and give a geographic and social focus to the meanings and experiences that drive their sense of place. Therefore, sense of place can be approached as a feature that both binds and extends community theory,
providing a framework for understanding the effects of direct experience with, and
symbolic representations of, multiple special places.

In addition to this community context, the idea of *action* as an ingredient of sense
of place deserves additional focus. Specifically, what do people *do* in their special
places? Do their actions contribute to a sense of place or community? An example of a
specific activity that may be relevant to the sense of place discourse is volunteering,
especially as a form of leisure in a natural resource context.

Volunteering and sense of place
There is a wide variety of contexts in which people volunteer, some of which
contribute to sense of place in important ways. This study focuses on one context in
particular - volunteering at a heavily-used natural resource recreation site as a form of
leisure. Volunteering as a form of leisure does not enjoy a particularly long theoretical
history. According to Stebbins & Graham (2004), much of the earliest theoretical work
linking volunteering to leisure only dates back to the 1970’s. Early authors, such as Smith
(1975), include broad statements that suggest the voluntary nature of *all* leisure activity.
Later authors, such as Henderson (1984), or Fischer and Shaffer (1993), become more
specific, and bring the discourse forward both empirically and theoretically (for a
complete review, see Stebbins & Graham, 2004). As a result, scholars who ponder
volunteering as a form of leisure today can tap into a wide array of perspectives, ranging
from social-psychological analyses of volunteer motivations, expectations, and benefits
(Farmer & Fedor, 1999; Grese et al., 2000; Jackson, 2003; Liao-Troth, 2001; Propst et
al., 2004; Schroeder, 2000) to more applied investigations of volunteers and their
management (Barnett, 2002; Bradner, 1993; Brudney, 1999; Campion Devney, 1992;

Social and personal contexts of volunteering. Just like sense of place, the act of volunteering is situated in social or personal contexts, oftentimes simultaneously. For instance, Hustinx and Lammertin (2003) describe the social context as collective volunteering, which has at its foundation a “sense of duty or responsibility to a local community or more abstract collectivity” (p.173). Alternately, they describe the personal context as reflexive volunteering, which encompasses activity that is more closely attributed to one’s personal history and sense of self. This attention to the “individualized biography” (p.173) means that reflexive volunteering can be a response to either personal problems, or for the “self realization and the setting of personal goals” (Hustinx & Lammertyn, 2003, p.173). From a sociological perspective, this suggests that personal contexts of volunteering are strongly reminiscent of Mills’ “sociological imagination” (1959), an internal vision which incorporates the history and biography of an individual into a personal context from which s/he can identify differences between personal troubles and larger social issues.

The “group vs. individual” framework is also used to explain volunteer motivations. When operating for themselves, Wilson (2000) argues that volunteers actively use available information to help them make decisions about when, where, and how often to participate. Specifically, he states that “individual attributes can be grouped into those that emphasize motives or self-understandings on the one hand and those that emphasize rational action on the other” (Wilson, 2000, p.215). If, on the other hand, the
volunteers are acting in a group context (such as a group of co-workers volunteering together one Saturday on the trail), they focus more on the development of social ties and the organizational structure of the activities in which they engage (Wilson, 2000). Perhaps, then, their behavior is also rooted in Granovetter’s theory of “strong and weak ties” (1973), which suggests that societies consist of individuals who maintain relationships with others of varying strengths.

In summary, the volunteer theorizing suggests that one of the most important elements of volunteer behavior is context. Some theories of volunteering put the individual at the forefront and context in the background, while other theories simplify the individual and place greater emphasis on the context in which s/he operates (Wilson, 2000).

A continuum of volunteer behavior. It should be noted that giving one’s time for free in support of a specific cause is sometimes classified as either “volunteering”, or “public participation.” It is important to understand the distinction between these two terms. Propst et al. (2004) suggest that researchers tend to focus on certain definitions based on their disciplinary training. For example, researchers who focus on public participation are grounded in “participatory democracy, civic engagement, social capital, international development and other theoretical frameworks common in political science and sociology”, while those who study volunteering “rely on theories from psychology” (Propst et al., 2004, p.405). While this is one important way to distinguish between the two frameworks, other differences exist. For example, definitions of volunteering and public participation vary in terms of the extent to which citizens actually seek out opportunities to donate their time and energy. While volunteering typically provides
services that are “professionally initiated and defined”, citizen participation tends to be more of a “voluntary activity that is *individually* initiated and defined” (Propst et al., 2004, p.405).

By “arraying specific behaviors along a spectrum to reflect the degree of citizen power over decision-making,” Propst et al. (2004) devised a method for defining participation based on the behaviors of volunteers (Figure 1):

**Figure 1: Spectrum of volunteer behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th>High Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in tasks directed by others (managed by the organization)</td>
<td>Exercising decision-making authority (co-managed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing unsolicited feedback (managed by the organization)</td>
<td>Providing unsolicited feedback (not managed by the organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct decision-making authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The ‘low power’ end of the spectrum includes volunteer behaviors consisting of “passive involvement in activities directed by others” (McDonough & Wheeler, 1998; Propst et al., 2004). Additionally, the ‘low power’ end of the spectrum includes behaviors that McDonough and Wheeler suggest are a “means to an end.” For example, at the low power end, the goal of the organization that manages volunteers is simply provision of labor, thus participation is a means to an end.

The ‘high power’ end of the spectrum, on the other hand, displays behaviors which include “some level of shared authority in policy making, planning or management,” where a volunteer assumes control of his/her own objectives and outcomes (McDonough & Wheeler, 1998; Propst et al., 2004, p.395). At this end of the spectrum,
McDonough and Wheeler suggest that the goal is empowerment, so participation is no longer the means, but rather the end.

As volunteer behavior moves from low power to high power, a personal connection to the work itself becomes visible. For example, one form of volunteering which is more than just the provision of labor, or means to an end, is known as serious leisure. Serious leisure is distinguished from other types of leisure by the level of personal investment: the need to participate in a unique subculture, acquire special skills and knowledge in the context of career development, and strongly identify with the chosen pursuit (Stebbins, 1992). Serious leisure affects behaviors by firmly locating the participant on the right (high power) side of the spectrum. Unlike public participation, however, the goal of serious leisure is skill or career development, not necessarily power in decision making.

Citizens who frequently volunteer with one organization, natural resource-based or otherwise, expect some level of influence and do not always feel they are treated fairly. Smith and McDonough (2001) examined natural resource management agencies in Michigan and determined that a volunteer’s conceptualization of “having been treated fairly and/or received fair outcomes” affected their satisfaction and their support for resource managing authorities (p.23). Citizens who were located on the high-power end of the volunteer continuum in natural did not always feel involved, and, in some cases, they felt disrespected (Smith & McDonough, 2001).

From a practical perspective, Propst and Bentley (2000) investigated the differences between managers and citizens in how they defined and perceived natural resource volunteers. While both mangers and citizens agreed that the benefits of having
volunteers exceeded the cost of their management, they disagreed as to the nature of volunteer contributions (Propst & Bentley, 2000). Managers saw volunteers in terms of power and input, while citizens saw their participation in terms of duty and community redress (Propst & Bentley, 2000).

Ultimately, the act of volunteering has transcended individual recreation activities and manager/volunteer relationships to find a place in the fabric of society. For instance, one widely held viewpoint is that the success of democracy in America rests in part upon the willingness of citizens to volunteer and participate in a wide variety of organizations and groups (Propst et al., 2004). Cigler and Joslyn (2002) measured this participation, discovering a relationship between attitudes of political tolerance and levels of membership in volunteer organizations. Specifically, if an individual is a member of a voluntary group, the resulting inclusion with other like-minded people can contribute to that person exhibiting higher levels of political tolerance (Cigler & Joslyn, 2002).

Furthermore, the more groups one is a member of, the more politically tolerant one will be (Cigler & Joslyn, 2002).

*Intersections of activity and place.* Place-based research has shown that when people are involved within their important places, they tend to maintain a stronger connection to the local area than those who don’t (Relph, 1976, 1997; Stedman et al., 2004). This is evidenced by high levels of engagement in place-based volunteering. For example, in 2001, the 31 groups which work together to maintain the Appalachian Trail under the oversight of the Appalachian Trail Conference enjoyed the services of over 5,000 volunteers, who contributed almost 187,000 hours (Appalachian Trail Conference, 2005). These volunteers participated in activities such as trail oversight and maintenance,
shelter adoption, boundary monitoring, and even performed office-based administrative work (Hardy et al., 2003). Not only is this volunteer workforce of great importance to the organizations that oversee recreational hiking trails, but the volunteers themselves also demonstrate a form of “ecological identity” (Gooch, 2003): they see their ability to maintain an important landscape as a proxy for creating a sense of place (Gooch, 2003).

In summary, volunteer behavior, like sense of place, is rooted in personal motivations and social contexts, which in turn impact the meanings that people ascribe to their volunteer behavior. Furthermore, the idea that their volunteer behavior is aligned along a continuum suggests that something is exerting influence over what people choose to do. Could it be a sense of place? Community interactions? An interest in the work itself?

**Toward the guiding research questions**

The purpose of this project is to understand the sense of place of people who live, work, and play in rural settings. Specifically, it will invoke two important contexts of sense of place: a setting context, and an activity context. In terms of the setting context, the literature revealed that community theory provides a way to organize the natural and manmade landscapes, social and environmental interactions, experiences, and subsequent meanings that are all integral to the creation of sense of place. In the activity context, the literature revealed that volunteer behavior provides a lens through which to study sense of place, due to the similarities between the two in terms of personal and social contexts, the creation of identity, and varying levels of involvement. Within both of these contexts, the actual places, experiences, and meanings are the fundamental building blocks of sense of place. Therefore, the questions guiding this research are as follows:
1) How does sense of place emerge in a setting context?
   Specifically:
   - Which places are important?
   - What meanings make these places important? What experiences give rise to these meanings?
   - How do these meanings and experiences contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place?

2) How does sense of place emerge in an activity context?
   Specifically:
   - What places make the activity important?
   - What meanings make the places and the activity important? What experiences give rise to these meanings?
   - How do these meanings and experiences contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place?

This project is not meant to measure the *strength* of sense of place, nor is it meant to draw parallel conclusions from the two data sets. Instead, it is meant to provide insight into the special places that exist in the spaces where people live, work, and play. It seeks to investigate the phenomena of sense of place among two different sets of people, engaging in different activities, in two different places. While the insights that emerge will be specific to the individual contexts in which the research was carried out, any related findings between the two will be highlighted and discussed.

This research is important for three reasons. First, it will contribute to the body of scholarship on sense of place, meanings and experiences. Second, it will assist future research by helping understand the parallel relationship between sense of place and community. Third, it will aid in the understanding of volunteers by elucidating the connections between what volunteers do and why they do it.
Chapter Three: Methods

For this project, resident-employed photography and in-depth interviews were used to collect two data sets. The first data set was assembled from the participation of 25 residents of Seward, Alaska. The second data set emerged from the participation of 10 individuals who regularly volunteer for the Streamwatch Program at the Russian River Campground in Cooper Landing, Alaska. This chapter will describe the two research settings, the methods used to collect the data, the analysis of the data, the validity and reliability of the data, and the usefulness of photography in sociological research.

Seward, Alaska

Seward, Alaska was chosen as the community in which the setting-based data set would be collected. Seward, located 125 miles south of Anchorage, served in 2004 as a “gateway” for nearly 630,000 visitors to the Kenai Fjords National Park and Chugach National Forest (National Park Service, 2005). Choosing a gateway community such as Seward was important because it allows the local community and the areas surrounding it to be examined as a continuous system. Communities are not isolated from the ecological and social systems in which they are embedded, and so it was important to consider the ‘buffer areas’ surrounding parks and communities as important spaces in which people work and play.
According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the town of Seward is the 15th largest town in Alaska, home to 2,830 people. The county of Kenai Peninsula Borough, in which Seward is located, was the 4th fastest growing county in Alaska in 2003, increasing 18% between the 1990 and 2000 censuses (40,802 to 49,691). Seward is representative of this growth, having grown 17% (from 2,300 to 2,830) during that same stretch. Seward’s population is
slightly older than the rest of Alaska, with an average age of 37 years versus 32 years for the balance of the state. Seward is also more male than Alaska as a whole (60 percent versus 51 percent). Seward residents are 72.1% white, 16.7% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 2.4% African American. These figures closely mirror the state-wide percentages (70.5% white, 16% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 3.7% African American). Of the 2,320 Seward residents older than age 15, the 2000 Census reports that 46.5% are married. While this is in keeping with Alaska and the U.S. (49.5% for each), Seward has a higher percentage of divorced residents (14.9% versus 10.8% for Alaska and 8.6% for the U.S.). Many Seward residents are originally from someplace else, and have migrated to Seward. According to the 2000 Census, more than half of the population (56 percent) was born outside of Alaska.

The residents of Seward do not have as much higher education as others in Alaska and the U.S. Specifically, 48.4% reported at least some college coursework, which is lower than both the rest of Alaska (60.5%) and the U.S. (51.8%). However, Seward has a higher number of high school graduates – they make up 38.2% of population, greater than the 27.9% of high school graduates in Alaska and the 28.6% across the U.S. In conversations with the researchers, several young people who had gone on to college indicated staying within the state to do so, attending either of the University of Alaska’s branch campuses in Anchorage and Fairbanks. When asked why they decided to stay in-state for their education, many indicated a desire to remain close to their family and friends in Seward. In terms of local educational opportunities, Seward is home to the Alaska Vocational Technical Center, a two-year technical academy offering training in culinary, maritime, health, automotive, and industrial technologies. Seward is also a site
for maritime research, guided primarily by the Alaska SeaLife Center, which was
constructed in 1998 using settlement money from the Exxon Valdez oil spill.

Per capita income in Seward was $20,360, which is slightly lower than the Alaska
average of $21,587. The unemployment rate in Seward is 9.1%, which is higher than the
6.7% reported state-wide. In and around the Seward area, the economic foundation
includes tourism, oil and gas, refining, and government. This focus on tourism is
reflected by the fact that 32.8% of Seward’s workers are involved in retail, arts,
entertainment, recreation, or lodging. The impact of fishing and seafood processing on
the economy are minor, as only 5 percent of Sewardites are employed in those industries.
This makes Seward different from the rest of Alaska, which relies on the oil and gas
industry to supply 85% of the state's budget. Additionally, fisheries throughout Alaska
harvest over 6 billion pounds annually, leading the U.S. (AK Dept of Labor, 2007).

Seward’s history demonstrates an economic evolution from resource industries to
recreation and tourism. Early immigrants from Northern Russia first settled the Kenai
area in the late 18th century to harvest abundant populations of fish and seal. In 1902, the
town was founded as the southern terminus of the newly-constructed Alaska Railroad.
Named after U.S. Secretary of State William H. Seward, who negotiated the purchase of
Alaska from the Russians, the town of Seward served for nearly half a century as a
transportation hub for coal, oil, and fish resource extracting industries. However, on
March 27, 1964, much of the city’s infrastructure was destroyed by the largest ever
earthquake recorded in the northern hemisphere. This earthquake, and the resulting
tsunami, destroyed 80% of the city’s buildings, and caused over $300 million in damage
statewide. The city’s reconstruction over the past half century has corresponded with the
Alaska-wide growth of tourism and recreation. Seward’s layout reflects this focus - not only is there an older downtown containing bars, shops, and restaurants, but the city also contains a second “downtown” about a mile away that is home to a large marina, charter offices, hotels, and outfitters. Additionally, Seward has established a substantial infrastructure in support of motor homes. As a result of the moratorium on shoreline construction after the earthquake, a large stretch of the downtown shoreline has been converted to parking spaces for these motor homes, complete with hook-ups for electricity, water, and sewer.

While in Seward, the researchers observed that the tourism industry is geared towards providing access to difficult-to-access outdoor recreation resources. For instance, a number of charter boat excursions provide access to several small islands and glaciers throughout Kenai Fjords National Park. These tours, which ranged in length from several hours to several days, allowed the researchers to observe a wide array of recreation activities such as fishing, kayaking, hiking, and camping, all in a setting that would not be otherwise accessible. In response to these charter operations, the amenities within Seward have grown to include five hotels and twenty-one restaurants.

The Russian River Campground and the Streamwatch program

The Russian River Campground is a Forest Service facility that includes 83 campsites, all of which are RV accessible, and a day use area with space for nearly 100 vehicles. The primary facility of the campground and day use area is a 2-mile boardwalk along the shores of the Russian River, providing easy access to viewing platforms, hiking trails, and fishing areas. The town of Cooper Landing, in which the campground is
located, is 100 miles south of Anchorage and approximately 25 miles northwest of Seward. Cooper Landing has a population of 369 people.

Figure 3. Map of the Russian River Campground, Cooper Landing, Alaska.

The primary attraction of the area is the Russian River itself, which runs a distance of 12 miles from the Upper Russian Lake to the Kenai River, approximately 75 miles from Cook Inlet. The point of confluence of the Russian and Kenai rivers is one of the most popular fishing areas in Alaska, due to both its proximity to Anchorage and its abundance of trout, coho salmon, and red salmon, who run the river in numbers averaging over 60,000 fish (AK Dept of Fish & Game, 2007). Over the past ten years, the
river has averaged 57,815 angler-days per year\(^1\) (AK Dept of Fish & Game, 2007). During the height of the season, which runs from April to August, over 1,000 fishermen can be fishing the river at the same time. These fishermen harvest nearly one-half of the salmon run, a total often averaging over 30,000 fish (AK Dept of Fish & Game, 2007). During visits to the Russian River, the researchers observed fishermen standing nearly shoulder-to-shoulder for a distance of almost 200 yards down the river.

Because of these large numbers of fishermen, several issues threaten the area. First, trampled shoreline vegetation has resulted in erosion along the riverbank. Trampled vegetation and erosion threaten fish populations by eliminating shade, warming the water temperature, and increasing the current (AK Dept of Fish & Game, 2007). Additionally, the byproducts of the recreation activity (such as fish-cleaning waste, human waste, dogs and litter) attract a large number of bears to the area each summer. Bear activity threatens both humans and the bears themselves, as most bears who lose their fear of humans must be destroyed.

To combat these issues, a volunteer-based education and restoration program known as “Streamwatch” was established along the banks of the river. This volunteer program was implemented in 1994 by the US Forest Service, placing volunteers at the Russian River Campground to educate fishermen in the ways of resource-friendly fishing practices. Fully funded through the Kenai River Sportfishing Association, by 2005 the program included 39 total volunteers, most of whom were recruited through newspaper and radio ads in Seward, Anchorage, and Soldotna. As of 2005, the program was full and accepting no new volunteers.

\(^1\) An angler-day is one angler fishing for all or part of a day (AK Dept of Fish & Game, 2007).
Volunteers in the Streamwatch program usually worked one day shifts, for periods of up to two weeks at a time. Before becoming active along the river, the volunteers received training in the form of an early season seminar and a comprehensive printed reference manual. Several volunteers lived in the Anchorage area (about 65 miles to the north), and chose to participate in Streamwatch for their vacation. These individuals owned RVs which they parked at the Russian River Campground during their stay. Other volunteers lived in the nearby towns of Cooper Landing and Moose Pass, and participated in the program either on weekends or during other free time. Many of the volunteers who participated in this project had either stayed at the campground or fished from the boardwalk in the past.

While visiting the Streamwatch volunteers, the researchers observed numerous examples of the work that the volunteers had done to protect the river. Several fences, installed by both the Streamwatch volunteers and other groups such as Youth Corps, kept fishermen away from areas containing fragile vegetation. Additionally, the installation of several fish cleaning stations reduced the amount of fish waste along the riverbank. Over time, the volunteers had become a recognizable presence along the river, and were often approached by fishermen seeking help or advice.

It is important to note that the data collected from the Streamwatch volunteers at the Russian River is not directly comparable to the data collected from the residents of Seward. In addition to the differences in the study sites described above, the participants were selected differently and asked to perform slightly different tasks (which will be described later in more detail). The rationale for the use of two sites is based upon the researchers desire to capture the twin phenomena of residing in Seward (the setting
context) and volunteering along the Russian River (the activity context), and how those phenomena contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place. This is in keeping with the phenomenological approach to place research described in Chapter Two, in which the focus is on specific experiences from the lives of people who experience a specific phenomena in a specific place.

**Resident-employed photography**

This study seeks to understand how people experience place via life in the community of Seward and volunteering in the Streamwatch program at the Russian River campground. A qualitative approach to data collection is ideal, because the ways in which researchers think about social theories such as sense of place has been “transformed to demand an account of subjectivity, culture and ideology” (Jones, 1989, p.19). Additionally, understanding lived experiences in the context of the dual phenomena of living in Seward and volunteering on the Russian River requires (re)searching the “central, underlying meaning of the experience” through the “analysis of specific statements and themes” (Creswell, 1998, p.52).

The project made use of resident-employed photography, a process whereby researchers analyze photographic images taken by local residents to show, instead of just tell, specific details of the places that are important to them. Participants also use their photographs to capture multiple details about each important place, and to remind them of what (or who) they are trying to capture. The resident-employed photography protocol specifically replicated the approach of Stedman et al. (2004). In that project, participants were asked to take multiple photographs of several different places of importance in their lives. They were then interviewed, in order to capture the stories and perspectives behind
each photo. The interviews are a critical part of the resident-employed photography process, because they allow both researchers and participants to “better elucidate the content of the photo and the degree to which it represents sociocultural and ecological phenomena, and how these combine in potentially unique ways” (Stedman et al. 2004, p.586).

From a broader academic standpoint, these visual methods have been supported in sociological research. Specifically, Haywood (1990) suggested that allowing participants to use cameras is effective because, in most cases, the participants will be 1) familiar with the photographic process, 2) more observant of their surroundings than they would be had they not been asked to photograph them, 3) able to more succinctly identify specific features of important places and 4) able to use the images to compare different places. Stewart and Floyd (2004) suggests that in addition to providing richer data, a visual approach can “reposition” the processes of constructing research questions and conducting analysis (p.580). Also, Goin (2001) encouraged researchers to focus less on a photograph as a statement of fact and more on the “metaphorical and lyrical elements within the image” (p.363). To his point, the use of photographs and interviews together go a long way towards bringing the lyrical elements of sense of place to the surface.

