The characteristics and motivational decisions of outdoor adventure tourists: a review and analysis

POMFRET, Gill <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1161-7703> and BRAMWELL, Bill

The characteristics and motivational decisions of outdoor adventure tourists: a review and analysis

Abstract

The growing demand for outdoor adventure tourism activities, and the rapid growth in associated industry supply, means we need an improved understanding of outdoor adventure tourists. The paper considers the characteristics and motives of outdoor adventure tourists, as well as the influence of experience, age and gender on their motives. This is based, firstly, on a critical review of the relatively much more extensive literature on outdoor adventure activity participants for insights into the character and motives of outdoor adventure tourists. The paper also focuses, secondly, on an original case study of mountaineer tourists in Chamonix, France. Results from the case study of mountaineer tourists are evaluated against the research themes and gaps identified from the review of literature on outdoor adventure activity participants, including outdoor adventure tourists. It is shown how outdoor adventure tourists are a diverse group. Motivational similarities and differences exist between these tourists and their outdoor recreational counterparts. Experience, age and gender influence the motives and motivational differences among outdoor adventure activity participants. It is noted that there is considerable scope for further research on outdoor adventure tourists, including mountaineer tourists, and potential new research directions are identified for the specific themes examined in the paper.

Keywords: outdoor adventure tourists; mountaineer tourists; characteristics; motives; motivational decisions.

Introduction

This paper considers the characteristics and motivational decisions of outdoor adventure participants, focusing in particular on those participants who are also tourists, based on them staying overnight away from home. It reviews previous literature on the characteristics of outdoor adventure participants, the motives encouraging outdoor adventure activity participation, the influences on those motives, and the theoretical constructs used to analyse those motives. A detailed case study is also provided specifically of outdoor adventure tourists, and of one group of such tourists – mountaineer tourists – based on original fieldwork. The findings of this case study are related to themes identified in the review of literature on outdoor adventure participants, including on mountaineer participants and tourists. Finally, the paper identifies important gaps in existing research on outdoor adventure tourists and it suggests related future research directions.

A critical review of existing research studies is needed because these studies are scattered across the academic fields of recreation, leisure and tourism. Further, there is a particular need to bring together findings from the relatively very few studies of outdoor adventure participants focused specifically on participants who are also tourists, based on them staying overnight away from home. It is helpful to relate the very restricted literature specifically on these tourists to the relatively larger, but still quite limited, literature on general outdoor adventure activity participants. One reason is that some previous surveys of general outdoor adventure participants were

likely to have included some tourists. There are also probably strong similarities in the motives of these two participant groups, and very similar or even the same analytical concepts are likely to be useful for understanding both groups. In addition, a critical review assists in identifying important patterns and trends in the characteristics and motivational decisions of outdoor adventure tourists, and also in establishing gaps in our understanding that require further research.

The paper reviews the rather dispersed and fragmented literature about outdoor adventure participants, showing that, while little is known about outdoor adventure tourists, more is known about outdoor recreational adventurers (e.g. Ewert, Gilbertson, Luo & Voight, 2013; Kerr & Houge-Mackenzie, 2012; Seiffert & Hedderson, 2009). Because adventure recreation is 'at the heart' of adventure tourism (Weber, 2001, p.361), then these two participant groups are likely to share some similar, and perhaps some almost identical, characteristics and motivational decisions. Yet, there have been few attempts to synthesise the literature about these two groups in a focused and consistent way. By bringing this literature together, the present study helps to break down barriers to our understanding of these two groups of outdoor adventure activity participants. It is hoped it will also encourage future fruitful exchanges of insight between these two research areas.

It is important to understand outdoor adventure tourists because demand estimations suggest that there is strong growth in demand and supply associated with outdoor adventure activities and holidays (Adventure Travel Trade Association [ATTA], 2013; Outdoor Foundation, 2012). It should be remembered, however, that the growth estimations are mostly sponsored by industry associations. There is a need for much more research on the characteristics of outdoor adventure tourists, including on their motivations, which are so important for their buying intentions, choices and behaviour (Park & Yoon, 2009; Schneider & Vogt, 2012). Research on outdoor adventure tourists can help adventure tourism organisations to better understand their clients and what prompts their participation in outdoor adventure activities.

The paper also provides a case study of mountaineer tourists to further extend our understanding of outdoor adventure tourists. While previous research has examined mountaineering more extensively than other types of outdoor adventure activity, few studies have investigated the characteristics and motivational decisions specifically of mountaineer tourists (Carr, 1997; Pomfret, 2006, 2011). The case study findings on mountaineer tourists are related to themes and concepts in the review of previous studies of outdoor adventure activity participants in general and also of recreational mountaineers in general (Buckley, 2011). This allows for comparisons of issues between outdoor recreational adventurers and this specific group of outdoor adventure tourists.

Research on outdoor adventure tourists is complex because of difficulties in defining adventure tourism, such as because of divergent views about the range of activities involved. Adventure tourism is generally thought to involve land-, air-, and water-based activities, ranging from short, adrenalin-fuelled encounters, such as bungee jumping and wind-surfing, to longer experiences, such as cruise expeditions and mountaineering. Yet, these activities overlap with other types of tourism, such as activity tourism and ecotourism, and this presents problems in clearly defining adventure tourism activities. However, adventure activities are often seen as distinctive because they embrace certain core elements: uncertain outcomes, danger and risk, challenge, anticipated rewards, novelty, stimulation and excitement,

escapism and separation, exploration and discovery, absorption and focus, and contrasting emotions (Swarbrooke, Beard, Leckie & Pomfret, 2003, p.9). Ultimately, however, adventure is a highly subjective concept which is perceived and experienced by individuals in varying ways, so that some tourists view the activities they engage in on holiday as adventurous, while others do not. Participants' personality, lifestyles and level of experience influence if, and how, they experience adventure (Ewert, 1989; Priest, 1999; Weber, 2001).