Sample selection
In partnership with the Seward Ranger District of the U.S. Forest Service, collection of the two data sets using the resident-employed photography protocol took place during a six-week period in the summer of 2005. This entailed the distribution of single-use cameras to 29 residents of Seward and 10 Streamwatch volunteers. Four residents dropped out before taking their photographs, and one volunteer returned a
camera with photos (which were used in the analysis) but declined to be interviewed.
Some cameras malfunctioned, resulting in photos of insufficient quality. In some cases,
the respondents could not remember why they took the photos they did. Finally, the act of
taking photos proved too time consuming for some participants. All told, the final
number of participants stood at 25 residents, and 10 volunteers.

Every effort was made to draw from across the ranges of gender, age, length of
residence, and occupation. The recruitment of Sewardites was based on response to
public notices, and “cold contacts” where individuals were approached in certain contexts
(i.e., a coffee shop, street festival, or recreation activity). Volunteers were chosen using a
purposive sampling technique established in conjunction with the Forest Service manager
who was serving as the Streamwatch liaison. Purposeful sampling is a technique “in
which particular settings, persons, or events are deliberately selected for the important
information they can provide that cannot be gotten as well from other choices” (Maxwell,

Instructions to participants
The residents of Seward were instructed to take two photographs each of 12
things that most attached them to the local area. They were told that their photos did not
necessarily need to be based inside the boundaries of Seward, the Chugach, or Kenai
Fjords, but should instead try to capture relatively local elements of their daily lives that
provide the most meaning, or that would be most missed if they were to move away. The
volunteers were asked to photograph these same things, but were also instructed to
photograph things that attached them to their volunteer work, represented why they
volunteer, or demonstrated what they most would miss if they ceased volunteering. Both
volunteers and residents were welcome to add any pre-existing photos in order to capture
different seasons, or different experiences that were not otherwise replicable. Participants
from both groups were encouraged to take all their photographs in two weeks, to allow
time for developing the photos and conducting the interviews.

Collecting the data
Once the cameras were collected from both the residents and the volunteers,
follow-up interviews were arranged to review the photos and retrieve the personal story
behind each one. Two sets of prints were made, with one placed in a small album as a
“thank-you” gift for the participant. Interviews lasted between forty-five minutes and
three hours. Each photo was examined in turn, with discussion centered on getting the
respondent to “describe the content of the picture, what they were attempting to
represent, and why they took it” (Stedman et al., 2004, p.588). During the interview all
participants were free to explore tangents, tell stories, bring in other people (several
respondents chose to include their spouses in the project), or provide additional materials
(usually in the form of notes or additional photographs). All told, the data set from the
Seward residents consisted of 341 photographs and 276 pages of transcribed interview
text.

The interviews with the residents of Seward were conducted in person and tape
recorded, with informed consent, appropriate to Penn State’s University’s IRB research
protection protocols. Because the volunteers had since left the Russian River and traveled
back to their homes around the Kenai, their interviews were conducted via telephone.
Technological limitations kept these interviews from being tape recorded, so the
researcher instead kept detailed notes of each of the volunteer interviews. The volunteer data set consisted of 117 photos and 28 pages of handwritten fieldnotes.

Analyzing the data

The two research questions seek to describe the places that were important to the participants, the meanings and experiences that gave rise to that importance, and the ways in which those places and meanings work together to contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place. For both the resident and volunteer data sets, the photos and interviews were analyzed using a process known as categorical aggregation, a series of techniques using labels, codes, and categories to organize qualitative data (Dewalt & Dewalt, 2002; Henderson, 1991; Mascarenhas & Scarce, 2004; Spradley, 1980).

For the first step, determining the places of importance, the photos were independently analyzed by two researchers. Each researcher labeled each photo based solely on the surface of the image. The categories, which emerged from each researcher’s understanding of the image, the sense of place literature, fieldnotes, and discussions, were as follows:

Table 1. Labeling categories for resident and volunteer photos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Places for socializing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and tourism places</td>
<td>The local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>Facilities of the Russian River campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td>Recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workplace</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In many of the photos, the intent of the photographer could not be easily
determined. Many photos either contained multiple elements (i.e. a landscape and a
home) or contained unclear representations of symbols, people, or places. Despite the
difficulty of labeling the photographs, the two researchers agreed 63.6% of the time. To
create a single series of codes for analysis, the researchers engaged in discussion until
consensus was reached.

In order to address the second part of each research question (determining the
meanings and experiences behind the photos), an additional round of labeling took place
using the interview text (or notes, in the case of the volunteers) as a guide to each
photograph. The use of a combination of the words of the photographer and his or her
images revealed several meanings and experiences that were not captured in the previous
round of labeling that only addressed surface images. Table 2 contains the expanded
labels used in this phase of the analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>People, friends, social interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends, family</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
<td>Protecting the resource (work/serious leisure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community interactions</td>
<td>Teaching (spreading the message)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to creating a more specific set of labels, the use of interviews also raised the level of agreement between the two researchers to 75.4%, increasing the reliability of the findings in the process. As with the first round of labeling, the researchers engaged in discussion to reach consensus on a single series of codes to be used for analysis.

For the third step, determining how important places, meanings, and experiences contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place, the researchers analyzed the interviews themselves independently of the photographs. Specifically, this analysis involved “reading each passage of a transcribed interview and identifying the main themes from the text with a word or short phrase,” a process also known as coding (Mascarenhas & Scarce, 2004, p.25). The interview text could be assigned a combination of codes. For example, the statement “here is the trail, there is all good blueberry picking up there,” was coded “landscape,” because it suggests an attachment to the natural surroundings. Additionally, a code of “recreation” was assigned, as the response also indicates some measure of attachment to blueberry picking as a leisure activity. In addition to these primary codes, secondary codes such as “within Seward” or “within the park” were assigned. Once the interviews were coded, the emergent meanings were organized into place-based themes. Each of these themes connects the places of importance described in the photographic images to the meanings and experiences that emerged from the interviews.

The categorical aggregation process, including the labeling and coding, was facilitated by the use of qualitative research software (N-vivo versions 2.0 and 7.0) used primarily for data organization. While physical copies of the photographs themselves
were kept both electronically and in hard-copy format, the interview text and its accompanying codes were stored, arranged, and retrieved using the N-vivo software. It is important to note that the software did not perform any analysis, but served as an organizational tool allowing the researcher to code, store, search, and retrieve data.

Expanding the findings quantitatively. As described in Chapter Two, a wide variety of positivist, quantitative sense of place research has effectively and informatively covered topics such as the strength of attachment and identity (Cuba and Hummon, 1993; Kaltenborn, 1998; Shamai, 1991), interactions between identity and dependence (Lalli, 1992; Williams et al, 1992), and analytical separations of meanings, settings, and behavior (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001). Given the usefulness of this work, it was decided to perform a quantitative analysis of the two data sets to confirm two things: 1) the role of participant characteristics as an informer of sense of place, and 2) the role of the meanings and experiences in predicting whether or not the sense of place captured in the photo was based either on the landscape, the community (for Seward residents), or the activity (for the Streamwatch volunteers).

The chosen tests were simple linear and multiple discriminant analyses. Discriminant analysis is a technique used to distinguish between two or more groups, based on a set of predictor variables. The discriminant function works by creating a weighted index of these predictor variables, and using it to predict the membership of a particular object in one of the groups. Because both the resident and the volunteer data sets contained a large number of photos (n=341 for residents and n=115 for volunteers), it was decided to use each one as a point of analysis. For the discriminant models, each photograph was grouped into one of two sense of place categories based on their image:
“landscape” and “community” for the residents, and “landscape” and “activity” for the volunteers. Then, membership in each of these categories was predicted using both participant characteristics (detailed in Chapter Four) and the assigned meaning codes that emerged from the interviews (from Table 2).

Discriminant analyses were appropriate for two reasons. First, the measurement level of the criterion variable (or dependent variable, in this case sense of place) is categorical. Other approaches, such as regression analysis or cluster analysis, require the dependent variable to be of an interval nature. Second, discriminant analysis allows for a classification of objects into multiple groups based on a weighted combination of predictor (independent) variables. This allows researchers to consider multiple categories of sense of place, while other approaches such as regression analysis would restrict the consideration of sense of place to one interval-level dependent variable.

The validity and reliability of the data

Validity hinges on how closely the research measures what it sets out to measure. Put simply, validity “may be considered a fit between what researchers record as data and what actually occurs in the setting” (Henderson, 1991, p.137). Achieving validity is slightly more complicated, as it requires “achieving that delicate balance of distance and closeness that characterizes effective interaction between the researcher and...the subject” (Henderson, 1991, p.58). Also, according to Maxwell (1996), “validity is relative: it has to be assessed in relationship to the purposes and circumstances of the research, rather than being a context-independent property of methods and conclusions” (p.86). Therefore, a contextual balance resulting in valid data was sought by purposely extending the duration of both the time spent in the Seward and the extent of actual participation in
the Streamwatch Program. Additionally, the researcher’s familiarity and experience with the contexts and operations of volunteer programs created an atmosphere for discussion which helped facilitate the collection of valid data.

The reliability of the data reflects its consistency, in terms of both its original collection and later repetitions of the same research protocol. In order to ensure that what was recorded by the researcher could be consistently applied and understood by other researchers, two measures were employed. First, an additional researcher served as an “auditor or second opinion in data interpretation” (Henderson, 1991, p.137). Second, two researchers independently coded the photographs. Although the image-based coding resulted in initially low levels of agreement, the addition of interviews to the coding process and the use of discussion to reach consensus further heightened reliability.

Ultimately, the resident-employed photography approach proved valid, reliable, and useful for this project. Because visual data is “entangled in social relations, arguing for a humanistic, engaged and reflexive approach to social research” (Banks, 2001, p.5), the project’s participants were able to share a variety of perspectives surrounding their important experiences, where they happened, with whom, and what they meant. Additionally, the use of cameras and photographs in this research project added an element of fun for the participants that would not have existed were they to simply answer predetermined questions.
Chapter Four: Sense of Place in a Setting Context

The first research question seeks to understand sense of place in a setting-based context. This will be done using the data set consisting of photos and interviews from the 25 residents of Seward, Alaska. These participants were asked to photograph and discuss elements of their daily lives that provided the most meaning, or that would be most missed if they moved away. This chapter describes which places were important to the participants, and the meanings and experiences that gave rise to that importance. It also describes the ways in which these places and meanings work together to contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place.

As shown in Table 3, sixty-eight percent of the participants in the Seward data set were age 35 or over, and twenty percent were retired. Two-thirds had lived in Seward for less than twenty years, and eighty percent were born someplace other than Seward. Additionally, twenty percent of the participants were retired, twenty percent worked directly in the tourism industry, and twenty-eight percent worked in support of Seward’s tourism industry (food service, retail, self-employed). Sixteen percent of the participants were classified as “other professional,” a categorization of office-based jobs including the insurance, administration, and legal professions.
Table 3. Sample characteristics of Seward participants (n=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Length of Residence in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4-9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born here</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born away</td>
<td>30 yrs or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Self Empl (guide, captain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Food Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Places

In order to determine the places of importance to Seward residents, each photograph was labeled based solely on its image, with no regard to the interviews. After a review of the literature and discussion amongst the research team, it was decided that each of the 341 photographs could be organized into the following six place categories (Table 4):

Table 4. Important places based on analysis of photographs (n=341)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and tourism places</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workplace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “natural environment” category included scenic views of nearby mountains, rivers, glaciers, and the ocean. This category was the most often represented, with 124 out of 341 photos (36.4%) determined to contain these nature-based images. Sixty-eight of the photos (19.9%) pictured a house or apartment and were labeled as “home.” Fifty photos (14.7%) depicted “recreation and tourism places,” including photos where recreation equipment was juxtaposed within a natural setting (e.g. a kayak in a lake). The “local community” and “built environment” were depicted 49 and 43 times, respectively, with the difference being that the built environment category included mundane features of Seward such as bridges, boardwalks, or roads. The community category, on the other hand, included photos of places, people, or items that appeared to represent something Seward-specific. The smallest photo category captured photos of warehouses, office buildings, machinery, or other representations of “work” (7 photos, 2.1%). Below are examples of the types of photos assigned to each category:

Natural landscapes:

![Natural landscape photos](image1.jpg) ![Natural landscape photos](image2.jpg)
Home (family, friends):

Recreation spaces and tourism:

Manmade items:
The community:

This organization of the photos highlighted the types of places that are important to Seward residents. However, embedded within these images are meanings and experiences – the fundamental ingredients that describe why a setting is important. To reveal these meanings and experiences, the participant’s interviews were analyzed alongside their photographs. This process of re-labeling each photo resulted in a new organization of the photos, this time in terms of important meanings and experiences.

Work:
Meanings, experiences, and the creation of sense of place

The new organization of photos in terms of meanings and experiences revealed not just what the photo portrayed, but what that portrayal meant to the photographer. This made it possible to determine the specific meanings and experiences that help explain why general settings such as the “natural environment” or “the community” were important. Table 5 includes these meanings and experiences, and their frequency:

Table 5. Important meanings and experiences from photos and interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends, family</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community interactions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “beauty” category was the most frequent, with 86 out of 341 photos (25.2%). Recreation, both alone or with others, was next with 58 photos (17.0%). Experiences with friends or family were revealed in the photos and interviews 40 times (11.8%), followed by pride in Seward and Alaska (9.9%), the history of the area (9.1%), community interactions (5.9%), and “home” (5.0%). Meanings and experiences involving threats to the landscape, tourism, local architecture, or work each made up less than 5% of the photos.
Digging deeper into these meanings and experiences and their contribution to sense of place requires an understanding of how the meanings are connected to the places of importance in and around Seward. To accomplish this, additional analysis took place in which the interviews were coded and qualitatively analyzed independently of the photographs in order to organize the emergent meanings into place-based themes. These themes each make a connection between the places of importance described in the photographic images, and the meanings and experiences that emerged from the interviews. The following themes best organize these connections between important places and important meanings:

- The natural landscape: beautiful surroundings and threatening/threatened resources
- The community: people, history, pride, and tourism
- Recreation spaces: their social and solitary importance
- Seward as “home”: continuity, friends, and families

Each of these themes will now be described in turn, with support from the photographs and interview text. The smallest of the place categories, “manmade places” and “the workplace,” are excluded, because they were very specific to a small number of participants and were therefore determined to make very little overall contribution to the findings.

The natural landscape: beautiful surroundings and threatening/threatened resources. Eighty-six of the 341 resident photographs and interviews either contained an image or conveyed a meaning that somehow reflected the beauty of the natural landscape. However, beauty as a place meaning was more complex than just a pretty view or a
picturesque setting. Peggy\textsuperscript{2}, a 56 year old artist who has lived in Seward for nearly five years, described how, to her, Alaska’s beauty meant a mixture of geography, animals, and activity:

\textit{This is by Spring Creek. This is just another place where you drive, and you can sit and glass all these mountains. I didn’t have enough pictures but I also like to go sit up on the mountains- Mt. Marathon, Bear Mountain, and look for goats, for hours sometimes. The beauty of this place is beyond…well, we live in a picture postcard place. If you don’t look at it, you don’t see it, know what I mean?}

With her summary of the landscape as a “picture postcard” place, Peggy is suggesting an attachment to the special and unique beauty of her surroundings. This is also reflected in the following photos taken by Lena, a 19 year old college student, and Charles, a 56 year retiree. Both suggested that the Seward landscape is beautiful because it is unique, unusual, and free of other people.

\textsuperscript{2} Pseudonyms used throughout.
I also took the picture because it’s pretty. I love the mountains, and the water is right there. It’s nice because not so many people know about that exact spot.

Again, this is beautiful. It’s just the beauty of Alaska that can’t be found anywhere else.

The beauty within the natural landscape is easy to see in the images themselves. However, the idea of beauty was difficult for some participants to explain. In many cases, the concept of beauty was represented by what the participant wanted to see in the landscape. Even though there is no visible evidence of wildlife in the following photos, it is still of great importance to Peggy, who took the first of the following photos, and Garth, a 48 year old high school teacher, who took the second:
There should be swans here. There are no swans right now, they were back in their nesting area. When I drove back yesterday, one of the swans was there. It’s just a spot that’s pretty, where the swans hang out so you can go and watch the swans. They nest there every year.

It’s really quiet and peaceful, and oftentimes there are eagles down at the end. It’s a glacier fed creek, so there’s not a lot of fish, but occasionally you do see fish, and the eagles come in for the fish. Sometimes if you’re lucky, early in the morning, about 5:30 or 6 o’clock, you can see a moose crossing a stream, right in front of a beautiful sun bathed mountain. It happens quite often. I saw a brown bear, right over here, just a couple days ago. A 300 lb brown bear.

In addition to the beauty of the natural surroundings, the landscape theme also included discussions of the landscape as both ‘threatened’ and ‘threatening.’ For example, Stacia, a 27 year old professional who has been a resident of Seward for almost 5 years, invoked a contradiction she sees between the beauty of the landscape and its threatening qualities:
To Stacia, the extreme landscape of Alaska is threatening, but she has learned to live with the threat, even taking pride in doing so. Her description of the threatening landscape as an “ironic” contrast to the beauty she encounters in her day-to-day-life even suggests she does not take the threat seriously. This is in contrast to some of the other participants who revealed a more acute concern for the local landscape as a ‘threatened’ resource. Madeline, who has lived in Seward for nearly 25 years, suggested that resource depletion in the ocean surrounding the Kenai Peninsula was, to her, a specific cause for concern. Deep sea fishing is a way of life in Seward, as charter and commercial fishermen have long made a living from the variety of species residing in the waters of Resurrection Bay. Madeline, although currently working in food service, grew up among fishers and had previously worked on a variety of fishing boats. To her, over-fishing and a lack of regulation threaten both the fishing way of life and the landscape on which it is based:

This one I took because it shows the tsunami evacuation area. I liked how you have the beautiful views in the background, but it shows the beauty with the danger, how it kind of goes together... If it happens, it happens. It’s just interesting, ironic, it so beautiful, but there is this threat.
That is a halibut she’s holding and right now they want to go limited entry on halibut and for years and years the commercial fisherman have had to have their halibut at 38 inches, but they (the charters) will take anything out of this bay that wiggles. Right now there are probably more than 200 boats and you can go right down there on the dock and see the whole resource being pulled out and it’ll be gone. If I left Seward I wouldn’t be surprised at all if I came back and there was no more fishing.

The above photo of a commercial fisherman cleaning her catch on Seward’s boardwalk reflects Madeline’s concern with the continued heavy reliance upon a rapidly dwindling natural resource. As mounting pressures to meet fish quotas or entertain tourists compel fishermen to capture fish of all sizes, she feels that the sense of responsibility to both the natural landscape of Seward and its future generations is in decline. The following photo further illuminates her concern with the shrinking size of the catch:
That’s probably 50 pounds or 80 pounds of halibut that’s less than 18 inches in length. Why does the halibut commission not regulate that? That’s what they proposed this winter – limited entry to get into the business (of charter fishing). So the business is going to be closed off to all our resources. Those people (the tourists) pay 200 dollars a day to get on those charter boats and that’s part of their action, so they have to deliver the fish. It really, really bothers me.

The participants who discussed threatened resources did not necessarily need to have a specific history with the resource, like Madeline. For example, Dan, a 79 year old retired town worker, never worked as a forester or fisher, but still brought up his perceptions of resource depletion by sharing his skepticism regarding a commercial harvest of what he saw as a public good:

D: We had an abundance of blueberries around here. It’s one of the things I always look forward to in August. Some commercial business out of Anchorage now is hiring people to come in to harvest the berries mechanically. I’m not real thrilled about that.

B: I read about that in the Log [the local newspaper]. What will it do, destroy the plants?

D: They used, they’re called rakers. It’s like a little box with a cross. It’s an efficient way of picking the berries. The berries come back, it doesn’t damage the plants so much, but what will it do to our supply? They are going to come in and take out 150 thousand pounds of blueberries? The locals who live here question why they should open up the forest to commercial ventures when it’s a public use forest.

The stories of Madeline and Dan serve as strong evidence that large-scale issues such as resource depletion are firmly located in how individuals experience the landscape around them. Not only have these long-term residents developed a strong attachment to the landscape, but they also take stock in the relationships, identities, and social systems
(i.e. “fishing as a way of life”) that have, historically, provided for their families and communities. The depletion of natural resources within the landscapes to which they are attached is therefore a significant threat woven throughout their sense of place.

The resources within the natural landscapes in and around Seward are also threatened by a growing conflict between “outsiders” and “locals.” Madeline articulated this conflict, describing how the town’s growing status as a tourist destination potentially damages places of importance:

So these are the people there on the 4th of July that we didn’t like because, see, a local would never park there. They were parked all around it. And camping, and trashing it out. Pretty much trashed it out.

In this photo, out-of-towners who have come to Seward for the annual Fourth-of-July celebration are encroaching upon a specific important place. To Madeline, this intrusion represents a growing trend in which favorite places are now being discovered by outsiders. To her, this is a serious problem, albeit one that is an unavoidable result of Seward’s reliance on summer tourists who come to fish, hike, boat, and camp. Even though these tourists have become part of Seward’s social fabric, they are still not completely accepted by many residents. This duality between residents and non-residents suggests that the experiences of the participants are based to some degree upon their
status as insiders with knowledge of special places and recreation destinations that are unknown to the average visitor. As these hidden places are discovered, the secrets known only to community insiders are threatened.

An additional example of threatened natural resources emerged when the ability to use important places was restricted. This is an ultimately political risk that threatens the creation of any place meanings that specifically invoke the natural landscape. This restriction is, for the most part, based upon recently imposed agency rules and regulations that have changed how the participants recreate:

It’s crazy now you have to pay five dollars just to park there. We feel that we have to have a cookie-jar full of money just to live here. And lots of time (R) and I get off work and we just want to go cruise for a half an hour, but we can’t get out of our car!

The photo above shows a recently installed self-pay fee station, known among the locals as an “iron ranger.” In this instance, having to pay for a recreational opportunity that used to be free signaled a personal loss of choice. Furthermore, the installation of the iron ranger is emblematic of how managing agencies (in this case, the Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation) present a challenge to the ability of the participants to recreate in their special places.
Cathy, a 22 year old respondent who has only lived in Seward a few months, also felt that her appreciation of the natural landscape was challenged by what she perceived as heavy-handed management:

I think it’s ridiculous that you have to ‘sneak’ up to touch the glacier. That’s absurd. I know it’s a little bit more slippery than the other path, but I think a simple sign saying ‘hey, this is a slippery path – please be careful’ would be good instead of blocking it off. Having to go and sneak around to touch the glacier is ridiculous, because it’s right there. There is no reason why you shouldn’t be able to touch it. And then that whole thing with the paved paths, ugh..

To take this photo of the Exit Glacier, managed by the National Park Service and located roughly ten miles outside of Seward, Cathy actually had to venture off the paved, roped path. Sense of place, to Cathy, is wound tightly around her ability to freely experience the wilderness despite the warnings of the Park Service. An important meaning, therefore, is that enjoyment can be threatened by natural resource managers who, through the imposition of rules, may prevent residents from experiencing the landscape on their own terms. This may actually result in a negative impact on sense of place, because without experiences, people can’t create meanings. With no meanings, they can’t create sense of place.

In summary, interactions with natural landscapes contribute to sense of place because they create meanings, such as those conveyed by the participants describing
beautiful surroundings and natural resources at risk. The beauty draws the participants out into the world, and as their attachment grows they begin to see threats to the places they love. These threats serve as a call to action, and as a result people have landscape meanings tied to public and private agencies, who are seen as helping (or harming) the future of the landscape.

*The community: people, history, pride, and tourism.* Analysis of the interviews revealed that the meanings invoking social interaction, the history of the community, and a sense of pride in both Seward and Alaska all have impacts on community-based senses of place. To begin, many participants used their photos and interviews to describe specific places within the community, where they would often interact. The following photo is of a coffee-shop and art gallery. This community feature represents a subculture of unique, artsy people, who are of great importance to several of the younger participants. Liz, an unemployed 29 year old, shared the coffee shop as a symbol of her interactions with other like-minded people:

> I took a picture of this place because it’s funky, it has some culture, and artsy-fartsy people who come here. I love living in a community that has people who are into art, and native art, and area art, using bones, or willow and alder, from the area. It’s a nice common meeting place.

3 Disclosure: The majority of the interviews were conducted at this coffee shop.
Another example of community interactions came from Maria, a 37 year old IT professional. She described the local post office as the “hub of the community,” where people bump into each other, sharing stories and news. These interactions are even facilitated by the post office, which allows personal notices (but no other advertisements):

*The post office here in Seward is one of the hubs of the community. More often than not, you can end up spending ½ an hour just getting your mail! It all depends who you run into! It’s a good place to catch up with folks. I find it odd that the only advertisements you can hang up at the post office are those for funerals, life celebrations and wakes.*

Another example of special places representing social interaction in community contexts came from Madeline, a 48 year old restaurant worker who has lived in Seward nearly 25 years. In the following photo, she describes the local one-screen theatre and how it has improved life for her and her son:
Martinette (who runs it) knows all the kids by name. Kids get free tickets for being on the honor roll. They are really a good support to the community. The movie theatre is something that the community can always go to. They are really kind people and I think they’ve been overlooked. Really great Alaskan people. We lost our bowling alley so as far as public things to do, the movie theatre is one of the few things left.

Even community features that were viewed negatively by the participants contained an element of community interaction. For example, some participants unfavorably referred to the potential for Seward’s new Safeway supermarket or Starbucks to drive out other local businesses. However, the following photo and discussion of the Safeway in Seward acknowledges the negative, but also captures the positive contributions that the store makes to the sense of community in Seward:

Not because it’s Safeway, because that sucks. Not because it has a Starbucks in it, because I believe that sucks, because they’re the big guy coming in wanting to make the little guy go away. But, it’s the only store we have, and it is a place where you see everybody. You get to talk to everybody.
Peggy, who provided this photo, wanted it to be understood that only the growth of the community has had a negative impact on her sense of place. “I hate the new hotel, because it blocks our view of the boats. You can’t walk along there anymore and see any of that. I hate it. I hate the brown building, [that’s] caused a huge hassle with our town. I’ve been to lots of the city council meetings. I hate it. But, the town - I love the town. I love the friendliness of the businesses.” These two sentences are evidence that someone’s experience with the local community is a careful balance between positives (community places bringing people together, creating community connections) and negatives (sprawl, destruction of beauty).

Sometimes, places themselves are not sites for community interaction, but are instead symbols for it. The following example is of the “noon bell,” an earthquake and tsunami warning system that is tested each day at noon. It has become a local landmark, as evidenced by the community interactions required to save it:

It goes off every day and they call it the noon bell. This is just part of living in Seward. Somebody tried to remove it, and it was taken away. Everybody was upset, so they had a vote. More people turned out to re-instate the noon bell than any other public vote in history....you never know, we may need the horn someday. How they keep finding parts for it no one knows.

The importance of community interaction was also evidenced by the repeated reference to Seward’s recent designation as an “All-American City.” This award is based
on organized community activity, and is coveted primarily for tourism marketing outside the local area. To Loretta, a 76 year old who served on the award committee, the place where the sign was located symbolized the importance of promoting Seward through publicity:

We just got the All-American City award, you know. The award is a plaque but the notoriety that you get from something like this, particularly I guess in tourism, people really become interested. You get a lot of publicity out of it.

Participants’ experiences with tourism also contribute to community meanings. Seward (as with most of Alaska) is widely considered a tourist destination, with people from around the globe arriving on a daily basis to recreate in and enjoy the area. The influx of visitors each summer impacts everyday life by providing locals with the opportunity to participate in events (i.e. the town-wide 4th of July festival and marathon) that would otherwise not exist. While many Sewardites simply enjoy these events, many others volunteer to participate behind-the-scenes to ensure that the event runs smoothly. This is an opportunity for residents who may not otherwise interact socially to unite around an event of shared importance, building a sense of Seward as a community in the process. In the following photo, Madeline describes the community-based relationships that emerged from her experiences with the annual Fourth of July festival.
I live right on the race trail, so 4th of July is really exciting. Seward is known nationally because of the 4th of July race. There’s a lot of community involvement and volunteering that puts this on. I get a lot of backup from local police, city maintenance, placing cones in my driveway. This year I got garbage cans.

The social interactions that arise from tourism in Seward are not just limited to experiences with like-minded locals in organized community frameworks such as the Fourth of July festival. Some participants reported that life is different (and in many cases better) because of all the extra people. Jerry, a 61 year old retiree, described the benefits of interacting with tourists from outside the community: “It doesn’t bother me at all. It’s actually kind of fun. At this time of year it’s actually kind of exciting because there is so much going on and there are so many people coming into town.” However, the crowding that results from this tourism has a negative impact on local behaviors. In many cases, the same RVs that some see as delivering new and interesting people are seen by others as traffic clogging nuisances.

Tourism in Seward has also caused changes to the local identity. For the most part, participants described a balance between the pros and cons of a tourist-town identity. While some actually embraced the idea that Seward had developed a tourist reputation, others preferred that the community not be promoted to tourists. A good example is displayed by the importance placed on what happens when the tourists leave:
Town has been quiet for the winter, which we enjoy. By the time labor day comes you are ready for them to go, you're ready to have your town back. You're ready to be able to go to the stores and be able to park. I tried to do that earlier today, and couldn’t. You don’t get hassled if you pull down the little boat ramp launch. You can park there normally and walk the beach. In the summer you can’t because the people from out of state that have some of these kayak places give you dirty looks because you are blocking their way of launching their boat.

These meanings impact community-based sense of place, because the annual shrinking of the town upon the departure of the tourists allowed the participants to reconnect with their fellow townspeople. Because everyone is busy within in the short-season tourist economy, they often have little time for socialization:

You don’t see anybody all summer because we all have to work. If you want to survive the winter you have to work the summer. It’s not uncommon at all in Seward, once the tourists leave, for people to stop in the street, car to car, and talk to one another.

Participants also revealed a strong connection to places representing the community history of Seward and Alaska. Seward is a relatively young town, founded in 1903 as the starting point for construction of the Alaska Railroad. Despite its relative youth, Seward’s history resonated strongly with several of the participants. In fact, many of the photos had one historical event in common. In March 1964, the largest earthquake in North American history struck Seward, measuring 8.4 on the Richter Scale and
spawning a tsunami which destroyed much of the town. This event, known as the “Good Friday Earthquake,” resonates most strongly with those who lived through the event.

Loretta, a 76 year-old retiree who has lived in Seward nearly 50 years, recounted her memories of the earthquake:

_We all met down on the road, and the road was actually – this lasted three minutes, they say four, I don’t know – the road was actually heaving. The little one said “stop road, stop road”. She was so scared. But you know what I remember the most, aside from my family, were the big cottonwood trees. They bent over, and they touched the ground and then stood again. I was terrified – I thought what if one snaps off and hits the house. So my husband, he’s pretty wise, he said lets bring the car up into the driveway, and when it stops shaking...remember this is going on for a while, you had time to talk...we’ll go into town and see what happened. Well, by the time it was over with we could see the flames from the Standard oil pumps and it was really bad._

For Loretta, the earthquake history contains meanings of both family and lived experience in Seward. Other meanings were not just tied to events, but were also provoked by historic places in Seward. Her photo of the Jesse Lee Home, an abandoned orphanage and tuberculosis ward that operated in the early part of the 20th century, helped her recall happier times with fellow community members:

_A lot of the people I know now grew up there. They were children there. Most of them native children, and they told of great experiences many times out, and when our children were taking caroling lessons, they used to have their recitals up there. It had a big, beautiful hall, and a piano. It just represented friendship with the kids. They, of course, went to the churches in town and everything else. I just had to take a picture of it because I have fond memories of people I knew there. I think it’s a beautiful location, I’d just love to see something up there. I’d love to see the senior center up there. But, I don’t think its available now because the city owns it._
While historic places helped create community meanings for some participants, others were connected to the experiences that Seward’s history represents. Seward, like most of Alaska, has a homesteading heritage. Several participants felt that homesteading was an important experience, because it meant that one could “create your own life.” Once upon a time, the freedom to homestead meant that in Seward, you could build your own house, or even bury your own dead:

M: This is the backyard of Penny H, who homesteaded here, and this rock is the marker for her husband’s grave.
B: Oh really, he’s actually buried there?
M: That’s homestead rights.
B: How long has he been buried there?
M: He’s been buried there probably 10 years. They were homesteaders. They used to be woodcutters, and they also brought in all the pine cone seeds for the forest department. Really hard hard workers. I thought that was so cool that you could bury your loved one right there in your front yard.

While homesteading regulations have changed, and modern-day homesteaders must buy their property, the sense of freedom and history of homesteading is still on display. Fred, another older resident, captured modern-day homesteading in action, and spoke specifically of how it represented the community’s sense of freedom:
This one here, you can’t see without looking closely, but there is a guy building a new house in the woods there. I was just trying to show the freedom. Here this guy comes along and buys a piece of property in the woods, that had virgin timber, and he’s building his house. It was the freedom that I was thinking of, the right to go and buy a piece of property and to build on it and realize your dreams.

The participants also told of community meanings in terms of what happened in Seward, and what people did in Seward. Others revealed a historical connection based on what Seward once was. Specifically, Seward’s place in history as a former point of entry for many North American newcomers serves to create place meanings for people today. Rochelle, a 37 year old volunteer coordinator, shows the following photo of a local monument commemorating the southern terminus of the Alaska Railroad:

I just think it’s really cool that Seward, historically speaking, was really a jumping off place. An important jumping off place for Alaska. There’s a lot of history there. You know the railroad came down here, we are on the road system. We’re kind of remote down here, but still connected, in an important way. You know the ferry comes here.
Community meanings also include a heavy dose of *Alaska pride*. While some residents described community meanings and experiences based on the town of Seward, other participants with shorter tenures in town described similar meanings and experiences based on the broader community of Alaska in general. For example, Stacia, the 29 year old archeologist who has lived Seward for only three years, showed her connection to one of Alaska’s most famous symbols - the Iditarod Trail Sled Dog Race, a seventeen day race from Anchorage to Nome⁴:

> And then, the Iditarod Trail. For me, working also in archeology, the heritage program, that’s a main thing. It’s a main thing just for Alaska, period. People think that one of the connections with Alaska, I think at least, is the gold mining, but the Iditarod trail is a big thing. If you mention Iditarod trail, pretty much everyone I think knows what it is. That was an easy symbol of how to put it across in a picture.

The meanings that represented both history and pride were often intertwined, as some participants described places in Seward as symbols of broader pride in Alaska. The following photo is of St Peter’s Church, one of the oldest buildings in Seward. Liz, a younger resident, referred to the building’s architecture as an important referent to Alaska’s Russian heritage:

⁴ Prior to 1983, the Iditarod began in Seward.
For this picture I was trying to capture the history, not necessarily the church. My point was the Russian influence, and the history of Alaska. I am really partial to Alaska native history and culture, and that’s one reason I came to Alaska.

The notion of Alaska pride as a community meaning also included a sense of loyalty among the participants. The following picture of someone’s home graced with an Alaskan flag is an example of a participant making specific reference to a non-local, yet still territorial, “community” consisting of Alaskan residents. In Fred’s case, the Alaskan flag was a symbol of loyalty to this community:

I took this one because it reminded me of the loyalty of the people of Alaska, and of this area. They are very loyal.

B: loyal to whom?
Loyal to other people, to the community, and to themselves. As a matter of fact after I took this photo, you can see on the right side that door is opened, as I was getting ready to leave this guy stuck his head out and
said “What's up” and I said I’m not a government man or anything like that, I’m just taking a picture because I thought it was kind of nice the way you had that Alaskan flag over your back window. This represents loyalty to me. He said “oh thank you – take all the pictures you want.”

In summary, social interactions, the impacts of community history, and a sense of pride in Seward and the larger, “Alaskan” community all contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place by giving people outlets through which they can become connected to the local community and its development. This is in keeping with the interactional community theory described in Chapter Two, which suggests that true communities are often territorially bounded in such a way as to allow people to interact with each other (evidenced by the descriptions of meeting in the post office), and consist of members who engage in forms of collective action (evidenced by the residents gathering to save the noon bell). In this case, the community is a clear ingredient in sense of place.

The role of community in Seward is also manifested in a “sense of us” that the residents have created through interaction, shared identity, and shared experience. This sense of community is alternatively fostered or threatened by the presence of outsiders. These outsiders also represent a connection to the aforementioned theme encompassing the natural landscape because, as they do for community, outsiders can either foster or threaten landscape-based sense of place.

Recreation spaces: their social and solitary importance. Specific recreation experiences in and around Seward were important ingredients in the sense of place of the residents. Because Seward is nestled in between mountains, glaciers, and the ocean, participants described enjoying a wide variety of recreation opportunities that included hiking, boating, hunting, fishing, and biking in all of the geographic contexts (mountains
and water) in the Seward area. For instance, with a picture of kayaks, Liz describes her connection to recreation experiences both at sea and on land:

That was my attempt at a picture of kayaking, and just overall sea activities. The ocean is so close, there are activities, and in Moose Pass I feel like I’m in the mountains. I’ve got 3000 foot peaks next to me, and bam, now I’m down here in Seward next to the ocean. It’s kind of nice.

Liz’s photo is of her equipment, not the ocean, which means that the equipment itself is a symbol the experience. However, she suggests that the outdoor setting encourages her to participate in the activities. Rick, the 51 year old proprietor of the local bike shop, was less subtle, going out of his way to frame his bicycle against the beautiful Alaska scenery. As with Liz, the setting is what makes the activity important.
Yeah, that’s my bike up at the top there, still at Lost Lake. It’s a nice little getaway to gather your thoughts and enjoy all that Alaska has to offer.

While Liz and Rick were careful to make sure the specific activity (kayaking, biking) was included in their discussion of outdoor recreation, other participants used the setting as a point of reference for recreation in general. Also, while many participants described how the landscape represents the recreation that they can do, some suggested that the landscape represents what they cannot do. For instance, Carrie, a 21 year old college student, talked about how the challenging Alaskan weather prevents her from enjoying the outdoors as often as she might like:

I hit it at least once a week. Lately the weather’s been kind of...I mean I love hiking in the rain, but at the same time I work 12, 16 hours a day so getting out on the trail and then coming in and drying off is kind of time consuming.
In addition to outdoor landscapes, plentiful solitude in the surrounding backcountry was of great importance to several participants. Alaska has one of the lowest population densities in the United States, and even though Seward attracts many tourists and outdoor recreationists, it is possible to encounter very few people in the outdoors. Liz described her attachment to the idea of meeting only locals in the backcountry:

*There are some really great hikes, some of the hikes are either 30 miles long, or they are 5 miles. It’s a give and take, but I like that there are not that many people on a lot of the trails, because it is so spread out. You only really see locals on the trails, unless people come here to hike. That’s what I’ve noticed.*

Recreating in solitude was a seasonal concept. Similar to the feeling of “getting our town back” that emerged as a community-based reaction to tourism, the experience of solitude is also enhanced when the tourists leave. Garth, a 48 year old teacher who has lived in Seward for nearly fifteen years, alluded to the harm that tourists can do to his sense of solitude:

*This is on the way to exit glacier. It’s also a quiet place to ski and walk, after the tourists leave. It’s really a dangerous place to walk when the tourists are here.*
Finding and experiencing solitude during recreation does not mean that the individual must be by his or her self. Pat, the 58 year old shopkeeper, described her appreciation of the opportunity to be alone with her family: “When our kids were little, we’d leave on Sunday afternoon, and take a tent, and we’d camp out there, and no one would be there. We had the campground to ourselves. Sunday night we’d start the cookstove, and come home Monday afternoon.”

While some of the participants clearly favored the opportunity to recreate by themselves, others felt that their recreation experiences were enhanced by the presence of other people. The following photo and discussion, also provided by Pat, show a fondness for the presence of young people at one of their favorite recreations places:

It’s great, it has a beach, with sand, which is ideal for the kids, and the lake. Right here we’re just cooking our picnic. Usually, there are a lot of other young people.

Again, the experience triggers the meaning. To Pat, the photo of the experience – the picnic at the beach - triggers meanings of good times with kids and other young people (even though there are no young people in the photo). This suggests that experiences in the past contribute to meanings in the present. However, some participants combined the experience with the meaning in real-time. Forty-one year old James, who
was training to become the captain of an oil tanker, expressed fondness for recreating with other people by describing his experience aboard a recent dinner cruise, an experience he had never had before:

Some participants had recreation experiences which were not easily classified. For example, some of the participants who displayed a connection to solitary recreation were also attached to the social nature of recreating with friends and family. In addition to his earlier photo of the empty landscape, Garth added a photo that also represented his attachment to recreating with other people:
In summary, the importance of recreation to sense of place has to do with specific, place-based experiences. Those experiences, such as biking, hiking, or boating, alone or with others, create meanings that can include either solitude or socializing, often reflecting an activity based connection to the natural landscape.

_Seward as “home”: continuity, friends, and families._ For many participants, sense of place was built upon a sense of home. While many of the images themselves were obvious depictions of home, some of the meanings revealed in the interviews were more subtle. One example of Seward as “home” invokes the longevity and unchanging nature of Seward’s manmade landscape. To Harriet, a 23 year old law student who often leaves Seward for extended periods of time, the unchanging nature of the manmade landscape creates meanings of security and home:

_I think, to me, what I was trying to get across with the photo is that the landscape is very familiar. It’s impossible to get lost, and things just don’t change. That hardware store, and the Peking restaurant, it’s been the same since I was a kid._

However, not everyone sees the landscape as unchanging. Peggy, the 56 year old artist who has lived in Seward 4 years, feels that tourism is changing her home, threatening the quiet ‘Seward lifestyle’ to which she has become accustomed:
The campgrounds fill up, the grocery store fills up, you’ve got to be really careful driving because [the tourists] don’t understand the 4-way stops. You can’t get on the computer down at the library. At any time there can be 5 to 7 thousand people down at the boat harbor. Bicycle riding becomes a special skill. After the tourists leave we feel that the town is ours.

In addition to these community–based representations of home, several participants discussed their home in the context of the elements of their life – such as love, work, children, and community. Many of these stories emerged organically, without special prompting, when participants were asked what was important to them about Seward.

Well, let’s see now, my dad ran fish between Dutch harbor and Seattle and he was a king crab fisherman and he operated a 185 foot freighter and when I was 22 I was hired on board as his head cook. Then I worked 10 years out on the Bering sea and I got married and we kept our boat - my ex-husband was a fisherman in the port of Anchorage but during the winter we would freeze up so we started making trips in the early 80s to Seward. I just fell in love with the Seward highway and the mountains. I grew up in Washington State in the Puget Sound but I fell in love with the mountains and I made a good living up here and I just couldn’t leave and at the time that I left Puget Sound it was going through the Microsoft era and the property values had escalated so high that I felt I couldn’t really afford to live down there. So I made Seward my home.

I came here 5 days before the 1964 earthquake. I came here at the asking of a company known as the Alaska Scallop Fleet. I came up here to refit a vessel up here, to go out and do towing for scallops. They were just doing a survey to find out if there were enough here to bring some boats around. I came, and started working on a boat, and the boat was lost in the tsunami. I stayed on because I was a welder and a fitter and a burner, and they needed a lot of that. I stayed thinking it would only be a few months, and it wound up being forever!
I grew up here in Seward, I’m a 3rd generation Sewardite. My grandparents moved here from Norway in the early immigration in the 1900’s. My father was born in the goldmine, Kinnecott, and when he was a year old his family moved back here, so he grew up here in Seward. He graduated from Seward high school in 1936. They left and came back to Seward when I was a year old. I essentially grew up here in Seward. I graduated from Seward high school in 1965. I lived for about 9 years, got married right here in this very location (referring to the coffee shop located in the old church), 32 years ago. We had our first two children here. We moved stateside for about 12 or 15 years, then came back 10 years ago. We had 4 children altogether. Three were born here in Seward, and our youngest was born in Seattle. We moved back because we like the quality of life here, and job opportunities, and the opportunity to raise our children in such a setting.