Researching outdoor adventure tourists is further complicated by the inextricable links between outdoor adventure activities for recreation and for tourism, and this sometimes creates difficulties in distinguishing between them. Tourism activities which take place in the natural environment are often based on recreational activities of a non-commercial nature (Tangeland & Aas, 2011), and both types share the same resources and facilities (Carr, 2002; McKercher, 1996). Participation in either type of activity can evoke similar social and psychological reactions, yet a range of 'pull' (Dann, 1977) motives can set tourism apart from recreation. These include the destination's natural setting and its distinctiveness from the tourist's home setting, the supply of adventure tourism services and facilities, and the promotion of adventure tourism products (Pomfret, 2006). Participants can also have different perceptions about whether they are tourists or recreationists, which can be influenced by their views about their outdoor activities and the meanings they attribute to them. Similarly, national park organisations can have differing perceptions of their park users. Thus, tourists are often regarded as users who demand extrinsic recreational facilities and who pay commercial operators for them, whereas recreationists are more likely to be considered to seek intrinsic values from the park, to be independent, and to rarely pay for their experiences (McKercher, 1996).

For the purpose of this paper, outdoor adventure tourists are seen as staying overnight away from home (on holiday) in order to participate in adventure activities in natural environments that are distinct from those in their home regions. While outdoor recreational adventurers probably share many similar characteristics with outdoor adventure tourists, the key difference is that the former group usually participates in adventure activities within their home environment. Yet, there is a lack of clarity in some studies (e.g. Sugerman, 2001; Willig, 2008) about whether the outdoor adventure activity participants are tourists or recreationists, and there may be some overlap.

The paper begins by reviewing literature on the characteristics of outdoor adventure activity participants, focusing on outdoor adventure tourists. Second, it evaluates the motives of outdoor adventure activity participants, again focusing on outdoor adventure tourists. Third, the review discusses three theoretical constructs applied to research in this field: flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), reversal theory (Apter, 1982), and edgework (Lyng & Snow, 1986). These motivational-based concepts have been examined in recreational adventurer research, but their application in adventure tourist research is more limited. Fourth, the influences on motives encouraging outdoor adventure activity participation are considered, namely participants' experience level in outdoor adventure activities, their age, and their gender. Fifth, discussion turns to a case study of mountaineer tourists. It considers the case study findings in relation to the characteristics, motives, and influences on motives reviewed earlier in the paper, and also to prior research on mountaineers. The case study also applies to mountaineer tourists the concept of flow that was

evaluated in the literature review. Finally, the paper identifies important gaps in existing research on outdoor adventure tourists, and related suggestions are made about future research directions.

Characteristics of outdoor adventure tourists

The review first considers existing scattered research on outdoor adventure activity participants, but with a focus on adventure tourists. Scant research exists on the characteristics specifically of adventure tourists, yet some insights have emerged.

In this research, however, there are varying definitions of adventure tourists, perhaps due to the subjective nature of adventure, the wide spectrum of activities involved, and their overlap with other tourism activities. This results in findings that are not directly comparable, making it difficult to provide a consistent overview of these tourists. For example, the ATTA (2010, 2013) defines adventure tourists in its surveys as tourists who participated in 'soft' or 'hard' adventure activities (Lipscombe, 1995) during their last holiday, although this definition ignores the core elements of risk and challenge. And Sung (2004) examines tourists who previously had taken an adventure holiday or who intended to take such a holiday within the next 5 years.

Another complication is that the relatively few previous studies of adventure tourists (ATTA, 2010, 2013; Muller & Cleaver, 2000; Muller & O'Cass, 2001; Patterson, 2006; Sung, 2004) have generally investigated together both 'package' adventure tourists, who use commercial adventure tourism organisations, and 'independent' adventure tourists, who independently organise and manage their own holidays. While there is a need to investigate both types of adventure tourist, it is valuable to study them separately because they may differ in their characteristics and motivational decisions. For instance, adventure tourism organisations create 'the illusion of risk' (Holyfield, Jonas & Zajicek, 2004, p.175) for package adventure tourists, while simultaneously implementing risk-avoidance strategies. By contrast, independent adventure tourists have to manage any potential risks by themselves.

Investigations of adventure tourists often adopt a consumer segmentation approach, presumably in order to assist governments, destination organisations, and adventure organisations to understand the market and the breadth of adventure tourist types. Segments have been identified according to traveller features, travel behaviour, soft and hard adventure, cultural learning or exchange, physical activity, and interaction with nature. Here a further complication should be noted, in that these studies have been carried out over a relatively lengthy period of time, and the potentially rapid changes in consumer trends mean that older studies may not fully reflect the characteristics of present-day adventure tourists.

The investigations reveal mixed results on the gender of adventure tourists. Early research (Sung, 2004) found that American adventure tourists are mainly men (68%), who often have a preference for hard adventure, whereas women have a higher propensity to engage in soft adventure. From among six market segments, 'general enthusiasts' tend to be male and to prefer hard adventure activities, and 'family vacationers' are predominantly male and with young children and well-established professional careers. Women dominate the smallest segment, the 'soft moderates', which mainly comprise middle-aged adventure tourists who prefer soft, nature-based adventure activities. By contrast, later studies by the ATTA (2010, 2013) indicate a

changing trend. There is a more equal gender split – 57% of adventure tourists are male – with no major differences between hard and soft adventure participation, although soft adventure remains slightly more appealing to females. In parallel with this potentially changing pattern of demand, there is growth in the supply of women-only adventure holidays (Mintel, 2011).

Adventure tourists are often younger, although participation among an older group, the 'baby boomers', is growing (ATTA, 2010, 2013). Compared with the older age groups before them, the baby boomers tend to be wealthier, healthier, more educated, and more likely to seek out fulfilling educational adventure experiences through engaging in commercially-organised, guided soft adventure activities (Muller & Cleaver, 2000; Patterson, 2006). The ATTA (2010) study segmented adventure tourists primarily by age, with Gen Y aged 18-30 years, Gen X aged 31-44 years, and baby boomers aged 45-64 years. Gen Y and X are experienced travellers who are classified either as 'high disposable income, time poor' (p.12) – tending to take packaged adventure holidays, packing in as much as possible to fulfil their dreams – or as 'smaller budget, extensive time' (p.12) – travelling for lengthy durations, and seeking authentic experiences through fully immersing themselves in local communities. The baby boomers have relatively large budgets, are time-rich, and some are new to adventure travel or have become engaged after a long period of non-participation.