These paragraphs follow a progression, each one beginning with the lives of parents and grandparents and progressing forward. This suggests that the participants do not see their homes in Seward as stories from the distant past, but instead as something more interactive within their daily lives. Although these social connections were not strongly located in any community context, they demonstrate a strong connection between place, people, and history.

Expanding upon the role of meanings

The prior thematic qualitative analysis portrayed the creation and maintenance of sense of place by linking important places to meanings and experiences. However, it could be useful to quantitatively explore the importance of each of these meanings, and determine if two other theorized variables, occupation and length of residence, have any role in the creation of sense of place. An appropriate way to conduct this quantitative exploration is to use the coded photographs as data points within a multiple discriminant function.

The idea of occupation and length of residence as drivers of sense of place has been previously tested. In terms of occupation, Carroll et al. (2000) found that
unemployed loggers wouldn’t move because of a strong attachment to their local communities and the small-town way of life those communities represented. The authors speculated that the loggers’ attachment to the logging occupation held them closer to home, a finding that mirrored the work of Hughes (1958) and Becker & Carper (1956), two early theorizers on attachment to work. Length of residence, on the other hand, emerges from the work of Karsada and Janowitz (1974), who tested several community attachment models, finding that one of the most useful models was predicated mainly on how long someone had lived in a certain place. This work was grounded in the writings of Thomas (1967) and Park & Burgess (1921, 1925), who were some of the first to claim that a local community is a “social construction which has its own life-cycle and reflects ecological, institutional, and normative variables,” and can therefore become more important to people the longer they stay there⁵ (Karsada & Janowitz, 1974, p.329).

Several steps were performed to operationalize the variables in terms of sense of place, length of residence, and occupation. First, the 341 resident photos were grouped into two sense of place categories based on their image: “landscape” and “community.” The landscape category was constructed from meanings surrounding the beauty of the natural landscapes, engagement in recreation, threats to the landscape, and tourism (see Table 5). The community category was constructed from those photos whose meanings represented friends, pride, history, community interactions, home, architecture, and work (see Table 5). Additionally, each photo was organized into two categories based on the occupation of the photographer (see Table 3): “resource-based”, consisting of the two retirees, the three self-employed participants, and the five tourism workers; and “non

---

⁵ The work of Karsada and Janowitz (1974) also suggests the appropriateness of measuring the strength of attachment. However, this study does not seek to understand strength as a factor of sense of place.
resource-based,” a classification including all others. Each photo was also labelled with how long the photographer had lived in Seward, a continuous variable with a mean of 21 years, a median of 18 years and a maximum of 62 years. Slightly more photographs were determined to convey a sense of place based on the landscape (51% versus 49%). More photos were taken by people employed outside of a natural resource-based industry than were taken by people employed in natural resources (63.6% percent versus 36.4%). The full results of the operationalization are displayed in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of place</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Landscape-based</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community-based</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of participants</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Resource-based</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Not Resource-based</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described in Chapter Three, discriminant analysis is a technique used to distinguish between two or more groups, based on a set of predictor variables. Tables 7 and 8 show the results of the multiple discriminant analysis which tests the ability of the occupation and length of residence variables to predict membership in the two sense of place categories. Neither variable differs significantly in terms of the two groups, and the predictive value of occupation and length of residence was worse than random - only
47.7 percent of the photos were successfully classified into the correct sense of place categories.

Table 7: Multiple discriminant analysis of sense of place categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrim Coeff</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Res</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p <.05
** p <.01
*** p <.001

Eigenvalue 0.008
Canonical Correlation 0.087
Wilks Lambda 0.992
Chi-Sq for Lambda 2.546
Significance of function P>.01

Table 8: Confusion matrix of predicted group memberships (n=341)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Landscape-based SoP</th>
<th>Community-based SoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape-based SoP</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.3%)</td>
<td>(55.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based SoP</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.3%)</td>
<td>(55.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of total cases correctly classified: 47.7%

Furthermore, both the Eigenvalue and the canonical correlation are extremely low, suggesting that very little of the variance in the discriminant function is explained by the categorizations of sense of place. The Wilks Lambda is high, and not significant, indicating that the group means do not differ, and therefore do not explain any variance in the discriminant scores. These findings, coupled with the low predictive power of the
discriminant function and the lack of significant differences between the independent variables, suggest that occupation and length of residence are not good predictors of whether or not sense of place will be based on landscape meanings or community meanings.

However, it should be noted that this finding may be caused by methodological problems, rather than theoretical ones. Specifically, the images contained in the photos may be poor indicators of sense of place. As noted before, some of the expressions were vague and difficult to categorize, challenging both reliability and validity. More work is needed to determine whether or not occupation and length of residence are predictors of place meanings.

The next step is to determine if the meanings that emerged so strongly in the interviews are good predictors of whether sense of place is based on “landscape” or “community.” To do this, the discriminant model was expanded to include the eleven categories of important place-based meanings contained in Table 5. Using this framework, a second multiple discriminant function was constructed using the two existing sense of place categories (“landscape” and “community”). The results of this analysis are contained in Table 9:
Table 9: Multiple discriminant analysis of sense of place categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning Variable</th>
<th>Discrim Coeff</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>151.425 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>-0.763</td>
<td>76.732 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends, family</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>39.553 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward &amp; AK</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>31.856 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>4.847 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community interactions</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>18.904 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>19.604 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>6.117 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>8.119 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>8.026 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>12.197 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001  

Eigenvalue 3.492  
Canonical Correlation 0.882  
Wilks Lambda 0.223  
Chi-Sq for Lambda 500.98  
Significance of function P<.001  

Group Centroids in Reduced Space  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape-based SoP</th>
<th>Community-based SoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.825</td>
<td>1.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 indicates that the model is strong. The discriminant function coefficients of seven of the meaning variables are statistically significant at the .001 level, indicating that the means of each variable differ across the two sense of place categories, and the results attributed to each of those variables are not due to chance. The canonical correlation is high, revealing a strong correlation between the meanings and the two sense of place categorizations. A score of 1.00 is perfect, and this analysis yielded a score of .882. Further indications of the strength of the model are the high Eigenvalue (indicating that a large proportion of the variance between the two groups was explained by the model), the low Wilks Lambda (indicating the proportion of the total variance among the
meanings not explained by the differences in the sense of place groups), and the significance of the overall discriminant function. The group centroids are of opposite signs but almost equal in absolute value, suggesting that the model has a strong capacity for discrimination.

Furthermore, each of the discriminant coefficients “can be interpreted in much the same way as a beta coefficient in a regression analysis” (Miller & Luloff, 1981, p.618). In this fashion, a comparative analysis of group centroids and the discriminant coefficients provide results similar to the qualitative analysis. Comparing negatively-signed coefficients shows that the photos classified as having a landscape-based sense of place tended to have accompanying meanings encompassing beauty, recreation, and tourism. Those with a community-based sense of place tended to carry meanings invoking family, pride, history, interactions, home, threats, architecture, and work. Friends and pride were the strongest discriminators, reflected by the high discriminant coefficients and F-values. On the other hand, history and threats were the weakest, with coefficients closer to zero and F-values approaching insignificance. These findings are in keeping with the qualitative findings – the main difference being the association of the meanings surrounding “threats to the landscape” with a community-based sense of place.

The power of the meaning variables to predict sense of place membership is described in Table 10. The expanded model correctly classifies 93% of the photos, a predictive ability almost twice that of the model using only occupation and length of residence.
Table 10: Confusion matrix of predicted group memberships – meanings (n=341)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Landscape-based SoP</th>
<th>Community-based SoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape-based SoP</td>
<td>152 (87.4%)</td>
<td>22 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based SoP</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>165 (98.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174 (51.0%)</td>
<td>167 (49.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of total cases correctly classified: 93.0%

Table 10 also indicates that the discriminant model is slightly better at predicting community-based sense of place than it is at predicting landscape-based sense of place (98.8% versus 87.4%). This may be a result of the greater number of meanings that were determined to be community related. Also, when compared to the confusion matrix\(^6\) presented in Table 8, it is evident that within the old model using occupation and length of residence, 44.3% of photos depicting a community-based sense of place were misclassified as depicting a landscape-based sense of place. But, 55.7% of photos depicting a landscape-based sense of place were misclassified as depicting a community-based sense of place. Therefore, using the meanings to predict sense of place not only improved predictability, it also “eliminated a systematic error of prediction” (Miller & Luloff, 1981, p. 618).

**Summarizing sense of place in a setting context**

This research question sought to understand sense of place in a setting context by determining places of importance, the meanings and experiences that gave rise to that importance, and the ways in which meanings and experiences contribute to the creation

\(^6\) A confusion matrix is a table describing actual and predicted classifications.
and maintenance of sense of place. Using photos and interviews collected from 25 residents of Seward, Alaska, the following important places, meanings, and experiences emerged:

Table 11: Summary of important places, meanings, and experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important places</th>
<th>Important meanings and experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>Beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and tourism facilities</td>
<td>Friends, family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workplace</td>
<td>Community interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These places, meanings, and experiences were qualitatively analyzed to understand how they interact in the creation and maintenance of sense of place. Four themes emerged:

- The natural landscape: beautiful surroundings and threatening/threatened resources
- The community: people, history, pride, and tourism
- Recreation spaces: their social and solitary importance
- Seward as “home”: continuity, friends, and families
In addition to this qualitative assessment, a multiple discriminant analysis was conducted to further expand upon the individual importance of these meanings, and determine if two other theorized variables, occupation and length of residence, have any role in the creation of sense of place. It was determined from this analysis that while occupation and length of residents are not strong predictors of sense of place, the meanings and experiences captured in the photo categorization explained much of the variation between a landscape-based and a community-based sense of place. This assessment complimented the quantitative analysis, with one exception: the category capturing meanings that had to do with threats to the landscape was quantitatively determined to be connected to a community-based sense of place, while the qualitative approach found it to be connected to the natural landscape.
Chapter Five: Sense of Place in an Activity Context

While the first research question sought to understand sense of place in a setting context, the second seeks to understand sense of place in the context of a particular activity. This will be done using the data set consisting of photos and interviews from 10 individuals who volunteered in the Streamwatch Program at the Russian River Campground. While both the residents of Seward and the Streamwatch volunteers were asked to photograph and discuss elements of their daily lives that provided the most meaning, the volunteers were also instructed to photograph things that attached them to their volunteer work, represented why they volunteer, or demonstrated what they would most miss if they ceased volunteering. This chapter will describe the places in and around the activity site (in this case the Russian River Campground) that are important to the volunteers, the meanings that make the activity important, and the experiences that give rise to those meanings. It will also describe how these places and meanings contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place in the context of volunteering.

Table 12 shows that of the ten participants in the volunteer data set, four were male. Six were over age 55, three were between 45 and 54, and only one was younger than 44 years of age. Six of the ten participants had served 5 years or longer.
Table 12: Sample characteristics of the Streamwatch volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time with Streamwatch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Places
As with the resident photos in the setting context, each photograph was labeled based on its image in order to determine the places of importance in and around the Russian River Campground volunteer site. After discussion, review of the literature, and two separate rounds of labeling, it was decided that each of the 115 photographs could be adequately organized into the following six place categories (Table 13). It is important to note that these categories reflect places only, so the concept of “work,” commonly affiliated with volunteer attachment, is not represented at this stage.

Table 13. Important places based on analysis of photographs (n=115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places representing the act of socializing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities of the Russian River campground</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “natural landscapes” category included scenic views of the Russian River, the mountains surrounding Cooper Landing, and other natural features of the area. This category was the most often invoked, with 32 out of 115 photos (27.8%) determined to contain these nature-based images. Twenty-five of the photos (21.7%) pictured places that appeared to represent the act of socializing. Twenty-two photos (19.1%) depicted “the local community,” including the Cooper Landing community center, the local museum, and the general store. Facilities specific to the Russian River campground were depicted in 19 photos (16.5%), and other recreation facilities were in 13 photos (11.3%). It is worth noting that the other recreation facilities category contains facilities located within the campground, but not obviously so. Finally, representations of the volunteer’s home appeared in 4 pictures (3.5%). Below are examples of the types of photos assigned to each category:

Natural landscapes:
The act of socializing:

The local community:

Facilities in the Russian River Campground:
Recreation facilities:

Home:

Organizing the photos in this fashion revealed the places in and around Cooper Landing and the Russian River Campground that are important to the Streamwatch volunteers. As in the last chapter, this project also aimed to illuminate any activity-based meanings and experiences that serve as the fundamental building blocks of the volunteer’s sense of place. To better understand these meanings and experiences, the interviews with the Streamwatch volunteers were analyzed alongside their photographs. This process of re-labeling resulted in a new organization of each photos, this time in terms of important meanings and experiences.
Meanings, experiences, and the creation of sense of place

The new organization of photos in terms of meanings and experiences revealed not just what was portrayed by the surface-level photographic image, but also what that portrayal meant to the photographer. This made it possible to determine the specific meanings and experiences that in turn help explain why general settings such as the “natural landscape” or “the community” were important. Table 14 includes these meanings and experiences, and their frequency:

Table 14. Important meanings and experiences from the photos and interviews (n=115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People, friends, social interactions</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource (work/serious leisure)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (spreading the message)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category encompassing “people, friends, and social interactions” was the most frequent with 27 out of 115 photos (23.5%). The “natural landscapes” category was second, with 22 photos (19.1%). Wildlife was depicted in the photos and interviews 17 times (14.8%), and a meaning surrounding “protecting the resource” was depicted 16 times (13.9%). The concept of “recreation” was next (13 photos, 11.3%) followed by “teaching and spreading the message” (11 photos, 9.6%). Finally, the meaning of home was invoked 9 times (7.8%).

Digging deeper into these meanings and experiences in the context of volunteering in the Streamwatch program requires an understanding of how they are
connected to the actual places of importance. To accomplish this, the interviews were coded and qualitatively analyzed independently of the photographs. This resulted in an organization of the emergent meanings into place-based themes. Each of these themes makes a connection between the places of importance described in the photographic images, and the meanings and experiences that emerged from the interviews. The following four themes best organize these connections between important places and important meanings:

- The Russian River setting: protecting landscapes and wildlife
- Social spaces: interacting with like-minded volunteers in and around the campground
- Recreation at the Russian River and in Cooper Landing
- The campground as a place to teach and give back

Each of these themes will now be described in turn, with support from the photographs and interviews. The smallest of the place categories, “home” is purposely excluded, because it was very specific to a small number of participants and was therefore determined to make very little overall contribution to sense of place. Also, as noted in Chapter Three, the volunteer interviews were not recorded, because the researcher did not possess the necessary equipment to record phone conversations. Instead of direct quotations, the photos will be supported with excerpts from notes taken during each of the interviews.

*The Russian River setting: protecting landscapes and wildlife.* The Russian River as a setting for the Streamwatch program was very important to the volunteers as both an actual place and a cogent meaning. As a place, it represented a wide range of both past and present experiences, both volunteer-related and not. As a meaning, it symbolized the
importance the volunteers placed on the immediate preservation of the natural resources of Alaska. To Martin, a retired Streamwatch volunteer from Anchorage, this preservation meant working to restore the landscape to the way it was before human impact. The following photo is of a little-used hiking trail leading into the wilderness:

![White trail is actually detour trail from red trail to power line. It’s a rainforest. Amazing. Makes you think about what it was like. So unique. I want to keep it as it is.](image)

Martin’s comments suggest that the trail was important to him because it represented how the landscape might have appeared in the past. By participating in Streamwatch, Martin could tap into this vision and contribute to the restoration of the natural area. A similar example of the importance of working toward restoration was provided by Dave, a five-year volunteer whose photo portrays a “keep off” sign that has almost been overgrown by the vegetation it was designed to protect:
Signage that was put up for restoration. See how much it’s improved over the years. There was nothing there once. Facing nothing but dirt before.

The meaning of Streamwatch as a vehicle for preserving the landscape also sheds light on why certain volunteers participate. For instance, some engaged in the restoration of the river because of their enduring love for it. Sarah, a 66 year old retiree who had been with Streamwatch for 5 years, provided the following photo of a riverbank, suggesting that her love for the river was a primary reason why she participated in Streamwatch:

Cottonwood corner up close and foliage. Improvement is the best here because it’s where the people are. Would still do it because we just love the river.
The idea of “love” for the landscape was articulated by several participants. One of the more interesting examples came from Dave, who provided a photo of a place he loved so much that he wanted his ashes spread there. This love actually drives him to act, as he wishes to see other people “appreciate it more.”

Scenery where my ashes will be scattered. Hopefully people will appreciate it more. Stop and look at these things.

In addition to holding meanings involving the protection of the natural landscapes around the Russian River, people were connected to the wildlife in the area as well. As was the case with the residents of Seward, a photo did not necessarily have to include an image of an animal in order to have an attached wildlife meaning:
Even though the bears are not in the photo, they are clearly the focus of both the photographer and the people huddled together along the trail. The following photo, taken by Sarah, also invokes the importance of wildlife (without capturing them in the image):

While wildlife was an important component of the natural-resource based sense of place of the volunteers for personal reasons, it was also important because of what it meant for their work with Streamwatch. Charlotte, a 62 year old resident of Moose Pass
who was in her ninth year with the Streamwatch program, was fortunate (or unfortunate, depending on one’s perspective) to encounter this black bear exploring the campground:

**Black bear. Impacts what we do. This year overwhelming. Bears up in campground too. Warn people. Try to make them understand. This experience makes people aware.**

Her main point is that the existence of bears around the area adds an additional element to her work as a Streamwatch volunteer. Warning visitors about bears is one of the primary responsibilities of the Streamwatch program, and is therefore a chief ingredient of how volunteers relate to the landscape. The following photos show the interrelationship between other animals and the Russian River’s “bear problem:”

**Gulls are part of the bear problem. They pull the fish carcasses out for bears. People don’t mess with them (bears).**
In summary, the meanings and experiences surrounding the natural landscape in and around the Russian River involved both protection of the land itself and protection (through successful coexistence) of the wildlife that inhabit the area. This finding differs from the landscape-based meanings revealed in the setting context, where the primary role of the landscape was to symbolize beauty.

Social spaces: interacting with like-minded volunteers. The second important organizing feature of meanings and experiences within the volunteers’ special places involves the importance of the friendships and relationships that are cultivated during the volunteer experience. Representing fun, solidarity, and purpose, the act of creating and maintaining friendships was revealed to be one of the highlights of volunteering in the Streamwatch program. In fact, nearly every participant who discussed relationships and friendships suggested that the seeing familiar people was one of the main reasons they returned to the Streamwatch program each year. Marissa, a volunteer in her mid forties, provided an example of the social aspect of volunteering by providing a photo of two other volunteers who were staying at a nearby campsite:
In addition to maintaining friendships, the “teamwork” that took place among the fellow Streamwatch volunteers was an important social meaning among many participants. Charlotte gathered several Streamwatch members for a group photo:

An important person within this group photo is Alicia, the Streamwatch Coordinator and liaison between the volunteers and the Forest Service. Alicia was held in
Alicia was important to the Streamwatch volunteers for three reasons. First, they saw her as a reliable and expert presence upon whom they could rely for advice, instruction, and resources. Second, they felt that she did a good job both training and
recruiting volunteers, by accounting for differences among people and doing her best to accommodate their various needs. Third, and most importantly, many of the volunteers considered her to be a good friend. Ultimately, Alicia was one of the reasons the volunteers returned to Streamwatch each season. Alicia was due to retire at the conclusion of the summer in which this research was conducted, and several volunteers indicated that she would be missed.

Other social meanings conveyed by the volunteers had to do with how they were rewarded as a group by the Forest Service. The following photo is of the picnic pavilion at the campground, which was the site of the annual volunteer picnic, an event held to recognize their participation in the Streamwatch program. Meredith, a 60 year old resident of Cooper Landing, and Dave, the 56 year old retiree, both provided photos of the picnic pavilion:

![Pavilion. Where the picnic is. Sponsored by sport fishermen association. Thank you gift, same for everybody.]
Both Meredith and Dave felt the annual picnic was an important reward for two reasons. First, it allowed them to catch up with other volunteers who they may not see but once or twice a year. Second, the picnic served as an official “thank you” from the Forest Service and the Kenai River Sportfishing Association. As with other areas of volunteering, the rewards gained from participating in Streamwatch were less about place and more about the activity. This suggests that regardless of where volunteer activity takes place, the attachment to rewards will be the same. Perhaps, the rewards are an important social meaning, one that inspires volunteers to continue their volunteer efforts.

The social interactions that were so important to the volunteers were not strictly limited to the boundaries of the Russian River campground. Jean, a 49 year-old resident of Cooper Landing who had volunteered with Streamwatch for 4 years, provided a photo and discussion of a different place where she volunteers:

*Pavilion. Where the end-of-season picnic is. Spring and fall. A nice place to catch up.*
Community landmarks such as these could be important even if the participant didn’t actually volunteer there. In the following photo, Dave suggests that the social interactions important to his sense of place also occur in places other than the Streamwatch program:

Community club member. Rented out for weddings, meetings. Great place to meet people. Good for community.

Social meanings could also be political in nature. Carter, a 47 year old resident of Cooper Landing who had been with Streamwatch for five years, provided a photo of a
gated roadway. He spearheaded an effort to persuade the Forest Service to unlock the gate, allowing passage to local residents. In this case, the political relationships that resulted were important contributors to his sense of place, as was his pride in his fellow volunteers, and what they were able to accomplish as a group.