There are potential differences in adventure activity choices by gender and age combinations, with older females preferring more age-related activities, such as bird watching and walking, and older men preferring activities more frequently associated with younger people, such as rock climbing, caving and white-water rafting (Muller & O'Cass, 2001). Adventure tourists may also have relatively distinct educational backgrounds and economic status. According to the ATTA (2013), adventure tourists are well-educated, with 37% having a degree, they are more likely to have managerial or professional careers, and they have higher levels of disposable income.

Motives and influences on motives encouraging outdoor adventure activity participation

Consideration is given now to current understanding about the motives, and influences on motives, encouraging adventure recreation and adventure tourism participation. Due to the lack of work specifically on adventure tourists, suggestions are given about how knowledge about outdoor recreational adventurers can be applied to adventure tourist research. The discussion shows the diversity of motives driving participation in outdoor adventure activities, and the motivational dissimilarities between different types of adventure activity. The constructs of flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), reversal theory (Apter, 1982), and edgework (Lyng & Snow, 1986) are appraised, with these ideas frequently used in studies of outdoor recreational adventurers to explain their motives and motivational states. The influences of experience, gender, and age on motives are also considered.

Motives of outdoor adventure activity participants

When examining the motives of adventure activity participants, including of adventure tourists, it is important to recognise that 'the [adventure] experience is

essentially ineffable and can be fully understood only by actually participating in it' (Lyng, 1990, p.862). Moreover, adventure motives are changeable during people's participation and are influenced by the resulting experience (Ewert, 1994; Ewert et al, 2013). As such, investigating this subject matter presents challenges. Outdoor recreational adventurers are often influenced by varied motives (Ewert, 1994; Mannell & Kleiber, 1997), yet some of the first studies predominantly focused on thrill-seeking as a motive driving outdoor adventure activity participation. More recent studies, however, have examined wider motives (Kerr & Houge Mackenzie, 2012), typically reflecting adventure's core elements.

The analysis draws together findings from past studies about outdoor adventure activity participants. This includes Buckley's (2011) examination of 50 motive-based outdoor adventure studies about climbing and mountaineering, white-water rafting and kayaking, skydiving and parachuting, surfing and sail-boarding, skiing and snowboarding, mountain biking, off-road driving, and multiple adventure activities. Buckley also analyses his personal experiences of "rush" experienced within different adventure activities. Rush is defined as a combination of thrill, flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) and peak experience (Maslow, 1977), culminating in 'excitement associated with the physical performance of a specific adventure activity, at the limits of individual capability, under highly favourable circumstances, by a person who is already skilled and trained in the activity concerned' (p.3).

Three pertinent themes emerge from Buckley's research. First, it is noted that outdoor adventure activity participants have wide-ranging skill levels, from novice to expert (Buckley, 2007, 2010a; Varley, 2006), and these differing abilities influence participants' motivational decisions. Second, despite the commonly-held assumption that adventure must always involve risk, either as an integral or secondary component (Ewert, 1985; Kane & Tucker, 2004; Martin & Priest, 1986; Robinson, 1992; Varley, 2006; Walle, 1997), limited evidence exists to confirm its motivational importance. Adventure activity participants acknowledge that risk may play a role in their experiences, but often it is not a motivational force. Third, a majority of authors lacked expertise in their researched outdoor adventure activities, resulting in few auto-ethnographic studies (see Ewert, 1985; Holyfield, 1999; Irwin, 1973). Buckley's review ascertained 14 distinct motivations, classified into 3 groups. The first group concerns internally-generated motives, which involve activity performance – thrill, fear, control, skills, achievement, fitness and risk. The second group of motivations comprises nature, art and spirit, which are internal or external motives related to the participants' place in nature. The final group of motivations is externally-produced, related to participants' social position, and it comprises friends, image, escape and competition.

Even though Buckley's (2011) review is comprehensive, less attention is paid to differences in motives according to the particular outdoor adventure activities. Although there are commonalities, differences are apparent for different outdoor adventure activities due to their diverse characteristics. For instance, mountaineering and ocean rowing have a lengthy duration and participants benefit from pitting themselves against nature. By contrast, downhill skiing and skydiving take less time and the focus is more on risk taking and adrenalin seeking. Activities such as bungee jumping require no previous experience or skill from participants. By contrast, BASE jumping and mountaineering expeditions demand high levels of competence and

experience (Kerr & Houge Mackenzie, 2012; Woodman, Hardy, Barlow & Le Scanff, 2010).

Findings from Buckley's review highlight the dearth of research on adventure tourists, with only 15 of the 50 studies focusing on adventure tourists. Table 1 illustrates the key motives found from 7 (Cater, 2006; Fluker & Turner, 2000; Patterson & Pan, 2007; Pomfret, 2006, 2011; Swarbrooke et al, 2003; Wu & Liang, 2012) of the 15 studies which specifically examine adventure tourists' motives. Other motivational-based research on adventure tourists, which is not presented in Buckley's (2011) review, has also been added to Table 1. It shows that motives driving multi-activity participation have been the main research focus, and that only a very few outdoor adventure activities have been examined in an adventure tourism rather than an adventure recreation context. Clearly recognised adventure sports, such as surfing, snowboarding, horseback riding and paragliding, have been neglected by researchers, despite such activities being offered as holiday experiences by commercial tourism organisations and being engaged in by independent adventure tourists. Table 1 also highlights how there are shared motives across activity types – for instance, the natural environment motivates mountaineers and also kayakers – as well as variations.

[INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE]

Despite variations between different categories of adventure activity, motivational dissimilarities across these categories have been under-researched, and the few studies that have been carried out tend to be based on experienced adventurers, although there are exceptions. For example, one investigation (Ewert et al, 2013) of 801 canoeists, rock climbers, white-water kayakers and sea kayakers, of varying skill levels, established motivational differences according to activity type. Rock climbers scored higher on sensation-seeking motives than canoeists and sea kayakers. And canoeists scored lower on self-image motives and higher on social motives than participants in white-water kayaking, sea kayaking and rock climbing. Ewert et al (2013) contend that such motivational differences reflect the diverse nature of these activities. Rock climbing and white-water kayaking, for example, usually take place in more challenging settings, they are more demanding, and they necessitate higher levels of skill than canoeing and sea kayaking.

Some researchers have explored participants' motives across a range of adventure activity types, but they have not always focused on motivational differences. For instance, Willig's (2008) small-scale study of participants of various adventure activities examined the meanings that they associated with extreme sport participation and the motives which influenced their involvement. A key motivational force was the pursuit of goals, and participants recognised that overcoming both mental and physical challenges, enduring suffering, and pushing themselves to their limits were important elements of this pursuit. The participants commented that they could escape from everyday problems through tackling the challenges involved in adventure activity participation. They were keen to develop mastery, which was realised through the development of skills and experience. They enjoyed the rejuvenating, energising and therapeutic effects of engagement, which culminated in flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), yet these perceived benefits did not motivate

respondents directly. Instead, they were ‘akin to a gift which one receives with gratitude and joy but which is not expected or sought out as such’ (p.698).

Theoretical constructs related to motivational aspects of outdoor adventure activity participation

The review now examines the motivational constructs of flow, reversal theory, and edgework. Key studies of outdoor recreational adventurers using these constructs are discussed mostly because these constructs have been applied very little in relation to adventure tourists.

Flow

Flow is 'the state in which people are so involved in an activity that nothing else seems to matter; the experience itself is so enjoyable that people will do it at great cost, for the sheer sake of doing it' (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992, p.4). It originated primarily from Maslow’s (1968) ‘peak experience’ concept, a generic term to describe poignant, positive experiences (Boniface, 2000) through participation in powerful, autotelic, intrinsically motivating and rewarding activities to achieve self-actualisation. Flow is a complex concept, purportedly experienced only when several of its nine dimensions come together and also when the participant’s perceived level of skill is suitably matched to the perceived challenges demanded from the activity, resulting in an anxiety-free and deeply satisfying experience (Jackson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1999). It is thought that this challenge–skill balance continually escalates as individuals aspire to surpass their ‘personal averages’ to extend their flow experiences (Houge Mackenzie, Hodge & Boyes, 2011, p.520). Accordingly, adventure activity participants can have different levels of flow depending on the activity’s specific level of challenge and skill, ranging from ‘micro flow’ to ‘deep flow’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975, p.141). The nature and intensity of the flow experience are influenced by individual perceptions of competence and risk (Martin & Priest, 1986), with positive perceptions more likely to lead to deeply satisfying flow experiences (Priest & Bunting, 1993).

It is widely acknowledged that flow is a deeply rewarding outcome of adventure activity participation, with the concept having been tested in varied settings with different participants. Yet there are weaknesses in the flow concept. It is argued, for example, that flow should not be used in isolation to examine the intrinsic motives of adventure activity participants (Jackson & March, 1996). Further, although a positive challenge–skill balance is thought to be essential to flow, it has not always been possible to use this as a tool to predict flow experiences accurately (Jones, Hollenhorst & Perna, 2003). Last, the four-channel flow model (Massimini & Carli, 1986), an elaboration of the original flow concept, has been considered unreliable in explaining optimal experiences (Jones et al, 2003). Despite its flaws, however, the flow construct has been used to measure the nature and intensity of optimal experiences in many settings, including natural environments. The experience of flow, rather than its motivational purpose, is more frequently the focus of investigation, although studies have demonstrated its importance in realising fulfilling adventure experiences and in acting as a motivational force encouraging continued participation (e.g. Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Delle Fave, Bassi & Massimini, 2003;

Jones et al, 2003; Seifert & Hedderson, 2009; Wu & Liang, 2011). It is recognised that 'flow offers a compelling reason why the entire experience of adventure is so greatly appreciated by participants' (Pomfret, 2012, p.147). Acknowledging the motivational strength of flow, Wu and Liang (2011) establish that challenge, skill and playfulness are powerful antecedents in facilitating the flow experience. The most influential antecedent is playfulness, a personality characteristic which entails active involvement in intensely gratifying activities (Bozionelos & Bozionelos, 1999).

Reversal theory

Motivational-based research on experienced adventure activity participants has applied reversal theory (Apter, 1982) to explain the diversity of motives underpinning behaviour. Contrary to previous optimal arousal theories, reversal theory claims that individuals alternate between distinct paired frames of mind, known as metamotivational states, within their daily lives. These states influence how people interpret the different motives that they experience at any given point in time. For instance, a person in the '*telic state* tends to be primarily serious, goal-oriented and arousal avoidant, and spontaneous, playful and arousal-seeking in the opposing *paratelic state*' (Kerr & Houge Mackenzie, 2012, p.650). According to reversal theory, the motivation to participate in adventure activities usually stems from paratelic-dominance and a desire to experience high levels of arousal within a complex environment (Apter, 1982). Participants in paratelic states have protective frames, which allow them to experience more negative feelings, such as danger and anxiety, as pleasant emotions during adventure activity participation. Other states are characterised by similarly contrasting frames of mind, with people alternating between these frames. Spending longer in one part of a paired metamotivational state than in the other shapes a person's personality and motivational style. For example, a person who mostly is 'competitive and dominating' has a mastery-dominant personality, whereas someone who craves for 'harmony and unity' (p.650) has a sympathy-dominant character.

Reversal theory has featured in a number of studies of recreational adventurers, yet the application of this concept within an adventure tourism context is limited. One exception is Houge Mackenzie & Kerr's (2013) study, which uses this theory to examine the motivational states of adventure guides. Another study by Kerr & Houge Mackenzie (2012) of five experienced adventure enthusiasts involved in varied adventure sports revealed many motives for participation, including risk-taking, challenge, adrenalin-seeking, goal achievement, and connecting with the natural environment, and these varied in importance for different respondents. All respondents switched back and forth between paired metamotivational states, but usually one state was dominant. For example, the river surfer enjoyed being in a highly stimulating paratelic state while surfing, characterised by fun, excitement, playful spontaneity, and intrinsic rewards; yet prior to participation she had been in a telic state from having trained hard to develop relevant skills and competence. Other investigations have used the Telic Dominance Scale (TDS) (Murgatroyd, Rushton, Apter & May, 1978) – which measures the paratelic-telic metamotivational state using three subscales – to ascertain the dominance of the paratelic frame of mind for adventure sports participants. The TDS has been used to compare risky sports participants with safe sports participants. Studies (Cogan & Brown, 1999; Kerr, 1990; Kerr & Sveback, 1989) have found that, compared with safe sports participants, risky

sports participants score much lower on the TDS arousal-avoidance subscale. Differences are apparent also on the TDS serious-mindedness and planning-orientation subscales, leading to the conclusion that risky sports enthusiasts enjoy a paratelic lifestyle.