In summary, the process of interacting with like-minded others in and around the campground contributes to the creation and maintenance of sense of place in an activity context through meanings invoking friendships, strong connections to the Forest Service liaison, group rewards, and community-based volunteering outside of the Streamwatch program. The fact that these social meanings and experiences spilled beyond the boundaries of the Russian River campground helps confirm the theoretical assertion described in Chapter Two which suggests that volunteer behavior, like sense of place, has roots in personal motivations and social contexts, which in turn impact meanings.

Recreation at the Russian River and in Cooper Landing. Several of the Streamwatch volunteers saw their efforts as a form of recreation. This was evidenced by the recurrence of images depicting the complimentary campsites provided to those

Most important! Took a year to get around sign. Really proud of government people – Nelson has been spectacular. I did it, I got past, thanks to their help. This happened because of volunteers.
Streamwatch workers who lived outside the local area. The following photos, from three different participants, show both the RV spots available to Streamwatch volunteers and the Russian River Campground itself:

*Actual campsite and motor home. Screen porch, private. Lots of room for enjoyment.*

*Campsite #59. Forest Service gives us the site. A.R.M. is the campground subcontractor. These are amenities that allow us to do this. We couldn't afford it otherwise.*
The free campsite was important to the Streamwatch volunteers for three reasons. First, they felt that receiving use of the site made their volunteer efforts seem less like work, and more like recreation. After their shifts, they could return to the campsite and engage in the same recreation activities as everyone else. Second, receiving the site for free helped many of them afford participation in the project, since a normal two-week reservation at the campground cost in excess of two hundred dollars. Third, it allowed them to connect with other volunteers. In many instances, volunteer shifts would overlap, and as a result other volunteers from out of town would share the site. This resulted in both the strengthening of old friendships and the development of new ones.

In the case of the campsite, the recreation was peripheral to the volunteer activity. Volunteers did their work, and were rewarded with an opportunity to recreate. In other cases, the act of volunteering was concurrent with recreation, an opportunity to both do some good and participate in a favorite activity at the same time. Dave provided the following photo which symbolizes why he and his wife volunteered:
Wife and I on river fishing for reds. One of the reasons that we volunteer, to keep fishing.

As with the social meanings, the recreation meanings provided by the volunteers were not always connected to Streamwatch or the Russian River. For instance, Jean described her attachment to her family’s personal cabin:

Our cabin – family and good times. Two kids live in Anchorage. Cabin was on property.

In this case, her recreation-based meanings were less activity-based and instead invoked family, fun times, and a sense of home. In other cases, recreation meanings were in fact activity-based, although those activities did not necessarily have to include the Streamwatch program. In his spare time, Carter was an avid miner, and contributed the following photos detailing his engagement in the activity of searching for gold:
God’s country. This is where I head up to gold-mine.

Dredge (for gold). This is way up in the canyon.

Gold in the trough. It settles in.
The photos above are insightful for several reasons. First, they represent a recreation activity that is both activity-based and landscape-based (“God’s country”, “way up in the canyon”, etc). This suggests that recreation as a meaning contributes to sense of place in multiple ways. Additionally, the photos are of places that are outside the boundary of the Russian River campground and the Streamwatch program.

In summary, the meanings and experiences surrounding recreation involved activities both in and outside of the Russian River campground, and in many case had nothing to do with volunteering in the Streamwatch program. These meanings contributed to sense of place differently that the recreation meanings that emerged from the Seward data set, mainly due to the lack of other people throughout the photos and interviews. When volunteering was invoked, it was used to describe the volunteer activity as a means to a recreational end (i.e. participating in Streamwatch in order to camp or fish). However, not all volunteers saw their work in that way – as described below, some volunteers saw their work as a combination of both recreation and fulfillment.

---

7 Carter chose not to be specific about the location of these photos, out of concern for the secrecy of his mining claim.
The campground as a place to teach and give back. Another important meaning within the sense of place of the volunteers involved their ability to construct and maintain the role of “teacher.” One of the major requirements of the Streamwatch program was to educate fishermen in the ways of resource-friendly fishing practices, and help visitors avoid the attentions of the many large bears that populate the area. To this end, volunteers would patrol the boardwalk, observing behaviors, engaging in interpretation, answering questions, providing assistance, and offering advice. This opportunity to “be an expert” about the facilities, the agency, and the Streamwatch mission was of great importance to volunteers. In some cases, this was symbolized by the campground itself:

Program works to save river. Privileged to be part of it. Like people and educating.

In other cases, it was symbolized by volunteers in action. Megan, a middle-aged resident of the nearby town of Moose Pass, indicated the importance of teaching fishermen about bears. She suggested that while some fishermen were resistant to the information, most were responsive to the larger message:
Warning people about bears, teaching them about what we do. They are hesitant. 75% are responsive to the message. Cross-section of people. Most people are in awe of the place so they listen.

Charlotte, the 57 year old volunteer from Cooper Landing, also mentioned the receptiveness of the fishing public:

The photos and interviews suggest that the volunteers see their work as that of a teacher, not an enforcer. Additionally, they also described meanings centered on the importance of protecting the actual facilities that people (including the volunteers
themselves) frequently use. This was often couched in terms of “giving back,” or working towards the upkeep of facilities that they themselves have used in the past. Many volunteers saw facilities built by the Forest Service along the river as a public good, and felt a strong connection to their role as maintainers. Martin provided an example of just such a facility, with a photo of a staircase that was built to ease the erosion of a steep trail leading from the parking lot to the river:

Grayling stairs facing up. To show improvement of area. Used to have to climb the bank. Caused erosion. Can keep and restore.

Martin felt that facilities such as this complimented his landscape-based meanings centering on the restoration of the shoreline. At another point in his interview, he conveyed pride in his role in the upkeep of the facilities, in part because he felt he had contributed to the overuse of the Russian River in the past. By participating in the Streamwatch program, and helping to build and maintain the boardwalk and the staircase, he could give back to the place that once upon a time had given to him. Sarah, like
Martin, felt that the some of the facilities in and around the Russian River were symbols of the area’s restoration:

Boardwalk. Sign of comeback. Shows how well its doing. (would you change the program?) No changes or improvements.

The meanings and experiences surrounding the act of teaching and giving something back also manifested themselves in the volunteer’s perception that they were an important part of something official. The volunteers were given official-looking uniforms and materials, so that many members of the public could not easily distinguish between the volunteers and full-time rangers. According to one of the Forest Service managers overseeing the project, this was done on purpose, to provide a sense of authority and expertise that make the volunteers more convincing to the general public.

Several of the photos and interviews showed that the volunteers took pride in the “official” nature of the project. The installation of the pre-printed, professional-looking signage captured in the following photos made Megan feel good about her role, and the commitment of the Forest Service to the Streamwatch program:
Official signage helps get the point across.

Forest Service has done a good job with the signage. They evolve and things get updated. People are taking time to read the signs.

The next photo, taken by Sarah, is also of a pre-printed sign, but the volunteer’s connection to it is different. While the previous signs were important because they were official-looking, this sign is important for what it says. It essentially presents a “before and after” scenario for that part of the river bank.

Sign shows what’s happening. Bear corner. Same as cottonwood corner. Shows the “before.” So you can see for yourself. Most walk by, but some read. Explains basics.

Later in her interview, Sarah indicated that the content of this sign made her feel “official” because it offered her a chance to participate in interpretation, which she
perceived as an activity usually reserved for paid Forest Service staff. She was proud of her expertise, and happy to share it in an “official” capacity.

In summary, the volunteers shared a common attachment to both the message they were trying to spread, and shared the meanings associated with being teachers. This shared identity, predicated on the Streamwatch mission of resource conservation and shoreline protection, actually bound the volunteers together, in ways similar to the shared community identity associated with Seward’s “All-American City” designation.

The experience of teaching and giving back is similar to the other ingredients of sense of place in that teaching-based experiences and meanings are centered more on the activity than on the specific place. However, the Forest Service created the Streamwatch program to save a specific place. This suggests that the roles played by both the agency and the volunteer are more than just management – they actually serve as one of the important bridges between the place itself and the meanings that the volunteers ascribe to it.

**Expanding upon the role of meanings**

The thematic qualitative analysis described above portrayed the creation and maintenance of sense of place by linking important places to meanings and experiences. The following quantitative analysis will expand upon the role of these meanings, and determine if one other theorized variable, the length of time spent volunteering, is a good predictor of whether or not sense of place will be based on landscape meanings or activity meanings. As in the previous chapter, this analysis will use the coded photographs as data points within a simple linear and multiple discriminant function.
The idea of length of volunteering as a driver of sense of place has emerged in past studies of volunteers. Specifically, Robinson & Wilkinson (2000) found that the length of time one had spent as a volunteer was a significant factor in a measured community cohesion scale, although it did not contribute substantially to the strength of the model. Similarly, Ryan et al. (2001) suggested that a measure of “frequency of participation” was a more appropriate way to predict volunteer commitment than a measure of the length of time spent volunteering. However, the data set collected from the Streamwatch volunteers included only the length of time spent volunteering, and did not include other measures of volunteer effort.

In order to operationalize the variables reflecting sense of place and length of volunteer service, the meaning categories attributed to the 115 volunteer photos were grouped into two sense of place categories based on their image: “landscape” and “activity.” The landscape category is constructed from meanings surrounding natural landscapes, facilities of the Russian River campground, and general recreation facilities (see Table 14). The activity category contains those photos whose meanings represented places for socialization, the local community, and home (see Table 14). Additionally, each photo was also labelled with how long (continuously, in N years) the photographer had volunteered with the Streamwatch program (Table 15):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of place</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Landscape-based</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Activity-based</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slightly more photographs were determined to convey a sense of place based on the landscape than a sense of place based on the activity (55.6% versus 44.4%). The average length of the Streamwatch volunteer’s tenure was 4.5 years, with a median of 5 years and a maximum of 9 years.

Table 16 shows the results of a simple linear discriminant analysis testing the ability of the “length of time spent volunteering” variable to predict membership in the two sense of place categories. The variable does not differ significantly in terms of the two groups, and the predictive value of length of time spent volunteering was weak - only 52.2 percent of the photos were successfully classified into the correct sense of place categories. This is in keeping with the literature, which described the limited importance of length of time spent volunteering:

Table 16: Confusion matrix of predicted group memberships (n=115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Landscape-based SoP</th>
<th>Activity-based SoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape-based SoP</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57.8%)</td>
<td>(42.2%)</td>
<td>(55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity-based SoP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54.9%)</td>
<td>(45.1%)</td>
<td>(44.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of total cases correctly classified: 52.2%

Eigenvalue 0.000
Canonical Correlation 0.002
Wilks Lambda 1.000
Chi-Sq for Lambda 0.001
Significance of function p>.05
Furthermore, both the Eigenvalue and the canonical correlation are extremely low, suggesting that very little of the variance in the discriminant function is explained by the categorizations of sense of place. The Wilks Lambda is high, and not significant, indicating that the group means do not differ, and therefore do not explain any variance in the discriminant scores in terms of length of volunteering. These findings, coupled with the low predictive power of the discriminant function and the lack of significant differences between the independent variables, suggest that the length of time spent volunteering is not a good predictor of whether or not sense of place will be based on landscape meanings or activity meanings.

As with the analysis based on the resident data set in the setting context, it should be noted that this finding may be caused by methodological problems, rather than theoretical ones. Specifically, the meanings expressed in the photos may be poor indicators of sense of place. As noted before, some of the expressions were vague and difficult to categorize, challenging both reliability and validity. More work is needed to determine whether or not it can be concluded that the length of time spent volunteering is a predictor of place meanings.

The next step is to determine if the meanings that emerged from the interviews are good predictors of sense of place. To do this, the model described above was expanded to include the seven categories of important place-based meanings and experiences contained in Table 14. Using this framework, a second multiple discriminant function was constructed using the existing sense of place categories (“landscape-based” and “activity-based”). The results of this analysis are described in Table 17:
Table 17: Multiple discriminant analysis of sense of place categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning variable</th>
<th>Discrim Coeff</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>37.736 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>5.961 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>2.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>5.117 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home^8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-      *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001

Eigenvalue 0.538
Canonical Correlation 0.591
Wilks Lambda 0.65
Chi-Sq for Lambda 47.339
Significance of Function p < .001

Group Centroids in Reduced Space
  Landscape-based SoP -0.649
  Activity-based SoP 0.814

This model is not as strong as the discriminant function that was applied to the resident data set in the setting context. The discriminant function coefficients of only three of the meaning variables are statistically significant, and only one of those is significant at the .001 level. These coefficients, then, identify only natural landscapes, wildlife, and recreation as important discriminators of the two sense of place groupings. The canonical correlation, while above .5, is still substantially lower than the perfect score of 1.00. This, coupled with the Eigenvalue of .538, reveals that only half of the variation in the discriminant function is explained by the sense of place categorizations. However, the Wilks Lambda (indicating the proportion of the total variance among the

^8 The “home” variable did not pass the minimum tolerance test and was therefore excluded from the analysis.
meanings not explained by the differences in the sense of place groups), is significant, suggesting that the group means do in fact differ.

The group centroids, while not equal in absolute value, are of opposite signs. This suggests that the model is still capable of discrimination (Miller & Luloff, 1981, p.618). However, only three of the meanings had discriminant coefficients that were significant. Of the three, the natural landscape and wildlife variables were associated with a landscape-based sense of place, while the recreation variable was more closely associated with an activity-based sense of place.

The power of the meaning variables to predict sense of place membership is described in Table 18. The expanded model correctly classifies 76.5% of the photos, which is an increase of 24.3% percentage points over the model that used length of time volunteering in the Streamwatch program. This represents a 50% increase in predictive power.

Table 18: Confusion matrix of predicted group memberships: meanings (n=115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape-based SoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity-based SoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape-based SoP</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(89.1%)</td>
<td>(10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity-based SoP</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39.2%)</td>
<td>(60.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55.6%)</td>
<td>(44.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of total cases correctly classified: 76.5%

Table 18 also indicates that the discriminant model is substantially better at predicting landscape-based sense than it is at predicting activity-based sense of place (89.1% versus 60.8%). This is surprising given the fact that 23.5 percent of the photos
were coded based on social interactions and other people (Table 14). However, when compared to the confusion matrix presented in Table 16, it is evident that the expanded model using occupation and length of residence misclassifies fewer photos. For example, in the model using length of time spent volunteering, 54.9% of photos depicting a activity-based sense of place were misclassified as depicting a landscape-based sense of place. Also, 42.7% of photos depicting a landscape-based sense of place were misclassified as depicting an activity-based sense of place. Therefore, although using the meanings did not greatly improve the predictive power of the model, it did manage to reduce errors in prediction.

**Summarizing sense of place in an activity context**
This research question sought to understand sense of place in an activity context by determining places of importance, the meanings and experiences that gave rise to that importance, and the ways in which meanings and experiences contribute to the creation and maintenance of sense of place. Using photos and interviews collected from 10 individuals who volunteered in the Streamwatch Program at the Russian River in Cooper Landing, AK, the following important places, meanings, and experiences emerged:
Table 19: Summary of important places, meanings, and experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important places</th>
<th>Important Meanings and experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>People, friends, social interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places representing the act of socializing</td>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities of the Russian River campground</td>
<td>Protecting the resource (work/serious leisure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation facilities</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Teaching (spreading the message)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These places, meanings, and experiences were qualitatively analyzed to understand how they interact in the creation and maintenance of sense of place. As with the Seward resident data set in the setting context, four themes emerged:

- The Russian River setting: protecting landscapes and wildlife
- Social spaces: interacting with like-minded volunteers in and around the campground
- Recreation at the Russian River and Cooper Landing
- The campground as a place to teach and give back

In addition to this qualitative assessment, simple linear and multiple discriminant analyses were conducted to further explore the individual importance of these meanings, and determine if one other theorized variable, the length of time spent volunteering, had any role in the creation of sense of place. It was determined from this analysis that while the length of time spent volunteering was not a strong predictor of sense of place, neither were many of the meanings and experiences captured in the photo categorization. The
fact that only a few of these variables explained any of the variation between a landscape-based and an activity-based sense of place suggests that more data, with more volunteers in more locations, may be necessary to fully understand how meanings and places work together to create sense of place in an activity context.
Chapter Six: Discussion and Conclusions

To better understand sense of place, this project questioned two different sets of data: one that is setting-focused, gathered from people in and around a small town; and one that is activity-focused, gathered from people who join together to volunteer their time at a heavily-used recreation site. Using both photographic and interview data, researchers determined the actual places of importance, the meanings and experiences that gave rise to that importance, and the ways in which those meanings and experiences contributed to the creation and maintenance of sense of place. At the conclusion of Chapter Two, it was stated that these findings would be important because of their contribution to 1) the existing scholarship on sense of place, 2) future explorations of the parallel relationship between sense of place and community, and 3) an understanding of the connections between what volunteers do and why they do it. This chapter will use the findings from this project to assess each of these claims, and will also discuss the usefulness and limitations of the study method.

Contribution to the existing scholarship on sense of place
Among the participants who lived in Seward, the photographs and interviews revealed meanings and experiences which represented the beauty of the landscape, recreation, friends and family, home, and tourism – all of which are in keeping with the literature. However, one meaning in particular was a surprise: the natural landscape as both ‘threatening’ (due to the possibility of natural disaster), and ‘threatened’ (due to resource depletion, conflicting resource use, and exclusion). In both cases, the threatening/threatened landscape was viewed in terms of its potential destructive impact
on the settings in and around the town of Seward. Put simply, the Seward participants were *evaluating* their special places in terms of these perceived risks.

Among the Streamwatch volunteers, the meanings and experiences within their sense of place focused on social interactions, the Russian River landscape, and wildlife, in addition to the work-related meanings surrounding teaching and the protection of the resource. As a whole, these findings were surprising because they suggested that the participants seemed to be just as connected to the Russian River as they were to the act of volunteering. For instance, the continued references to the Russian River were very specific, highlighting both past and present experiences at the river, most often in the context of recreation and leisure. This specificity suggests that the river itself is the primary reason why many of the volunteers participated in Streamwatch in the first place. This heightened importance of the setting is an important contribution to the literature on activity specialization, serious leisure, public participation, and other activity contexts, which have not always accounted for the influence of the setting on the activities that take place within. Volunteer studies similar to this one are underway in locations outside of Alaska, and it will be interesting to see if they yield similar results.

In addition to the surprises described above, the findings also *confirmed* several points within the literature. First, both the resident and volunteer participants provided examples of direct and symbolic experiences with a landscape. The bike on the mountain trail, or the rack full of kayaks, are examples relating to direct experiences. The participants also added symbolic representations, both directly and indirectly experienced. An example of these symbols at work would be the photos and discussion
surrounding various flags, buildings, or monuments, many of which convey a connection to Alaska and the creation of a special ‘Alaskan’ identity.

Second, the findings confirmed that sense of place works at either a personal, individual level, or a social, group-based level. There were indications throughout the data of personal creations of sense of place, such as volunteers who were looking to “give back” to the Russian River, or residents who loved the landscape around Seward because of a specific attachment to its beauty. In addition, there were group-based meanings, reflected by the repeated referrals to organizations in Seward (church groups, the community center) and the various social discourses taking place therein (e.g. the discussion about “getting our town back”). However, it is important to note that not every mention of community reflected a social meaning - descriptions of “my” community reflected individual meanings, while references to “our” community reflected social meanings.

Finally, for the Seward residents, their identity as “Alaskans” was a visible and critical part of their sense of place. This was displayed by the referrals to the history of Seward and Alaska, and the pride that many of the participants felt towards Alaska’s reputation as a rugged, independent place. The participants, then, used this social construction of Alaska as a “place apart” as a factor in their sense of place, much like Grieder and Garkovich’s (1994) subjects constructed their definitions of landscape based on cultural interpretations and social interactions. Among volunteers, the identity created was that of a member in an interactional, non-territorial group of like minded people. The creation of this “community” of volunteers emerged from both the act of volunteering and an attachment to the Russian River. The fact that it was both the action and place,
instead of just the place alone, support Theodori’s assertion (2005) that “community occurs in places and is place oriented, but the place itself, per se, is not the community” (p.663).

Exploring the parallel relationship between sense of place and community

As described in Chapter Two, sense of place and community are parallel in terms of how people interact with both the landscape and each other. Sense of place is created through 1) cumulative, direct experience with a place, and/or 2) the use of symbols. Community is created through a similar process - people develop and maintain strong connections based on direct experiences with others and/or symbolic representations of what their community means. While social interactions are not needed for the creation of sense of place, they are a requirement for the existence of community.

However, social interactions that represented both experiential and symbolic forms of community were clearly an ingredient that emerged when the residents and volunteers were asked to describe their sense of place. In terms of the residents, this was evident via the place-based meanings surrounding friends and family, interactions with fellow townspeople in community settings (the post office and grocery store), and engagement in collective action (the 4th of July celebration or the saving of the Noon Bell). In terms of the volunteers, the description of community was both experiential, focusing on social interactions such as the end of season picnic, and symbolic, focusing on the shared perceptions of teaching and protecting that the act of volunteering represents.

Using the sense of place and community frameworks in this project has helped illuminate how people are connected to settings and activities. However, the findings
described above also suggest a new way to explore the parallel relationship between sense of place and community. Specifically, sense of place, in both community and activity contexts, could be a lens through which to view community development. Specifically, sense of place could be a factor in the development “of” community, defined as a heightened engagement in the collective actions that help people meet their day-to-day needs. Sense of place could also factor into a more personal, individual type of development “in” community, predicated on behaviors that could not only impact how people participate in communities, but potentially change their position within them.

It may be useful to consider examples that illuminate how these two forms of community development might work. In Seward, it seems that development “of” community is evident in the photos and discussions involving tourism - specifically the repeated references to the large amount of effort that went into achieving “All-American City” status for Seward. This suggests that meanings surrounding Seward’s identity as a tourist destination could be causing people to engage in actions that further develop that tourist identity.

Additionally, both Seward participants and Streamwatch volunteers referred to the importance of creating and maintaining relationships with the federal and state agencies that oversee natural resources. By playing an active role in resource management, residents could be attempting development “of” community, by working to ensure Seward’s position as a natural resource town. Finally, an additional example of development “of” community could be the public outcry and organized vote to reinstate the noon bell. In this instance, the people of Seward came together to engage in collective
action that saved an important community symbol - possibly enhancing the power of their community in the process.