Reversal theory has also been examined alongside flow experiences (Houge Mackenzie, Hodge & Boyes, 2011). Adventure activity participants encountered diverse flow experiences, which developed from different metamotivational states, perceptions of challenge and skill, and emotions linked to flow. Telic-flow experiences were deeply satisfying, cherished and strongly associated with the accomplishment of pertinent, challenging goals. By contrast, goal setting was absent from paratelic-flow states, and instead the focus was on adventure activity participation and the experiences were more relaxing and less intense.

Edgework

The third theoretical construct applied in research on the motives of outdoor adventure activity participants is the concept of edgework (Lyng & Snow, 1986). It involves pushing one's limits through voluntary yet calculated risk taking, and moving away from one's comfort zone to get close to the 'edge', ultimately to experience feelings of self-actualisation and a complete departure from the usual self (Lois, 2005). Edgework is considered to be an indescribable, powerful experience which involves 'negotiating the boundary between chaos and order' (Lyng, 1990; p.855) and also going through the four stages of: preparation, performing, aftermath, and redefining feelings. Although edgework has been examined in various contexts associated with risk, it is particularly pertinent to experienced outdoor adventurers who are strongly driven by risk and who seek to use and develop their skills and expertise in their chosen activity. Edgeworkers aspire to move closer to the edge through facing up to their fears and taking increasingly more extreme and sometimes death-defying risks, while simultaneously maintaining control throughout participation (Laurendeau, 2006). Edgeworkers greatly value the experience of risk, and they appreciate the opportunity to test out their skills more highly than the positive outcome enjoyed at the end of participation. The adventure activity type and the degree of real risk involved determine the edgework experience. Hence, sports such as skydiving and mountaineering, which potentially involve life and death situations, ultimately can lead to more intense experiences.

Researchers (Allman, Mittelstaedt, Martin & Goldenberg, 2009; Lois, 2005; Lyng, 1990; 1993; 1998) conclude that edgeworkers across different types of outdoor adventure activity are driven by multifaceted motives which reflect generic outdoor adventure activity motives. These include skills-development, achievement, control, spiritual feelings, sense of belonging and adrenaline-seeking. It is recognised that edgework and flow share similar characteristics, yet there are also distinct differences. Edgework has the potential to induce intense feelings of anxiety and a deeper sense of self, whereas flow is less likely to evoke fearful emotions, and it is characterised by a 'loss of self-consciousness' (Csikszentmihalyi 1985, p. 491; Lyng, 1990).

It is claimed that commercial adventure tourists are not motivated by voluntary risk taking as they carefully assess any potential risks associated with the activity they engage in, prioritising instead safety and caution (Schrader & Wann, 1999). Similarly, the commercial operators that organise their holidays gauge the risks

carefully and adopt stringent safety measures in order to manage potential hazards (Pomfret, 2011). Paradoxically, these organisations try to maintain a balance between safety and risk, while concurrently striving to ensure a challenging, adrenaline-fuelled experience. Research on commercial white-water rafters demonstrates this point (Holyfield, Jonas & Zajicek, 2005). The findings show that the guides during their non-guiding leisure time pushed themselves to their emotional, physical and mental limits so as to enjoy the benefits of edgework, while their clients merely enjoyed a taste of what edgeworking would be like. The guides used their skills to carefully control the entire rafting experience by managing their clients' emotions and by protecting them, while at the same time constructing a certain level of perceived risk. There is some support for the view that package adventure tourists categorically do not experience edgework (Holyfield et al, 2005; Schrader & Wann, 1999), but the opposite would seem to be the case for independent adventure tourists (Allman et al, 2009), who rely on their own skills, expertise and judgements about risk.

Influences on the motivations of outdoor adventure activity participants

The discussion next explores literature concerning experience, age and gender, and how these influence the motivational decisions of outdoor adventure activity participants. The experience level of these participants is considered more fully as past research has tended to examine this element more than age or gender. Previous work has demonstrated the significance of experience, age and gender for the motivational differences and changes among outdoor adventure activity participants. These elements are further considered in the subsequent case study so as to ascertain their impact on the motives of mountaineer tourists.

Outdoor adventure activity experience level

It is known that motives evolve and become more complex with increased experience in outdoor adventure activity participation. Experienced participants tend to be more intrinsically motivated in comparison to their novice counterparts, who are more likely to be extrinsically motivated, although this is not always the case, as the discussion will explain. Intrinsic motives are derived from the desire to fulfil internally-driven needs, such as challenge, risk-taking, control, excitement, enjoyment and achievement. In relation to adventure activities, intrinsic motivation includes seeking out demanding experiences which provide opportunities to develop one's abilities and to learn new skills (Ryan & Deci, 2000). By contrast, extrinsic motives are other-directed and evolve from external or environmental factors, such as the need to socialise and to be with others (Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1989; Patterson & Pan, 2007). Recreational adventurers are known to go through a transformative process in which their motives become more intrinsic with continued involvement in a particular activity (Ewert, 1987). This transformative process is known as recreational specialisation, defined as 'a continuum of behavior from the general to the particular, reflected by equipment and skills used in the sport, and activity setting preferences' (Bryan, 1977, p. 175).

Research on skydivers (Celsi, Rose & Leigh, 1993) has uncovered a process of motivational change with increased experience in skydiving. Novice skydivers mostly were extrinsically driven by interpersonal, safety and survival reasons, and by normative motives involving social compliance within the skydiving community.

More experienced skydivers, however, tended to be intrinsically driven by efficacy motives, which reflected the development of mastery, both for personal satisfaction and for social status within the skydiving community. Flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) was a prominent motive spurring on these skydivers to continue with skydiving due to its liberating effects, and its ability to induce intense moments of exhilaration and long-lasting feelings of personal satisfaction. Other work (Seifert & Hedderson, 2009) has also demonstrated the importance of flow to experienced adventure activity participants. At the core of experienced skateboarders' intrinsic motivation was the desire to encounter flow, to feel 'in the zone' (p.288) and to enjoy a transcendental experience. Goal-setting, feedback and mastery, which are key conditions required to experience flow, compelled continued participation in skateboarding. One study (Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1989) found that as the level of engagement increased, participants became progressively more motivated by natural and less-developed wilderness environments, an increasingly internalised locus of control, more autonomous decision-making, risk-taking, challenge and achievement. By contrast, novices sought out more developed natural settings in which opportunities existed to engage in guided, structured activities with minimal levels of risk, reflecting the importance of externally-directed motives.