The volunteer data provides the best examples of how people could possibly use sense of place to inform their development “in” community. In addition to the actual work itself, and the Russian River setting, the volunteers showed a sense of place built in part on relationships - both with other volunteers and the U.S. Forest Service. The creation and maintenance of these relationships with like-minded others suggests development “in” community, as volunteers use interpersonal connections to strengthen and enhance their role in the Streamwatch program. This type of community development can be further distinguished from development “of” community because it is not specifically tied to a geographic referent (the Russian River) that is used by people who are operating in settings like Seward.

Future explorations of community development as a connector of sense of place and community require understanding not only the experiences that go into one’s sense of place, and how they create meanings, but also evaluations of sense of place, such as place satisfaction, place dependence, or strength of attachment. Assessing how much a place means, or what it is important for, can greatly aid the understanding of how places can move people to action. What’s more, the context in which people are seeing their landscapes – for instance, as a resident or as a volunteer – will have a hand in the behaviors that develop community.

However, is should be noted that interactional community building is a complex endeavor, of which sense of place is only one ingredient. Outcomes such as community activism or expressions of community identity that reflect the development “of”
community may be based on more than just people’s connection to the location. They may be based on the specific problem at hand, the cast of characters involved in the issue, or the nature of the existing society. Likewise, outcomes such as increased skill or heightened authority that reflect development “in” community may depend in part on attachment to some heretofore undiscovered component of the community activity, the setting, or the creation of a particular identity. Despite these concerns, great potential still exists for sense of place and community to interact and inform areas of future research, of which community development is just one example.

Understanding what volunteers do and why they do it

The findings revealed that volunteers do what they do for a number of reasons. First and foremost, they see the act of participating in Streamwatch as a form of leisure, reflected by the pictures of the campsite where they stayed and the repeated referrals to the “fun” of the program, the enjoyment of seeing wildlife, and the act of socializing with others. Second, the volunteers participated in Streamwatch in order to give their time and skills back to a resource that they felt had given much to them. Finally, the volunteers participated because they saw the act of volunteering (both in Streamwatch and elsewhere) as a way to strengthen and maintain the landscapes they saw as “home.”

But why were they using the act of volunteering to have fun, socialize, and give back? First, the volunteer participants saw Streamwatch as a way to address their need for social connection, using the program as an outlet to search for new opportunities for social growth. This growth came about through the creation of new, teamwork based
relationships with fellow volunteers, which helped the volunteers feel as though they were an important factor contributing to a greater good.

Volunteering in the Streamwatch program also helped volunteers legitimate important identities as “teacher” or “protector of the resource.” This act of identity creation, or in some cases identity maintenance, is in keeping with the social-psychological literature in wider volunteer contexts (Finkelstein et al., 2005; Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Piliavin & Callero, 1991) and the organizational literature in non-volunteer contexts (see Glynn, 2000). Specifically, the creation of identity gives volunteers a sense of what they’re doing and why – “it is through their particular identity lens that organizational actors craft their particular definitions of institutional resources and core capabilities” (Glynn, 2000, p.285).

In addition to the creation of social networks and the maintenance of the identities described above, the volunteers also participated in Streamwatch to accomplish certain goals. This confirms the appropriateness of organizing volunteer behavior along a power spectrum, the ‘low power’ end of which includes passive volunteer behaviors, directed by others, that serve as a means to achieve a specific end. The ‘high power’ end of the spectrum, on the other hand, displays authoritative, self-directed volunteer behaviors. At this high-power stage, the act of volunteering is no longer the means, but rather the end. Most of the volunteer activity described in the Streamwatch program could be classified as a means to an end. Although the volunteers worked independently and at their own pace, their work was ultimately directed by the Forest Service, designed specifically to preserve the banks of the Russian River. For example, the teaching of leave no trace to fishermen may seem self directed (and to some extent is), but the volunteers were
following a specific protocol and disseminating predetermined information to raise awareness among fishermen.

It is also important to assess whether or not the volunteers were engaging in serious leisure, meaning that they were using their volunteer activity to develop special skills that replicate those developed over the course of a career. These skills, developed over a long period of time, go beyond the simple provision of labor, or volunteering as a means to an end. On the surface, the aforementioned identity creation may make it appear as though the Streamwatch volunteers were engaging in serious leisure. However, during the interviews they did not mention volunteering as a proxy for a career, only that they enjoyed the opportunity to engage in the various volunteer activities. This suggests that the volunteers, at least in this context, may not be engaging in their volunteer work to the extent necessary to classify it as a form of serious leisure.

In summary, sense of place is a useful way to reach out to the volunteers who are becoming more important to the future of important places such as national parks and forests. As budgets shrink and services decline, it makes sense to implement place-based approaches to understanding those who have donated time and energy to support forests and their management. Applications of this understanding could include a written handbook for volunteer recruitment, possibly instructing managers to use place descriptions to entice potential volunteers. It could include a training manual, with a section on skill development in line with the concept of serious leisure. Another potential product could be a manual of best practices aimed at the long-term retention of volunteers in a specific place based-context. Observing how these materials work will also help managers gain a basic understanding of how experiences, meanings, and relationships
inform the cognition of volunteers. Elucidating sense of place will also help the volunteers themselves better understand what they do, providing them with a means toward the realization of repeated, satisfying and fulfilling volunteer experiences.

Methodological conclusions and limitations
The photographic approach to data collection was a good fit for the research questions, because it allowed the respondents to use their own images and words to elucidate otherwise complicated notions of sense of place. In addition, the participants were enthusiastic about the act of taking pictures and then talking about them, which resulted in a deep, rich set of data. Data collection went smoothly, as the participants were able to successfully follow both the directions and the suggested timeline. Most importantly, they had fun with the project, as evidenced by the relatively low dropout rate described in Chapter Three.

However, while people spoke clearly of important places and meanings, they didn’t always photograph the places that they ended up discussing - in many cases, their meanings and experiences were based on something (or someone) else. This suggests that different people interpret sense of place differently: the church represents friendship to some people and represents history to others. Important places, then, are more accurately described as triggers which help people access deeper meanings and attachments, suggesting that the characteristics of the place itself are only one piece of the puzzle. The thing itself (i.e. the mountain or the store or the trail) was only relevant, in this data, in terms of what took place there once upon a time.
The fact that the images and the meanings often differed is an important reason why the quantitative confirmation of the role of meanings was useful. Based strictly on the qualitative assessment, one could possibly conclude that the essential units of measurement in a sense of place study are the meanings, instead of the places. However, the strength of the quantitative models used in this study (which tested the power of meanings to actually discriminate sense of place) supports the idea that the two concepts are intertwined. Sense of place is dependent on meanings, and different meanings are related to different places. Given this, the mixed-method approach to the study of sense of place is an important avenue through which to focus on how places and meanings inform one another.

There is great opportunity to further implement mixed-methods approaches to sense of place research. For example, one could construct a survey, administered to an entire community, in which residents would be asked to choose their favorite places from a pre-determined list. Their choices would reveal ‘favorite’ places which could then be explored by a qualitative analysis, adding a greater descriptive depth to the findings. In other instances, interviewing and observing community members may highlight important avenues for creating a later survey. These and other mixed-method approaches can strengthen research by improving both interpretive consistency (the consistency of interpretations across individuals) and inference transferability (the generalizability of inferences to other populations) (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). However, it must be ensured that despite the potential of mixed method research, its use is appropriate to the specific nature of the questions asked by the researcher.
Place research can also benefit greatly if expanded to include multiple locations. Findings from rural Alaska may be different than those from park communities in Canada or gateway communities in the eastern United States. Specifically, each of these locations could maintain different cultural values, norms, or fields of community interaction, all of which could have substantially different impacts on sense of place. Additionally, those who have never visited certain places may hold different symbolic perceptions than those who have – an individual who has visited neither Alaska or Canada may think of each place in similar terms (northern, remote, hockey-loving) without regard to the political, geographic, or economic differences that become clear to those with direct experience. Measuring these potential gaps in understanding can help determine whether or not sense of place is just a regional construct (meaning it can only be understood at the local level) or one that can be easily and appropriately applied to broader measurements at the national or global level.

Although there is great confidence in the veracity of this data, it is still subject to the familiar cross-examinations endemic to qualitative research. First, the research took place in only two locations, and involved only 35 people. Therefore, there are limitations surrounding the inferences and generalizations that can be made from these (and any other) qualitative findings. However, this limitation is offset by the depth to which researchers were able to investigate the sense of place of each of the residents and volunteers.

Second, the analysis could be minimally influenced by preexisting biases and gaps in knowledge on the part of the researchers. Our individual backgrounds, education, and perspectives all influence the questions we ask and the answers we seek. The
possibility exists that the field researcher, not being Alaskan, did not adequately understand the individual perspectives of the participants and therefore did not ask the right questions or share in any innate cultural understandings.

Third, it could be argued that the places, meanings, and experiences described by the residents and the volunteers are predicated on their own individual understanding of the instructions. The interpretation of words such as “important,” “meaning” or “attach” is based on the intrinsic definition of the person reading them. Therefore, the possibility exists that each of the photographs and interviews represent a different set of assumptions on the part of the participant. However, the researchers did observe a measure of consistency, as all participants appeared to be “on the same page” in terms of the project’s definitions and assumptions.

The discriminant analysis is also subject to critiques common to quantitative work. First, it could be argued that a form of circular causality exists, in which one set of researcher-created meanings is used to predict a second set. Second, there exists a potential sleight of hand that takes place when each photo is used as a point of analysis to quantitatively assess the connections between characteristics such as occupation, length of residence, or length of volunteer tenure as predictors of sense of place. While there are several hundred photographic data points, more than enough for statistical analysis, they were taken by only 35 people. Therefore, the characteristics are not specific to each photo – in reality they can be repeated up to a dozen times each. This means that it may not be accurate to use statistical approaches based on the photos themselves to make statements about the people who took the photos. However, this problem is mitigated when using the meanings as discriminators, since they are in fact specific to each unit of analysis.
In conclusion

Alaska is a place apart, and this research reveals the complexities of sense of place and community in both setting and activity contexts. The complications that drive sense of place are nowhere more evident than in the setting context, a small Alaska town with a sense of community and identity constructed around an amalgamation of the state’s remoteness, politics, and people. On one hand, people in Seward value the tight-knit relationships formed from Alaska’s common bonds. On the other, they greatly value the ample freedom, isolation, and anonymity that is an important feature of their Alaskan community.

This complexity also illuminates subtle distinctions in how people, especially those who live in proximity to working forests, waterways, and recreation areas, create and maintain place-based meanings in their lives. These meanings, which include beauty, threats, recreation, friends, family, home, and community, are all snapshots reflecting the variety of social interactions among people in place. Because many of these “social landscapes” have local natural resources at their core, those who are tasked with resource management face a tremendous opportunity to add sense of place to traditional metrics such as visitor satisfaction and ecological quality.

For instance, those who are in charge of maintaining community mechanisms must (figuratively) remove their boundaries, ameliorating the ‘us versus them’ mentality that can exist between locals, visitors, and resource managers. Specifically, the example of Seward as an unchanging homeplace to the participant who left for a long period of time suggests that one’s interest in a community, activity, or special place does not stop once they are outside its boundaries. Hiring permanent residents instead of seasonal
transients for temporary positions, developing educational programs that include both tourists and locals, and nurturing communication are all strategies to remove the traditional boundaries between community residents and those who maintain their connection from afar.

Carefully crafted natural resource policy and management can make the most of sense of place by providing opportunities for the creation of new senses of place and the maintenance of old ones. Managers can assist this developmental process by helping form new opportunities for people to interact with both natural resources and with each other. For instance, the local planning commission could add an environmental component to the design of new tourist amenities, such a new recycling campaign added to Seward’s existing Fourth of July festivities. Town managers could also add ingredients of sense of place to public participation, possibly leveraging the perception of the landscape as “threatened” as a key ingredient in public activities such as the fight to save the noon bell. Recreation specialists can tap into perceptions of the landscape as a place to teach and give back when designing educational or interpretive programs for youngsters. Non-profit managers could even consider the theoretical frameworks of serious leisure while creating volunteer programs in both community and natural resource contexts.

The thirty-five people who participated in this project created a variety of multi-layered mosaics describing how meanings, experiences, and behaviors were important parts of their sense of place. This is proof that people can be aware of the multiplicity of roles that natural areas and community spaces play in their lives. People’s perceptions matter, whether they be perceptions of the land around them, perceptions of the people
with whom they interact, or perceptions of activities in which they engage. Hopefully, further work with the perceptions of place, either within or beyond the setting or activity contexts used here, will inspire and create a body of knowledge that further elucidates the social connections of sense of place.
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Appendix A: Recruiting Script and Participant Instructions

Recruiting Script for Potential Research Participants

Project: Sense of Place in Resource Management

Penn State University and the US Forest Service are conducting a study to determine the “sense of place” that residents hold for both the local landscapes and the local community. We will also examine the relationship between this “sense of place” and how people volunteer their time toward the maintenance and management of local natural resource and recreation amenities.

To participate in this research, you would have to agree to take two photographs (using a camera we’ll provide) each of things that most attach you to your community, that provide the most meaning to you, or that you would most miss if you were to move away. Furthermore, you would have to consent to an interview with me or another researcher. This interview would take between one and two hours. If you are interested in participating, you would have to sign an informed consent form prior to engaging in the interview.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate at all; you may refuse to participate in certain procedures or answer certain questions; and you may discontinue your participation at any time. If you decide not to participate in this research, but would like to be informed of the results of the research, let us know and we will provide a short summary via email or US mail when results become available.

Contact Information: Ben Amsden, Graduate Student
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Penn State University – Armsby Building
University Park, PA 16803
(814) 404-6746; bla144@psu.edu

Dr. Richard Stedman, Assistant Professor
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Penn State University – Armsby Building
University Park, PA 16803
(814) 865-5461; rstedman@psu.edu
Instructions for Participation

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our research! We are confident that this will be a fun and informative process for all involved. Here are a couple points to get you started:

The purpose of our study is to use your photographs (and your descriptions of them) to learn about the “sense of place” that local residents hold for the landscapes and communities of Seward. **What’s important to you about this area?** What elements of this area provide meaning to you? What would you miss most if you were to move away?

1. Please take about **one week** to shoot your photos.

2. The cameras have 27/28 exposures – **take 2 photos each of the 14 things that most attach you to this area, that provide the most meaning to you, or that you would miss most if you were to move away.** If possible, make a mental (or written, if you prefer) list of what you’d like to photograph before hand.

3. When all the exposures have been shot, please write your name on the camera and then call me at **907-224-5193** (you may have to leave a message) and I’ll retrieve the camera, or you can drop it off at the **US Forest Service office located at 334 4th Ave in Seward.** Then we can schedule a time (if we haven’t already) to talk about your photos.

4. I’ll develop the camera, and you’ll get a copy of the your photographs to keep!

5. If you have any questions, please contact me at 907-224-5193 or 907-224-3374.

Thanks,

Ben Amsden
Penn State University
Social Science Analyst
U.S.F.S.
Appendix B: Sample Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Sense of Place in Resource Management

Principal Investigator: Dr. Richard Stedman, Assistant Professor
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Penn State University – Armsby Building
University Park, PA 16803
(814) 865-5461; rstedman@psu.edu

Co-investigator: Benoni Amsden, Graduate Student
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Penn State University – Armsby Building
University Park, PA 16803
(814) 404-6746; bla144@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the project is to determine sense of place for both
the local landscape and the local community. The project will also examine the
relationship between sense of place and how people volunteer their time toward the
maintenance and management of local natural resource and recreation amenities.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to take two photographs each of 12
things that most attach you to your community, that provide the most meaning to
you, or that you would most miss if you were to move away. Additionally, you will
be asked to answer questions during an interview. With your permission, these responses
will be tape-recorded.

3. Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those
experienced in everyday life. You may consider some questions to be personal and
discomforting. You may be mildly embarrassed about being recorded.

4. Benefits: You might learn more about your feelings for the area in which you live.

5. Duration: We will ask that you take the photographs in one week’s time. Once the
photos are developed, our interview will last approximately 1 to 2 hours.

6. Statement of Confidentiality: Only Mr. Amsden and Dr. Stedman will know your
identity. All of the information you give them, including interview tapes and transcripts,
will be secured on the Penn State Campus at 301 Armsby in a locked desk. Only Mr.
Amsden and Dr. Stedman will have access to these materials. These materials will be
destroyed at the completion of our research, in 2007. The Office for Research Protections and the Social Science Institutional Review Board may review records related to this project. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from this research, no personally identifiable information will be shared. Your name will be replaced by a pseudonym. We will protect your privacy to the maximum extent allowable by law.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:** You may ask questions about this research. Contact Ben Amsden at (814) 404-6746 with any questions. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775.

8. **Compensation:** You will receive one set of your photos in a small album as a token of thanks.

9. **Voluntary Participation:** You may decline to participate in this research. If you decide to participate, you may terminate your participation at any time, and you may decline to provide any information you prefer not to provide.

You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study, and if you understand the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this signed and dated consent form for your records.

______________________________________________  __________________________________________
Participant Signature  Date

______________________________________________  __________________________________________
Person Obtaining Consent  Date
Appendix C: Sample Transcript and NVivo Coding Report

Participant #7
7/21/05

“F”, male, 67
Time in Seward: 41 years (1964)

B: Before we start flipping through the pictures, do you mind if I ask your age?

F: 67.

B: Could you please say a little bit about your background in Seward, how long you’ve lived here, when you came?

F: Sure. I came here 5 days before the 1964 earthquake. I came here at the asking of a company known as the Alaska Scallop Fleet. I came up here to refit a vessel up here, to go out and do towing for scallops. They were just doing a survey to find out if there were enough here to bring some boats around. I came, and started working on a boat, and the boat was lost in the tsunami. I stayed on because I was a welder and a fitter and a burner, and they needed a lot of that. I stayed thinking it would only be a few months, and it wound up being forever!

B: So far so good! And you’ve been here year-round?

F: Yes. We stay here year-round. As a matter of fact this used to be my church [referring to the coffee shop where the interview took place]. Resurrection Lutheran Church. I helped paint the ceiling. The scaffolding was either too short, or too high, and you’d have to lay on your back and that’s how we did it. Another member of this church was Dan S, who ran in the Iditarod the first time. It used to be the most horrible green you’ve ever seen, and then they went to salmon pink. That too was terrible. We got a paint committee, and they came up with white and gold and a yellowish color.

I worked in many different places, I did all the refrigeration down at the Seward fisheries, I was a construction foreman when they built the Louisiana-Pacific Mill. I was also the superintendent after it fired up and was running.

B: What did they make at that mill?

F: It was before they changed the rules, about shipping raw logs. They used to cut two lines on each side of the log, and out of those two lines we’d get chips and domestic lumber also. That’s what they did. Then they changed they law, so you couldn’t ship raw logs. That knocked the mill out. Also the Koreans had signed a contract for the chips, and they reneged on that.
B: Okay, now maybe we could take a turn through the photos, and you could tell me about each one?

[1] F: Sure. That’s the first one I took, and just looking at that glacier out there just kind of gives me an idea of how small I actually am.

B: Is that Exit Glacier?

F: That’s exit glacier, yes. Another thing, too, I’m used to taking photos with a 300 or a 500 lens, and the little point-and-shoot kind of threw me off.

B: A lot of the landscapes don’t really come out.

F: Anyway that’s what my idea was here. Starting out with something of enormity and that certainly is enormous. It’s very beautiful up there. When I first went out to this glacier, there wasn’t a road, there was a trail.

B: when did they build the road?

F: let’s see the early 80’s, I believe.

B: okay, so it’s been here for a while.

F: Actually, it was started by Herman Lerher, he’s the one who started that. They built some bridges, and the bridges didn’t last, and so that’s when the state moved in. They paved it, and built some substantial bridges. They could see that it was going to be big thing to go out to that glacier for years to come there. That’s one of the reasons that I took that because it’s a fond memory of many years ago.

[2] F: I took this one because it reminded me of the loyalty of the people of Alaska, and of this area. They are very loyal.

B: loyal to whom?

F: Loyal to other people, to the community, and to themselves. Probably themselves last. Most people of the community of Seward are very proud of the All-American City award that we’ve won what, three times?

B: I’ve heard a lot about the All-American City award. It’s impressive how much pride is derived from that, it seems to be quite an accomplishment. People know about it, too.

F: As a matter of fact after I took this photo, you can see on the right side that door is opened, as I was getting ready to leave this guy stuck his head out and said “What’s up” and I said I’m not a government man or anything like that, I’m just taking a picture because I thought it was kind of nice the way you had that Alaskan flag over your back
window. I said I’m doing this for some other folks, I’m using up this camera. This represents loyalty to me. He said “oh thank you take all the pictures you want.”

[3] F: This one…that river is so wild out there, you can go there and it’s running on this side of the road, and you can go the next day and it’s running over here. Also, the fireweed I’m a sucker for fireweed.

B: It is beautiful.

F: yes it is. It’s not as I see it most years out there on Exit Glacier road. A lot of it is not there this year. I think it has something to do with the river changing it’s course, it’s disrupted. As the river switches, again, the first thing that grows, generally in a place that’s been devastated either by fire or flood, is fireweed. It’s the first thing to grow back. That’s how it got its name. Whenever acres burn, fireweed is the first thing to grow back. Fireweed, and then mushrooms, then hardwoods. That’s why natives used to set fires and let them go, because it would make good moose habitat.

B: Fireweed reminds me of lupines.

F: You used to see a lot of lupines, but I don’t know what happened to them.

[4] F: this one here, you can’t see without looking closely, but there is a guy building a new house in the woods there. I was just trying to show the freedom. Here this guy comes along and buys a piece of property in the woods, that had virgin timber, and he’s building his house. It was the freedom that I was thinking of.

B: do you think the freedoms that you’re representing here, have they changed at all over the years? Do you feel that they are threatened at all?

F: Yeah I do. I feel that a lot of things are threatened, because of progress. I mean you can’t stop progress. Progress in a lot of instances is very good. In other instances, it’s not. I liked it when I only had to drive a couple of miles to get my moose. Back when I needed the meat, when I was raising a bunch of kids. Now you have to travel miles. The peninsula moose have been decimated. I found a cow and two calves once out there by mile 14, somebody had just shot them and left them. Not only out of season, but you shouldn’t kill cows and calves. That’s not how everybody is, I know that, there are a lot of good people in the world still. They just hide a little more than they used to. So that’s what I was thinking of, was the freedom that we have here, the right to go and buy a piece of property and to build on it and realize your dreams.

[5,6] F: On both of these pictures, I was trying to show how beautiful it is. That never changes. From winter to summer, fall, spring, whatever. You can always find something that’s beautiful.

B: Do you know what mountain that might be in the background, there?
F: I think it’s, I think they call that Sheep Mountain. You can find sheep up there, sometimes goats. They don’t live together. Actually, this fireweed here was in front of the roadhouse.

B: It’s think it’s interesting that you noted how the beauty is there in all four seasons, not so much just in the summertime or just in the winter.

F: like I say, there are beautiful things to look at, all year round. I used to really look forward to the lakes freezing up, so I could trap. I trapped for 4 or 5 years. Then, of course, fur became something that you don’t want to be associated with (laughs). But, you know, back in the early days, people did that for a living. When I first came here there were still people trapping for a living. And goldmining. All those things were still open then and they still are, somewhat. I wouldn’t trap again. Not using the technology we had then, compared to what they have now. If I had the traps that would kill, I would have trapped longer, but catching them by the leg, that’s cruel. It is. At first it didn’t seem that way, but then the more I thought about it, and the more that reports came in of wolves being snared and choking to death, or chewing their leg off.

B: That and the numbers declined, there aren’t as many of those creatures around as there used to be.

F: Like beaver. There used to be a lot of beaver around here, but there is not anymore. There was a lot of lynx. That’s what I trapped mostly, was lynx and wolverine. But, it’s not a good thing now (smiles).

[7]F: This, I was just trying to show free enterprise. That’s what exactly what this guy really shows me. With free enterprise you can get by with just about anything. You can cut your lumber with a chainsaw and build a place and make a million dollars. This guy out here, you know “cheap beer and lousy food” (the restaurant’s slogan). That is really a mis-statement if I ever saw one. I don’t know about the beer but the food is wonderful. The atmosphere, you know, you can kick back. That’s what I was showing there.

B: So he can run his own business the way he wants to.

F: Exactly, and, you know, build it the way he wants to. If people don’t like the looks of the unfinished lumber, well, they can go down to Ray’s (a fancier Seward restaurant).

B: do you know that fellow?

F: I know of him, I don’t know him that well.

[8] F: I took both of these to show that free enterprise is still wide open here if you so desire. If you have the gumption and the ambition to get out and pursue it.
B: and put the elbow grease into it. That might tie into the notion of freedom a little bit, too, that people are free to follow their dreams. Same as building the house, you can build a business.

F: Sure. From nothing. The first thing he built out there was a house on the left-hand side, I don’t think you can see it, but he built it on stilts. He had a pipe driven. The way I knew what he was doing is because he hired me to come out and cut the pipes off, so when he built the house it’d be level. And weld some plates on it. That’s what I did, for 40 years, I was a welder. I had a business for 25 years, right where the SeaLife center is.

[9] F: And then, getting on to this cabin, Steve and Kristy Audette lived in this cabin, when they first got married. It’s pretty dilapidated now, but it’s on Old Exit Glacier road. It’s just….this is the past. That’s exactly what I was thinking when I was taking the picture. The past should be and is being recorded by some folks. That’s the way it should be.

B: I’ve talked to a lot of people who know a lot about the history of this town. It seems that the history of the town is being carried on both orally, written, a lot more than it is in other places.

F: that’s exactly right, and there are some old timers that I can sit and listen to, and I’m one of them now. There are people much older than I am that were here, they have so many stories. One lady is very dear to me. She used go to this church. When it moved, and I stopped going, she was flabbergasted. She called me and I said it doesn’t have what I want anymore. It matters more what you wear and how much you give, and that’s not the way it’s supposed to be. So I went church shopping. My wife and I did that for quite a spell before we finally picked a church that we really liked. We’re happy with the church we got to.

[10, 11, 12] F: this here is free enterprise, linked together with family ties. See these are a really fine bunch of folks. I’ve worked with Dan for 4 and a half years driving the Seward bus to anchorage. I did half a million miles on the Seward highway in 4 and a half years.

B: Is that right? Wow.

F: I knew everyplace where you’d see an animal, and I still know. Where you’ll find a moose, or a black bear, or a brown bear. Where the fireweed grows the best. The most dangerous parts of the road, which is from Girdwood into Anchorage. But there again, there is so much beauty on that highway. All you have to do is open your eyes and look. I’ve taken thousands of pictures of the Seward highway. Sheep, goats, bear, wolves, all kinds of critters. In 4.5 years of driving that highway, I ran over 2 squirrels, and killed one duck. In half a million miles, that’s good, I never hit a moose, never came close to hitting a moose, because I knew where they would be coming up, and I’d slow down. That’s why people hit them, because they don’t slow down. They are going too fast. They have no control.
This is the same thing, Seavey’s I-did-a-ride (the name of the dogsled ride business). These young girls inside, were just so nice, I said you don’t know but maybe you’ll see your face in a magazine sometime.

B: (laughs) If this work becomes that famous I’ll be happy. I’m just hoping for a dissertation or journal. Now, about the I-did-a-ride business, is that something that has just come along with the tourist industry? Do the tourists help drive free enterprise?

F: yes, they did that for sure. Also, not only is it linked to tourism, but it’s also a heck of a way to keep your dogs in training. They pull those rubber-tired carts, with pneumatic tires on them, and aluminum carts, which are really easy to pull compared to a sled. A sled has a lot of drag. People say that’s cruel keeping those dogs like that, but those dogs are better cared for than a lot of humans. They are. The vet comes often the check them out, especially in the race. They are fed vitamins, whatever they need. Their feet are better cared for than the musher’s.

B: You are not going to win many races with unhappy dogs.

F: Mitch really worked hard to win that Iditarod, he’s run it, I don’t know how many times now, but it’s a lot.

B: He actually won the race, once?

F: Oh yeah, Mitch Seavey. It think it was 2004 (it was). Last year he was second or third (third). His dad started that. He was a school teacher, he was the one who painted the ceiling with me (in the church). Dan was into mushing so Mitch just followed in his footsteps. One of Mitch’s boys got into it, so now two of them are into it, and a third one has a tour business going up to the glacier, which is all woven into the family. Everything in that shop out there has gotten every one of that family’s names tied to it. Dan Seavey the third just finished college with a 4.0 grade average was home schooled, and he is one of the nicest young men you’d ever want to meet. He’s very intelligent. Matter of fact, for the race the Mitch won, Dan plotted all the strategy. He knows very well what it takes. Dan ran in it once, and he’s not going to do it again. It’s not for him.

B: So the whole family is involved in every aspect of the business then.

F: yes, in every aspect. And they all get along just famously. They are a good family.

[13] F: with this, I was trying to show the artwork that you can see around here. I know the fellow who put this together.

B: This is the memorial, for the founders of Seward, right?

F: yes. Some people don’t like it but I do.

B: How could you not like that? (laughs)
F: Well, they say the old one was better. Just off a little ways is a dogsled, commemorating the old beginning of Iditarod, which was here. By the way, Dan Seavey is the head of the Iditarod trail committee. Mitch Seavey is the only one who ran it the entire way. Which was from Seward, to Nome. The race now always starts in Anchorage, or if there is no snow it will start in Wasilla, or wherever, somewhere along the line. He is the only one who ran his dogs from here, and bedded them down right in front of the sign that says welcome to Anchorage. You know, he got very little publicity out of it. And a few years ago, Dan ran, the dad, Mitch ran, and one of the boys ran. There were 3 generations. And they never got any notoriety out of that, either. They say you don’t have to pat yourself on the back, somebody else will do it for you. But it was really, they should have been recognized for that. 3 generations!

[14] F: These were sailboats out there. I was trying to show the recreational parts of Seward and they bay, which is beautiful all the time too, I think. Even when there is fog hanging in, you know, I’ve seen vessels coming out of that fog, and the pictures are just beautiful. To see just the bow of one of those big vessels sticking out of the fog, and the rest of it you can’t see. That’s really cool. I take photographs all the time.

[15] F: This is the waterfall down there.

B: The one right past the sealife center?

F: right. I was privy to going inside of that. 2 years ago they rerouted it, in there is a big pipe to get it out into the bay. They did it when there was the least amount of water in it. I asked if I could go inside there and take some pictures, and they said ‘only if you make us up a set, and give it to us’, I said sure. Also, there is a history. I do know the fella that did the dynamiting in there. He still lives here. He was what they call a Powder Monkey. He was born in this country but raised in Norway, or Sweden. So anyway, I did go inside it, and it’s really something. It’s a quarter-mile through that thing.

B: How did they stop the water?

F: You mean when they went in to clean it out? They diverted it. They put sandbags and rocks and stuff. It wasn’t flowing anywhere near like this. It was in the latter part of winter, into the spring, before the spring runoff. Anyway, it’s really cool in there. If you enter this thing from this end, where the water comes out, you have to lean because the wind is coming through there. It’s really something. If you walk it, through from the canyon end, you can feel it pushing you. The closer you get to the end, the more you are feeling it. I took my tripod in there and I took a lot of pictures inside, some with the sunlight on the other end, and I kept going further and further into the tunnel until after a while I could see boats out there so I was taking pictures of boats going by, through the tunnel opening. It’s all cemented on the inside, nothing rough about it at all. They did an excellent job. The river used to run right down the street by here, Jefferson. They had bridges over the street, at that time. In 1938, they decided they were tired of the river tearing up the town, so they went to work on it, and by 1941, they opened it, to go
through the tunnel in bear mountain. That’s really cool. Several people have come up to me and said wow, that’s the biggest spring I ever saw! I say, it’s not a spring, it’s a river that used to run through town. If you find a spring that big, you bottle it, and get rich overnight!

B: It would indeed be a mighty spring if it was one.

[16] F: I was just trying to show the fishermen down here. I used to do that a lot, go down to the beach and snag salmon. My son, he’s a fisherman, extraordinaire. He can catch fish when no one else can. He works for Fishing Company of Alaska, he’s been with them for 14 years. He’s a factory deck superintendent. When he comes home the first thing he does is gets his snag pole and goes down on the beach and goes fishing.

[17] F: I think this one here was an accident. I have no idea.

[18, 19] F: This right here is upper trail lake. I have taken so many photographs of that lake. It’s just absolutely beautiful. I have pictures what I started doing early in my picture taking career was to take a bush or a branch or something off to the side or in the corner, especially on photos of lakes like this, so you can tell which way is up. A lot of these, you can turn them over, and if you don’t have trees in there, you can’t tell. Sometimes the reflection is more clear than the actual.

B: That’s amazing.

F: For instance, this one right here. If I took that tree out of the side, it would be hard to tell which way is which. It always amazes me, when you take those photographs, if you turn them on their side it looks like a goblet.

B: ohh, so it does! How about that?

[20] F: This right here is a swamp, out at 37 mile, tern lake. I have taken many photographs of that area also. In the wintertime, you’ll see swans in here when the lake is partly frozen. It’s the most comical thing you ever saw, those things trying to land on that ice. They are so beautiful, but they fall down and roll over and skid, making all kinds of noise. This place has always been beautiful to me, and I’m a sucker for arctic terns.

[21, 22] B: Oh there’s one!

F: and there again, if I had my camera in the second picture you see him reflected in the water. If I have been able to zoom in on that, it would have been a really nice picture. You can actually see some of the reflections of this over here in that water.

B: that’s a beautiful photo. Those birds really are something.

[23] F: That one I just tilted the camera on edge. There was a young duck, right there, with a mother and 5 siblings. This one was not keeping up. They would cross someplace,
and he’d be the last one, and he’s stop to eat something, and the other ones would get away from him. I thought it was kind of cool that he kept on keeping on, you know?

[24, 25] F: Again, this is beautiful. It’s just the beauty of Alaska that can’t be found anywhere else.

[26, 27] F: And that’s my dog. That’s my buddy.

B: Indeed. What kind of dog is this?

F: A llahsa apso.

dog discussion

B: These pictures are wonderful. You’ve shown me a lot of natural landscapes - do you think these are being managed appropriately, in your mind? Do you feel that the recreation opportunities, like with the sailboat or the people fishing from shore, are those the kinds of things that are being protected for the next generation? Do you see any problems with the status quo?

F: I don’t see a problem with this general area, no. I think that its pretty much kept up on. I think there have been small mistakes made, but they’ve been rectified. A lot of things you do by trial and error. There is just no other way to do it. You just jump in with both feet and hope that you don’t sink up to your backside. Nothing ventured, nothing gained. Everything has to be tried. I know progress has to come, and I know things have to change. When I first came here, down by where the Breeze in is there was a little airstream trailer that had two booths and three stools at a small counter, and they served hamburgers. And look at it now. A big restaurant, bar, conference room, motel in the back, shops. It’s really grown. There was nothing along the boardwalk that they have now. There was the harbormaster’s office and a couple of places behind it. They sold bait during the salmon derbies.

The reason I know a lot about places in town, is because way back in the early 70’s and up into the 80’s, I was one of the few people who thawed water lines. I had a welding machine and I’d go around and hook up. I knew where everybody’s shut off was, I knew where to hook up on them, and I’d tell them okay, leave your key, and a 50 dollar bill, in the usual place. If either one is missing you won’t have water when you get home.
B: do you think the freedoms that you’re representing here, have they changed at all over the years? Do you feel that they are threatened at all?

F: Yeah I do. I feel that a lot of things are threatened, because of progress. I mean you can’t stop progress. Progress in a lot of instances is very good. In other instances, it’s not. I liked it when I only had to drive a couple of miles to get my moose. Back when I needed the meat, when I was raising a bunch of kids. Now you have to travel miles.

How did they stop the water?

F: You mean when they went in to clean it out? They diverted it. They put sandbags and rocks and stuff. It wasn’t flowing anywhere near like this. It was in the latter part of winter, into the spring, before the spring runoff. Anyway, it’s really cool in there. If you enter this thing from this end, where the water comes out, you have to lean because the wind is coming through there. It’s really something. If you walk it, through from the canyon end, you can feel it pushing you. The closer you get to the end, the more you are feeling it.

10 days before the 1964 earthquake. I came here at the asking of a company known as the Alaska Scallop Fleet. I came up here to refit a vessel up here, to go out and do towing for scallops. They were just doing a survey to find out if there were enough here to bring some boats around. I came, and started working on a boat, and the boat was lost in the tsunami. I stayed on because I was a welder and a fitter and a burner, and they needed a lot of that. I stayed thinking it would only be a few months, and it wound up being forever!

So far so good! And you’ve been here year-round?
17: F: Yes. We stay here year-round. As a matter of fact this used to be my church [referring to the coffee shop where the interview took place]. Resurrection Lutheran Church. I helped paint the ceiling. The scaffolding was either too short, or too high, and you’d have to lay on your back and that’s how we did it. Another member of this church was Dan S, who ran in the Iditarod the first time. It used to be the most horrible green you’ve ever seen, and then they went to salmon pink. That too was terrible. We got a paint committee, and they came up with white and gold and a yellowish color.

18: I worked in many different places, I did all the refrigeration down at the Seward fisheries, I was a construction foreman when they built the Louisiana-Pacific Mill. I was also the superintendent after it fired up and was running.

19: F: I knew everyplace where you’d see an animal, and I still know. Where you’ll find a moose, or a black bear, or a brown bear. Where the fireweed grows the best. The most dangerous parts of the road, which is from Girdwood into Anchorage. But there again, there is so much beauty on that highway. All you have to do is open your eyes and look. I’ve taken thousands of pictures of the Seward highway. Sheep, goats, bear, wolves, all kinds of critters. In 4.5 years of driving that highway, I ran over 2 squirrels, and killed one duck. In half a million miles, that’s good, I never hit a moose, never came close to hitting a moose, because I knew where they would be coming up, and I’d slow down.
out here, you know “cheap beer and lousy food” (the restaurant’s slogan). That is really a mis-statement if I ever saw one. I don’t know about the beer but the food is wonderful. The atmosphere, you know, you can kick back. That’s what I was showing there.

Passage 3 of 4 Section 0, Para 89, 176 chars.

89: F: Exactly, and, you know, build it the way he wants to. If people don’t like the looks of the unfinished lumber, well, they can go down to Ray’s (a fancier Seward restaurant).

Passage 4 of 4 Section 0, Paras 95 to 97, 366 chars.

95: [8] F: I took both of these to show that free enterprise is still wide open here if you so desire. If you have the gumption and the ambition to get out and pursue it.

96:

97: B: and put the elbow grease into it. That might tie into the notion of freedom a little bit, too, that people are free to follow their dreams. Same as building the house, you can build a business.

98:

Node 6 of 91 positive feelings toward agency
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 188, 454 chars.

188: F: I don’t see a problem with this general area, no. I think that its pretty much kept up on. I think there have been small mistakes made, but they’ve been rectified. A lot of things you do by trial and error. There is just no other way to do it. You just jump in with both feet and hope that you don’t sink up to your backside. Nothing ventured, nothing gained. Everything has to be tried. I know progress has to come, and I know things have to change.

Node 7 of 91 suspicion of government
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 53, 517 chars.

53: F: As a matter of fact after I took this photo, you can see on the right side that door is opened, as I was getting ready to leave this guy stuck his head out and said “What’s up” and I said I’m not a government man or anything like that, I’m just taking a picture because I thought it was kind of nice the way you had that Alaskan flag over your back window. I said I’m doing this for some other folks, I’m using up this camera. This represents loyalty to me. He said “oh thank you take all the pictures you want.”

Node 8 of 91 (1 1) /Connection to Landscape/Natural Landscape
Passage 1 of 7 Section 0, Paras 27 to 35, 598 chars.

27: [1] F: Sure. That’s the first one I took, and just looking at that glacier out there just kind of gives me an idea of how small I actually am.

28:

29: B: Is that Exit Glacier?

30:
F: That’s exit glacier, yes. Another thing, too, I’m used to taking photos with a 300 or a 500 lens, and the little point-and-shoot kind of threw me off.

B: A lot of the landscapes don’t really come out.

F: Anyway that’s what my idea was here. Starting out with something of enormity and that certainly is enormous. It’s very beautiful up there. When I first went out to this glacier, there wasn’t a road, there was a trail.

Passage 2 of 7 Section 0, Paras 57 to 59, 627 chars.

B: It is beautiful.

F: yes it is. It’s not as I see it most years out there on Exit Glacier road. A lot of it is not there this year. I think it has something to do with the river changing it’s course, it’s disrupted. As the river switches, again, the first thing that grows, generally in a place that’s been devastated either by fire or flood, is fireweed. It’s the first thing to grow back. That’s how it got its name. Whenever acres burn, fireweed is the first thing to grow back. Fireweed, and then mushrooms, then hardwoods. That’s why natives used to set fires and let them go, because it would make good moose habitat.

Passage 3 of 7 Section 0, Paras 71 to 75, 451 chars.

F: On both of these pictures, I was trying to show how beautiful it is. That never changes. From winter to summer, fall, spring, whatever. You can always find something that’s beautiful.

B: Do you know what mountain that might be in the background, there?

F: I think it’s, I think they call that Sheep Mountain. You can find sheep up there, sometimes goats. They don’t live together. Actually, this fireweed here was in front of the roadhouse.

Passage 4 of 7 Section 0, Para 111, 105 chars.

But there again, there is so much beauty on that highway. All you have to do is open your eyes and look.

Passage 5 of 7 Section 0, Para 158, 128 chars.

F: This right here is upper trail lake. I have taken so many photographs of that lake. It’s just absolutely beautiful.

Passage 6 of 7 Section 0, Para 166, 112 chars.

F: This right here is a swamp, out at 37 mile, tern lake. I have taken many photographs of that area also.

Passage 7 of 7 Section 0, Para 176, 105 chars.

Again, this is beautiful. It’s just the beauty of Alaska that can’t be found anywhere else.
71: [5,6] F: On both of these pictures, I was trying to show how beautiful it is. That never changes. From winter to summer, fall, spring, whatever. You can always find something that’s beautiful.

72: B: Do you know what mountain that might be in the background, there?

75: F: I think it’s, I think they call that Sheep Mountain. You can find sheep up there, sometimes goats. They don’t live together. Actually, this fireweed here was in front of the roadhouse.

79: F: like I say, there are beautiful things to look at, all year round.

158: [18, 19] F: This right here is upper trail lake. I have taken so many photographs of that lake. It’s just absolutely beautiful. I have pictures what I started doing early in my picture taking career was to take a bush or a branch or something off to the side or in the corner, especially on photos of lakes like this, so you can tell which way is up. A lot of these, you can turn them over, and if you don’t have trees in there, you can’t tell. Sometimes the reflection is more clear than the actual.

162: F: For instance, this one right here. If I took that tree out of the side, it would be hard to tell which way is which. It always amazes me, when you take those photographs, if you turn them on their side it looks like a goblet.

176: [24, 25] F: Again, this is beautiful. It’s just the beauty of Alaska that can’t be found anywhere else.

79: used to really look forward to the lakes freezing up, so I could trap. I trapped for 4 or 5 years. Then, of course, fur became something that you don’t want to be associated with (laughs).
111: F: I knew everyplace where you’d see an animal, and I still know. Where you’ll find a moose, or a black bear, or a brown bear

Passage 3 of 5 Section 0, Para 154, 424 chars.

154: [16] F: I was just trying to show the fishermen down here. I used to do that a lot, go down to the beach and snag salmon. My son, he’s a fisherman, extraordinaire. He can catch fish when no one else can. He works for Fishing Company of Alaska, he’s been with them for 14 years. He’s a factory deck superintendent. When he comes home the first thing he does is gets his snag pole and goes down on the beach and goes fishing.