Nonetheless, the 'internal/external dichotomy' (Ewert et al, 2013, p.98) classification to explain the association between motivational differences and experience may be less clear-cut. Social motives, which routinely would be categorised as extrinsic, could be intrinsically generated as they reflect the internal desires and needs of participants. And sensation-seeking motives, which customarily would be classified as intrinsic, could allude to the feelings that participants hope to enjoy as part of the adventure activity experience, and hence these may be extrinsically driven. Other work has also contradicted the association between participants' experience level and intrinsic–extrinsic motivation. In one study (Kerr & Houge Mackenzie, 2012) both intrinsic and extrinsic motives were significant for 5 veteran recreational adventurers throughout their involvement in different adventure activities. For instance, during his many years of experience, a kayaker was externally motivated by the natural environment, yet a range of other motives also evolved. Initially, he was both intrinsically motivated by adrenaline, risk, challenge and the development of experience, and also externally driven by the opportunities for camaraderie. Later, his connection with the natural setting became an even stronger draw, coupled with the gratifying kinaesthetic experience evoked from the kayaking experience itself. Another study of sea kayakers' motivations (O'Connell, 2010), ascertained that although veteran paddlers tended to be more intrinsically motivated, and their less experienced counterparts were more extrinsically driven, the motivational differences were found only in the two domains of nostalgia and escaping family.

Age and gender

Although few studies compare the motives which drive different age groups, motivational dissimilarities are apparent. For instance, O'Connell's (2010) work established that younger sea kayakers were more highly motivated by achievement and stimulation than the second youngest age group, and both these age groups were more strongly driven to escape personal and social pressures than the oldest age group. Older individuals are less likely to want to escape such pressures as they tend

to be retired, to have an established network of friends, and to be less involved in raising a family (Sugerman, 2001). Most research has concentrated on older or 'third age' participants aged over 55 years, yet this is limited (Boyes, 2013). Older adventure tourists are motivated by the potential for excitement and thrills during participation in 'safe' soft adventure activities, feeling youthful again and enjoying bodily rejuvenation (Cater, 2000; Patterson & Pan, 2007). Other drivers for older adventure tourists include challenge, fun, activity, boredom relief, social opportunities during participation, stability to life, and a sense of accomplishment. Improved health, heightened life expectancy, more free time and increased levels of wealth are externally generated motives which drive participation. Older people primarily are intrinsically driven to engage in adventure tourism activities because of the perceived benefits potentially to be enjoyed (Patterson & Pan, 2007).

Motives for older recreational adventurers broadly reflect those for older adventure tourists, although there are additional reasons encouraging participation. Older adults involved in outdoor adventure programmes designed specifically for over 55 year-olds predominantly are motivated by the natural environment, developing their skills in particular adventure activities, physical activity, meeting like-minded people and developing new friendships (Sugerman, 2001). Benefits for older outdoor recreational adventurers include general physical improvements, a positive impact on well-being, camaraderie, social engagement and support, occupying one's mind, and gaining a positive image as older adults (Boyes, 2013).

Gender differences exist for participation rates and specialisation level in different types of outdoor adventure activity, with men more likely than women to become involved in outdoor recreation activities and to engage in them more regularly (Bialeschki & Henderson, 2000; Hvenegaard, 2002). Motivational disparities are also evident between male and female participants. While competition and challenge are important motives driving male participation in leisure activities (Jackson & Henderson, 1995), females are more strongly motivated to learn new skills in a supportive outdoor environment, to escape their stereotypical gender roles, and to connect with other women (McClintock, 1996). Ewert et al's (2013) study found that female rock climbers, white-water kayakers, sea kayakers and canoeists attributed more importance to social motives, such as developing friendships and being part of a team, than was the case for males. By contrast, males were more strongly driven by self-image and sensation-seeking motives than females. O'Connell's (2010) research on sea kayakers ascertained that females were more highly motivated by the enjoyment of nature and creativity than males. However, it should be noted that the sample of respondents was drawn from a sea kayaking symposia, at which there were opportunities for females to express themselves freely and creatively during women-only events and to enjoy different experiences away from the potentially oppressive male-dominated sea kayaking scene. By contrast, risk-taking, instructing others, and using their own equipment or testing out new equipment were stronger motivational forces for males than females. Additionally, the study found that age and gender interacted to influence motivation, yet this was only significantly apparent for temperature. Thus, young males were more strongly driven to engage in kayaking than older males and females in order to provide some relief from hot weather. As canoeing is a male-dominated activity where gender differences could be more apparent than in other types of adventure activity, research has also examined motivational differences between male and female canoeists (Lee, Graefe & Li, 2006). The findings show that females were more strongly motivated by passive

motives, such as relaxation, social interaction and enjoying the natural environment, whereas males expressed more interest in active motivations. Contrary to previous work (Jackson & Henderson, 1995), however, there were no gender differences for the motives of competition, challenge and curiosity.

Case study of mountaineer tourists

The paper now turns to a detailed case study specifically of adventure tourists, and even more specifically of mountaineer tourists, based on original fieldwork. It discusses the fieldwork findings in relation to the characteristics, motives, and influences on motives reviewed earlier in this paper, and also to previous research on mountaineers. The analysis of mountaineer tourists in the case study also draws on the concepts, themes and debates that emerged from the review of literature on outdoor recreational adventurers.

Buckley's (2011) review of motive-based outdoor adventure activity studies found that 14 of the 50 studies focused on mountaineers and climbers, highlighting that these adventurers are more researched than other types of adventure activity participant. Nonetheless, most previous research has investigated recreational mountaineers, rather than mountaineer tourists. Accordingly, the case study also uses this fragmentary research to develop useful insights into mountaineer tourists.