Passage 4 of 5 Section 0, Para 166, 330 chars.

166: In the wintertime, you’ll see swans in here when the lake is partly frozen. It’s the most comical thing you ever saw, those things trying to land on that ice. They are so beautiful, but they fall down and roll over and skid, making all kinds of noise. This place has always been beautiful to me, and I’m a sucker for arctic terns.

Passage 5 of 5 Section 0, Paras 172 to 174, 408 chars.

172: B: that’s a beautiful photo. Those birds really are something.

173:

174: [23] F: That one I just tilted the camera on edge. There was a young duck, right there, with a mother and 5 siblings. This one was not keeping up. They would cross someplace, and he’d be the last one, and he’s stop to eat something, and the other ones would get away from him. I thought it was kind of cool that he kept on keeping on, you know?

Node 11 of 91 (1 1 3) /Connection to Landscape/Natural Landscape/The view
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 150, 277 chars.

150: I took my tripod in there and I took a lot of pictures inside, some with the sunlight on the other end, and I kept going further and further into the tunnel until after a while I could see boats out there so I was taking pictures of boats going by, through the tunnel opening.

Node 12 of 91 (1 2) /Connection to Landscape/Man-made Landscape
Passage 1 of 3 Section 0, Para 130, 123 chars.

130: [13] F: with this, I was trying to show the artwork that you can see around here. I know the fellow who put this together.

Passage 2 of 3 Section 0, Para 140, 284 chars.

140: Even when there is fog hanging in, you know, I’ve seen vessels coming out of that fog, and the pictures are just beautiful. To see just the bow of one of those big vessels sticking out of the fog, and the rest of it you can’t see. That’s really cool. I take photographs all the time.

Passage 3 of 3 Section 0, Para 150, 374 chars.
150: t’s all cemented on the inside, nothing rough about it at all. They did an excellent job. The river used to run right down the street by here, Jefferson. They had bridges over the street, at that time. In 1938, they decided they were tired of the river tearing up the town, so they went to work on it, and by 1941, they opened it, to go through the tunnel in bear mountain.

65: Here this guy comes along and buys a piece of property in the woods, that had virgin timber, and he’s building his house.

69: The peninsula moose have been decimated. I found a cow and two calves once out there by mile 14, somebody had just shot them and left them. Not only out of season, but you shouldn’t kill cows and calves.

43: Actually, it was started by Herman Lerher, he’s the one who started that. They built some bridges, and the bridges didn’t last, and so that’s when the state moved in. They paved it, and built some substantial bridges. They could see that it was going to be big thing to go out to that glacier for years to come there. That’s one of the reasons that I took that because it’s a fond memory of many years ago.

101: [9] F: And then, getting on to this cabin, Steve and Kristy Audette lived in this cabin, when they first got married. It’s pretty dilapidated now, but it’s on Old Exit Glacier road. It’s just….this is the past. That’s exactly what I was thinking when I was taking the picture. The past should be and is being recorded by some folks. That’s the way it should be.

142: 15] F: This is the waterfall down there.

143:

144: B: The one right past the sealife center?

145:

146: F: right. I was privy to going inside of that. 2 years ago they rerouted it, in there is a big pipe to get it out into the bay. They did it when there was the least amount of water in it. I asked if I could go inside there and take some pictures, and they said ‘only if you make us up a set, and give it to us’, I said sure. Also, there is a history. I do know the fella that did the dynamiting in there. He still lives here. He was what they call a Powder Monkey. He was born in this country but raised in Norway, or Sweden. So anyway, I did go inside it, and it’s really something. It’s a quarter-mile through that thing.
14: I came, and started working on a boat, and the boat was lost in the tsunami. I stayed on because I was a welder and a fitter and a burner, and they needed a lot of that. I stayed thinking it would only be a few months, and it wound up being forever!

Passage 2 of 6 Section 0, Paras 19 to 23, 644 chars.

19: I worked in many different places, I did all the refrigeration down at the Seward fisheries, I was a construction foreman when they built the Louisiana-Pacific Mill. I was also the superintendent after it fired up and was running.

20:
21: B: What did they make at that mill?
22:
23: F: It was before they changed the rules, about shipping raw logs. They used to cut two lines on each side of the log, and out of those two lines we’d get chips and domestic lumber also. That’s what they did. Then they changed they law, so you couldn’t ship raw logs. That knocked the mill out. Also the Koreans had signed a contract for the chips, and they reneged on that.

24:

Passage 3 of 6 Section 0, Para 43, 409 chars.

43: : Actually, it was started by Herman Lerher, he’s the one who started that. They built some bridges, and the bridges didn’t last, and so that’s when the state moved in. They paved it, and built some substantial bridges. They could see that it was going to be big thing to go out to that glacier for years to come there. That’s one of the reasons that I took that because it’s a fond memory of many years ago.

Passage 4 of 6 Section 0, Para 101, 361 chars.

101: [9] F: And then, getting on to this cabin, Steve and Kristy Audette lived in this cabin, when they first got married. It’s pretty dilapidated now, but it’s on Old Exit Glacier road. It’s just….this is the past. That’s exactly what I was thinking when I was taking the picture. The past should be and is being recorded by some folks. That’s the way it should be.

Passage 5 of 6 Section 0, Paras 103 to 105, 422 chars.

103: B: I’ve talked to a lot of people who know a lot about the history of this town. It seems that the history of the town is being carried on both orally, written, a lot more than it is in other places.

104:
105: F: that’s exactly right, and there are some old timers that I can sit and listen to, and I’m one of them now. There are people much older than I am that were here, they have so many stories. One lady is very dear to me.
150: t’s all cemented on the inside, nothing rough about it at all. They did an excellent job. The river used to run right down the street by here, Jefferson. They had bridges over the street, at that time. In 1938, they decided they were tired of the river tearing up the town, so they went to work on it, and by 1941, they opened it, to go through the tunnel in bear mountain.

Node 16 of 91 (3 1 1) /History/History of Seward/Earthquake
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 14, 249 chars.

14: I came, and started working on a boat, and the boat was lost in the tsunami. I stayed on because I was a welder and a fitter and a burner, and they needed a lot of that. I stayed thinking it would only be a few months, and it wound up being forever!

Node 17 of 91 (3 1 3) /History/History of Seward/Other Seward history
Passage 1 of 2 Section 0, Paras 142 to 146, 709 chars.

142: 15] F: This is the waterfall down there.
143:  
144: B: The one right past the sealife center?
145:  
146: F: right. I was privy to going inside of that. 2 years ago they rerouted it, in there is a big pipe to get it out into the bay. They did it when there was the least amount of water in it. I asked if I could go inside there and take some pictures, and they said ‘only if you make us up a set, and give it to us’, I said sure. Also, there is a history. I do know the fella that did the dynamiting in there. He still lives here. He was what they call a Powder Monkey. He was born in this country but raised in Norway, or Sweden. So anyway, I did go inside it, and it’s really something. It’s a quarter-mile through that thing.

Passage 2 of 2 Section 0, Para 150, 374 chars.

150: t’s all cemented on the inside, nothing rough about it at all. They did an excellent job. The river used to run right down the street by here, Jefferson. They had bridges over the street, at that time. In 1938, they decided they were tired of the river tearing up the town, so they went to work on it, and by 1941, they opened it, to go through the tunnel in bear mountain.

Node 18 of 91 (3 2) /History/History of Alaska
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 43, 409 chars.

43: : Actually, it was started by Herman Lerher, he’s the one who started that. They built some bridges, and the bridges didn’t last, and so that’s when the state moved in. They paved it, and built some substantial bridges. They could see that it was going to be big thing to go out to that glacier for years to come there. That’s one of the reasons that I took that because it’s a fond memory of many years ago.

Node 19 of 91 (3 2 1) /History/History of Alaska/Homesteading
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 69, 156 chars.
69: So that’s what I was thinking of, was the freedom that we have here, the right to go
and buy a piece of property and to build on it and realize your dreams.

Node 20 of 91 (3 2 2) /History/History of Alaska/Other Alaska History
Passage 1 of 3 Section 0, Para 79, 314 chars.

79: But, you know, back in the early days, people did that for a living. When I first came
here there were still people trapping for a living. And goldmining. All those things were
still open then and they still are, somewhat. I wouldn’t trap again. Not using the
technology we had then, compared to what they have now
Passage 2 of 3 Section 0, Paras 81 to 83, 311 chars.

81: B: That and the numbers declined, there aren’t as many of those creatures around as
there used to be.
82:
83: F: Like beaver. There used to be a lot of beaver around here, but there is not anymore.
There was a lot of lynx. That’s what I trapped mostly, was lynx and wolverine. But, it’s
not a good thing now (smiles).
Passage 3 of 3 Section 0, Para 138, 921 chars.

138: F: Well, they say the old one was better. Just off a little ways is a dogsled,
commemorating the old beginning of Iditarod, which was here. By the way, Dan Seavey
is the head of the Iditarod trail committee. Mitch Seavey is the only one who ran it the
entire way. Which was from Seward, to Nome. The race now always starts in Anchorage,
or if there is no snow it will start in Wasilla, or wherever, somewhere along the line. He
is the only one who ran his dogs from here, and bedded them down right in front of the
sign that says welcome to Anchorage. You know, he got very little publicity out of it.
And a few years ago, Dan ran, the dad, Mitch ran, and one of the boys ran. There were 3
generations. And they never got any notoriety out of that, either. They say you don’t have
to pat yourself on the back, somebody else will do it for you. But it was really, they
should have been recognized for that. 3 generations!
139:

Node 21 of 91 (3 3) /History/History of the Individual
Passage 1 of 7 Section 0, Para 14, 545 chars.

14: came here 5 days before the 1964 earthquake. I came here at the asking of a
company known as the Alaska Scallop Fleet. I came up here to refit a vessel up here, to
go out and do towing for scallops. They were just doing a survey to find out if there were
enough here to bring some boats around. I came, and started working on a boat, and the
boat was lost in the tsunami. I stayed on because I was a welder and a fitter and a burner,
and they needed a lot of that. I stayed thinking it would only be a few months, and it
wound up being forever!
Passage 2 of 7 Section 0, Paras 16 to 19, 878 chars.
16: B: So far so good! And you’ve been here year-round?
17:
18: F: Yes. We stay here year-round. As a matter of fact this used to be my church [referring to the coffee shop where the interview took place]. Resurrection Lutheran Church. I helped paint the ceiling. The scaffolding was either too short, or too high, and you’d have to lay on your back and that’s how we did it. Another member of this church was Dan S, who ran in the Iditarod the first time. It used to be the most horrible green you’ve ever seen, and then they went to salmon pink. That too was terrible. We got a paint committee, and they came up with white and gold and a yellowish color.
19: I worked in many different places, I did all the refrigeration down at the Seward fisheries, I was a construction foreman when they built the Louisiana-Pacific Mill. I was also the superintendent after it fired up and was running.

Passage 3 of 7 Section 0, Para 99, 298 chars.

99: He had a pipe driven. The way I knew what he was doing is because he hired me to come out and cut the pipes off, so when he built the house it’d be level. And weld some plates on it. That’s what I did, for 40 years, I was a welder. I had a business for 25 years, right where the SeaLife center is.

Passage 4 of 7 Section 0, Para 101, 361 chars.

101: [9] F: And then, getting on to this cabin, Steve and Kristy Audette lived in this cabin, when they first got married. It’s pretty dilapidated now, but it’s on Old Exit Glacier road. It’s just….this is the past. That’s exactly what I was thinking when I was taking the picture. The past should be and is being recorded by some folks. That’s the way it should be.

Passage 5 of 7 Section 0, Para 107, 152 chars.

107: I’ve worked with Dan for 4 and a half years driving the Seward bus to anchorage. I did half a million miles on the Seward highway in 4 and a half years.

Passage 6 of 7 Section 0, Para 146, 623 chars.

146: : right. I was privy to going inside of that. 2 years ago they rerouted it, in there is a big pipe to get it out into the bay. They did it when there was the least amount of water in it. I asked if I could go inside there and take some pictures, and they said ‘only if you make us up a set, and give it to us’, I said sure. Also, there is a history. I do know the fella that did the dynamiting in there. He still lives here. He was what they call a Powder Monkey. He was born in this country but raised in Norway, or Sweden. So anyway, I did go inside it, and it’s really something. It’s a quarter-mile through that thing.

Passage 7 of 7 Section 0, Para 189, 432 chars.

189: The reason I know a lot about places in town, is because way back in the early 70’s and up into the 80’s, I was one of the few people who thawed water lines. I had a welding machine and I’d go around and hook up. I knew where everybody’s shut off was, I knew where to hook up on them, and I’d tell them okay, leave your key, and a 50 dollar bill, in the usual place. If either one is missing you won’t have water when you get home.
F: These were sailboats out there. I was trying to show the recreational parts of Seward and they bay, which is beautiful all the time too,

F: I took this one because it reminded me of the loyalty of the people of Alaska, and of this area. They are very loyal.

F: I took this one because it reminded me of the loyalty of the people of Alaska, and of this area. They are very loyal.

B: loyal to whom?

F: Loyal to other people, to the community, and to themselves. Probably themselves last. Most people of the community of Seward are very proud of the All-American City award that we’ve won what, three times?

As a matter of fact after I took this photo, you can see on the right side that door is opened, as I was getting ready to leave this guy stuck his head out and said “What’s up” and I said I’m not a government man or anything like that, I’m just taking a picture because I thought it was kind of nice the way you had that Alaskan flag over your back window. I said I’m doing this for some other folks, I’m using up this camera. This represents loyalty to me. He said “oh thank you take all the pictures you want.”

build on it and realize your dreams.

and put the elbow grease into it. That might tie into the notion of freedom a little bit, too, that people are free to follow their dreams. Same as building the house, you can build a business.

Sure. From nothing. The first thing he built out there was a house on the left-hand side, I don’t think you can see it, but he built it on stilts. He had a pipe driven. The way I knew what he was doing is because he hired me to come out and cut the pipes off, so when he built the house it’d be level. And weld some plates on it. That’s what I did, for 40 years, I was a welder. I had a business for 25 years, right where the SeaLife center is.
101: The past should be and is being recorded by some folks. That’s the way it should be.
Passage 6 of 6 Section 0, Para 124, 877 chars.

124: F: Oh yeah, Mitch Seavey. It think it was 2004 (it was). Last year he was second or third (third). His dad started that. He was a school teacher, he was the one who painted the ceiling with me (in the church). Dan was into mushing so Mitch just followed in his footsteps. One of Mitch’s boys got into it, so now two of them are into it, and a third one has a tour business going up to the glacier, which is all woven into the family. Everything in that shop out there has gotten every one of that family’s names tied to it. Dan Seavey the third just finished college with a 4.0 grade average was home schooled, and he is one of the nicest young men you’d ever want to meet. He’s very intelligent. Matter of fact, for the race the Mitch won, Dan plotted all the strategy. He knows very well what it takes. Dan ran in it once, and he’s not going to do it again. It’s not for him.

Node 25 of 91 (6 2) /Alaskan Heritage/Family history
Passage 1 of 2 Section 0, Para 124, 877 chars.

124: F: Oh yeah, Mitch Seavey. It think it was 2004 (it was). Last year he was second or third (third). His dad started that. He was a school teacher, he was the one who painted the ceiling with me (in the church). Dan was into mushing so Mitch just followed in his footsteps. One of Mitch’s boys got into it, so now two of them are into it, and a third one has a tour business going up to the glacier, which is all woven into the family. Everything in that shop out there has gotten every one of that family’s names tied to it. Dan Seavey the third just finished college with a 4.0 grade average was home schooled, and he is one of the nicest young men you’d ever want to meet. He’s very intelligent. Matter of fact, for the race the Mitch won, Dan plotted all the strategy. He knows very well what it takes. Dan ran in it once, and he’s not going to do it again. It’s not for him.

Passage 2 of 2 Section 0, Paras 126 to 128, 160 chars.

126: B: So the whole family is involved in every aspect of the business then.
127:
128: F: yes, in every aspect. And they all get along just famously. They are a good family.

Node 26 of 91 (6 3) /Alaskan Heritage/Homesteading
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 65, 122 chars.

65: Here this guy comes along and buys a piece of property in the woods, that had virgin timber, and he’s building his house.

Node 27 of 91 (7) /Tourism in Seward
Passage 1 of 2 Section 0, Paras 114 to 116, 77 chars.

114: Do the tourists help drive free enterprise?
115:
116: F: yes, they did that for sure.

Passage 2 of 2 Section 0, Para 188, 451 chars.

188: When I first came here, down by where the Breeze in is there was a little airstream trailer that had two booths and three stools at a small counter, and they served hamburgers. And look at it now. A big restaurant, bar, conference room, motel in the back, shops. It’s really grown. There was nothing along the boardwalk that they have now. There was the harbormaster’s office and a couple of places behind it. They sold bait during the salmon derbies.

Node 28 of 91 (7 3) /Tourism in Seward/Tourists do dumb things
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 111, 105 chars.

111: That’s why people hit them, because they don’t slow down. They are going too fast. They have no control.

Node 29 of 91 (8) /Community
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 49, 207 chars.

49: F: Loyal to other people, to the community, and to themselves. Probably themselves last. Most people of the community of Seward are very proud of the All-American City award that we’ve won what, three times?

Node 30 of 91 (8 1) /Community/People~reationships
Passage 1 of 3 Section 0, Para 105, 220 chars.

105: F: that’s exactly right, and there are some old timers that I can sit and listen to, and I’m one of them now. There are people much older than I am that were here, they have so many stories. One lady is very dear to me.

Passage 2 of 3 Section 0, Para 107, 276 chars.

107: [10, 11, 12] F: this here is free enterprise, linked together with family ties. See these are a really fine bunch of folks. I’ve worked with Dan for 4 and a half years driving the Seward bus to anchorage. I did half a million miles on the Seward highway in 4 and a half years.

Passage 3 of 3 Section 0, Para 112, 209 chars.

112: This is the same thing, Seavey’s I-did-a-ride (the name of the dogsled ride business). These young girls inside, were just so nice, I said you don’t know but maybe you’ll see your face in a magazine sometime.

Node 31 of 91 (8 2) /Community/Places where people come together
Passage 1 of 1 Section 0, Para 105, 408 chars.

105: She used go to this church. When it moved, and I stopped going, she was flabbergasted. She called me and I said it doesn’t have what I want anymore. It matters
more what you wear and how much you give, and that’s not the way it’s supposed to be. So I went church shopping. My wife and I did that for quite a spell before we finally picked a church that we really liked. We’re happy with the church we got to.

No other nodes in this set code this document.
Appendix D: SPSS Output From Discriminant Analyses

Discriminant results - resident data - Occ/LoR variables

Analysis Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both missing or out-of-range group codes and at least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Valid N (listwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>20.396</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>22.341</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>21.664</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis 1

Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions

Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. First 1 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.
### Wilks' Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>2.546</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Length of residence</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>-.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Length of residence</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>-.459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions.

Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.

### Functions at Group Centroids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means.

### Classification Statistics

#### Classification Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processed</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Cases Used in Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in Output</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prior Probabilities for Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Cases Used in Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Count</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 49.9% of original grouped cases correctly classified.

**DISCRIMINANT**
/GROUPS=ImageType(1 2)
/VARIABLES=Beauty Recreation OtherPeople Pride History SocialInteractions Home Threats Tourism Architecture Work
/ANALYSIS ALL
/PRIORS EQUAL
/STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV UNIVF TABLE
/CLASSIFY=NOMISSING POOLED.

**Discriminant results - resident data - meaning variables**

(DataSet5) M:\SPSS Data_residents.sav

#### Analysis Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both missing or out-of-range group codes and at least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoP classification</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>d1</th>
<th>d2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>151.425</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>76.732</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>39.553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in Seward and AK</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>31.856</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>4.847</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>18.904</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>19.604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the landscape</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>6.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>8.119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>8.026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>12.197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis 1
Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions

Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4922</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. First 1 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Wilks’ Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>520.988</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Beauty</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Other people</th>
<th>Pride in Seward and AK</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Social Interactions</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Threats to the landscape</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.820</td>
<td>-.763</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Beauty</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Other people</th>
<th>Pride in Seward and AK</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Social Interactions</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Threats to the landscape</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions

Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.
Functions at Group Centroids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>-1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>1.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means

Classification Statistics

Classification Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processed</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Used in Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior Probabilities for Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Cases Used in Analysis</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>341,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP classification</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Count</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 93.0% of original grouped cases correctly classified.
Discriminant results - volunteer data - LoV variable

(DataSet4)

Analysis Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both missing or out-of-range group codes and at least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Valid N (listwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of volunteer service</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of volunteer service</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of volunteer service</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of volunteer service</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis 1

Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions

Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. First 1 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.
Wilks' Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Length of volunteer service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Length of volunteer service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.

Functions at Group Centroids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Landscape based SoP</th>
<th>Community based SoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means

Classification Statistics

Classification Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processed</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Used in Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior Probabilities for Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Cases Used in Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Community based SoP</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 52.2% of original grouped cases correctly classified.
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### Discriminant results - volunteer data - meaning variables

[DataSet4]

#### Analysis Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both missing or out-of-range group codes and at least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Valid N (listwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape based SoP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based SoP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>37.736</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>5.901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>5.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis 1

**Variables Failing Tolerance Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within-Groups Variance</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Minimum Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All variables passing the tolerance criteria are entered simultaneously.

a. Minimum tolerance level is .001.

### Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions
Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. First 1 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Wilks' Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>47.339</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural landscapes</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>-.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>-.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>-.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the resource</td>
<td>-.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions

Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.

a. This variable not used in the analysis.

Functions at Group Centroids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>1.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means

Classification Statistics
### Classification Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processed</th>
<th>115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or out-of-range group codes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one missing discriminating variable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in Output</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prior Probabilities for Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Cases Used in Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoP based on image</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Original Count</th>
<th>Landscape based SoP</th>
<th>Community based SoP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community based SoP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Landscape based SoP</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Community based SoP</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 78.5% of original grouped cases correctly classified.
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