Despite tourism and recreation becoming less temporally and spatially separated (Williams, 2003), this is not the case with mountaineering. Mountaineering opportunities are more restricted for recreational mountaineers unless they live near to or in mountainous regions, whereas mountaineer tourists can choose suitable mountaineering destinations for their holidays. Motivations to participate in mountaineering holidays can develop from recreational mountaineering experiences, the latter providing opportunities for training and skills development in advance of future trips (Pomfret, 2006). Hence, there may be both similarities and differences in motives between recreational mountaineers and mountaineer tourists.

In the case study, attention is directed to flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) as a motive encouraging mountaineering participation. The theoretical constructs of reversal theory (Apter, 1982) and edgework (Lyng & Snow, 1986), however, are not considered. This is because these latter two concepts are particularly applicable to investigations of very experienced, sometimes professional, outdoor adventure activity participants, whereas the case study focuses on mountaineer tourists with differing levels of experience, although most respondents classified themselves as intermediate level or lower. A consideration of reversal theory and edgework in this case study, therefore, is less appropriate for these respondents. By contrast, flow is potentially very relevant for adventure activity participants with varied experience levels, and this informed the decision to ask respondents questions related to this concept. As noted earlier, Csikszentmihalyi (1975) suggests that, while some individuals may encounter 'micro flow', others may experience 'deep flow' depending on the degree of challenge that they face during participation, and the level of skill they have in the chosen activity. A further reason for examining flow in this case study was to extend the literature about its motivational purpose, as much of the previous work in the adventure realm has also focused on the flow experience.

Methodology

The case study data were collected using self-completion questionnaires with a sample of independent mountaineer tourists on holiday in France's Chamonix region. These tourists organised and managed their own mountaineering experiences, sometimes using commercial guiding services to assist them in achieving their goals. By contrast, package mountaineer tourists usually book holidays with mountaineering operators offering tightly organised, guided, skills-based courses and opportunities to summit mountain peaks (Pomfret, 2011). The Chamonix area is internationally renowned for its diverse alpine mountaineering and outdoor adventure activity opportunities – including Mont Blanc - which are accessible to mountaineers across the full spectrum of competence levels and experience. It has a well-established tourism infrastructure, reputable mountaineering companies and guiding services, and it is easily accessible from other parts of Europe due to good transport links (Pomfret, 2011).

A key consideration for the sample of respondents was their level of English language competency. For the accuracy and reliability of the study's findings it was considered essential that respondents understood the precise meaning of the questions in the questionnaire. The language and conceptual terms used in these questions were carefully designed to reflect very specific and nuanced motivational states and emotional feelings, and an understanding of the subtlety of the language and terms required a good level of English. There were also nuanced but important differences in the terms used in different but related statements. Thus, respondents needed to have a good level of English in order to complete the questionnaire accurately. For instance, for questions on mountaineering motives the respondents needed to understand terms such as 'to get away from it all', and to make a distinction between 'to become more competent in mountaineering' and 'to become more experienced in mountaineering'. Similarly, for questions related to flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), respondents needed to differentiate between words such as 'elated', 'absorbed' and 'at ease'. They were also required to write statements reasonably fluently in response to open questions about their motivations for taking a mountaineering holiday.

Because of these language issues, it was necessary to initiate short, informal conversations in English with potential respondents in order to appraise their suitability to complete the questionnaire with adequate precision. These conversations began with a brief overview of the research purpose and an invitation to take part in a short 'interview'. The conversation then included questions to learn whether or not potential respondents were on holiday, what type of holiday they were on – packaged or independent - whether or not they were participating in mountaineering activities during their holiday, and why they had come to the Chamonix region for their mountaineering holiday. Practical details about their holiday were then covered, such as who they were travelling with, how long they were staying in the region, and whether or not they had visited the region before. The researcher took brief notes on the responses. It was only after this conversation that the researcher either invited respondents to participate further in the research by completing a questionnaire, or else they were thanked for their input and time and they were not asked to complete the questionnaire. The researcher spoke with 183 potential respondents, and 160 of these were considered suitable to complete the questionnaire, on the basis that they were engaging in mountaineering activities while on holiday, they were on an independent mountaineering holiday, and that their

English language competence was judged to be adequate. The researcher waited with respondents until the questionnaire was completed and returned, and the researcher was available to answer any questions.

It was recognised that the English language requirement meant some people were excluded due to their limited English language competence, but this was considered to be an acceptable limitation of the case study in order for the questionnaire to be completed accurately. In practice most respondents (95%) were from the UK and Ireland, with others from other parts of Europe. Although the Chamonix region attracts mountaineer tourists from countries around the world, at the time of this survey a substantial proportion of tourists in the resort were from the UK and Ireland. In addition, the influence of nationality on motivational choices was not a focus of the study.

Based on this selection process, the questionnaires were handed to tourists at two locations attracting many mountaineer tourists: a mountaineering information centre in Chamonix, the Office de Haute et Moyenne Montagne (OHM) and at Gaillands, a valley rock climbing area a short distance from the town centre. The OHM provides route-planning information and advice to mountaineers, and it promotes risk management and accident prevention in the mountains. Respondents at the OHM were usually organising forthcoming mountaineering activities. Some had recently arrived in Chamonix, while others had returned to the OHM after mountaineering trips so as to organise subsequent activities. Respondents at Gaillands completed the questionnaire while taking a break from rock climbing. Climbing at Gaillands provided participants with opportunities to practice and hone their skills before tackling more challenging climbs or other mountaineering-related activities, and to climb when adverse weather was forecast in the higher mountain regions. Of the 160 individuals after the preliminary conversation who were invited to complete the questionnaire, 146 (91%) both agreed to complete it and did so. The locations where the questionnaire was completed, and the researcher's presence during questionnaire completion, most likely encouraged the high achieved response rate (92%).

The questionnaire mainly comprised closed questions about the respondent and their motives. It also asked about the influence of experience level, age, and gender, to ascertain how these affected their motives. Other questions asked about the importance of different motives for their participation in mountaineering holiday activities. Initially, an open question was asked ('Why did you come on this mountaineering holiday?') to assess their overall motives. This was followed by 14 statements to elicit specific information about their motives for going on a mountaineering holiday (see Table 4). A 4-point Likert Scale was used to gauge the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with such statements as 'I have come on a mountaineering holiday to take on new challenges'. A mid-point neutral option in the scale was excluded, so respondents had no choice but to respond positively or negatively. Respondents with past mountaineering holiday experience were also asked both open and closed questions alluding to flow elements and the deeply satisfying and exhilarating benefits that such experience might offer.

Previous research on mountaineering motives influenced the motive-based statements. Ewert (1985) established six motivational dimensions applicable to novice and more experienced recreational climbers. The Challenge/Risk dimension concerns personal testing, accomplishing goals, excitement, and taking calculated

risks. Relaxation, slowing of the mind and escapism characterise the Catharsis dimension. The Recognition dimension relates to the prestige associated with being a mountaineer, while the Creativity dimension involves problem solving and using one's mind. The Locus of Control dimension entails skills development and decision making, while the Physical Setting dimension concerns the natural mountain environment. Questions based on the first five of these dimensions were designed to ascertain key push mountaineering motives, and a separate question was developed about the Physical Setting dimension as this relates to pull motives (Dann, 1977). The motive-based questions also drew on Loewenstein's (1999) work on personal accounts written by experienced mountaineers. He found that mountaineering participation was driven by a desire to more fully appreciate life and to make it more meaningful. Veteran mountaineers were motivated by mastery, a need to enhance self-esteem, and a strong desire to fulfil self-set goals. They wanted to overcome adversities and potential risks to accomplish their goals, even when faced with harsh conditions. They sought to demonstrate to themselves and others that they had enviable characteristics.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for responses to the closed questions in the questionnaire, and qualitative data from the open questions on motives and flow were collated and examined for prominent themes.

There may be some limitations to the case study research in terms of its wider applicability. The moderate sample of 146 mountaineer tourists, the limited respondent numbers in the older age groups, and the many male respondents (71%) may reduce the extent to which the findings can be generalised. A survey in different mountain locations or in mountain huts might possibly have produced a more diverse mix of age groups. Due to Chamonix's global acclaim as a mountaineering hub, the characteristics and motivational decisions of mountaineers who holiday there may also differ from those who holiday in less well-established areas. Other mountainous areas may have less developed tourism infrastructure and fewer mountaineering organisations, which might discourage visits by less experienced mountaineers. Yet, the two locations of OHM and Gaillands for the questionnaire survey had the advantage that they may have attracted a reasonable range of mountaineer tourists.

In reporting the case study results, firstly, the characteristics of the independent mountaineer tourists are considered. Secondly, there is an assessment of their mountaineering motives, including an evaluation of their experiences of flow. Thirdly, consideration is given to responses related to the influences of experience level, age, and gender on mountaineer tourist motives.

Characteristics of the mountaineer tourists

Among the independent mountaineer tourist respondents, 71% were male and 29% were female. This gender disparity reflects the general demand for mountaineering holidays by UK residents (British Mountaineering Council, 2012) and for such trips in the Chamonix region (Icicle Mountaineering, 2011; Pomfret, 2012). Despite this imbalance, female participation in mountaineering seems to be rising, with Mintel (2008) suggesting that UK female demand increased from 16% in 2000 to 25% in 2006. It is interesting to note that overall demand for commercially-organised adventure tourism holidays indicates more of a gender balance, with the propensity for females to take such trips as high as that for males (Mintel, 2011).

A majority of the independent mountaineer tourists in the study were aged 18-25 years (46%), 29% were aged 26-35 years, and 18% were aged 36-45 years. There were very few older respondents, with only 5% in the 46-55 age bracket, and 2% aged 56-65 years. No respondents were aged 65 years or older. Nevertheless, the skew toward younger age groups in this study broadly mirrors mountaineering participation trends. Sport England (2007) indicates that all age groups participate in mountaineering activities, although figures for the 25-29 years age group (18% of all participants) are double the national average across all sports. 35-44 year olds form the highest percentage of the mountaineering participants (20%). By contrast, people aged 64 years plus represent only 2% of participants.

A majority of respondents in the study were highly educated: 48% had a degree, 12% had a Masters qualification and 7% had a PhD. These findings mirror those from previous research on adventure tourists (ATTA, 2010, 2013; Sung, 2004).

The questionnaire asked the mountaineer tourists to rate their competence in mountaineering. This subjective assessment indicated how proficient they perceived themselves to be in mountaineering. As respondents were independent mountaineer tourists, it was assumed that most, if not all, would have a certain level of skill, experience and self-sufficiency. This was found to be the case, with 46% categorising themselves as intermediates, 11% as advanced, 27% as lower intermediates, and only 15% indicating they were novices. By contrast, previous research investigating tourists on commercially-organised mountaineering holidays found that 45% of respondents were on beginner mountaineering courses, and thus they were aspiring to develop their skills and to gain experience (Pomfret, 2011).

Another indicator of competence level in mountaineering was that only a very small number of respondents (4%) were planning to use commercial guiding services during their holiday. Most respondents (86%) said that they were self-reliant while participating in mountaineering activities during their holiday in Chamonix. 10% of respondents had completed a packaged mountaineering course during their holiday, although they were still considered to be independent mountaineer tourists because they had already finished their course and they were then practicing the skills they had developed. Respondents had participated in, or were planning to participate in, a range of mountaineering activities while on holiday. The most commonly mentioned activities were rock climbing (79%), classic Alpine routes (75%), and glacier travel (68%). 28% of respondents had ascended, or were planning to ascend, Mont Blanc.

Participation in previous mountaineering holidays also indicated their mountaineering experience levels. Most respondents (86%) had taken this type of holiday before, and 41% went on mountaineering trips regularly (between three to over five times annually) (see Table 2). Furthermore, 78% had engaged in other types of adventure holiday activity, as indicated in Table 3. This Table shows responses for mountaineering and climbing separately because, while climbing is often integral to mountaineering, different types of rock climbing and bouldering can also be stand-alone activities. The activities which respondents previously had participated in while on holiday were mountaineering (31%), climbing (24%), skiing (12%), water sports (21%), cycling (6%) and multi-activities (6%). These activities also broadly reflect patterns of adventure activity participation in respondents' home environments, with climbing (41%) and mountaineering (16%) attracting the highest participation rates. Such findings highlight how outdoor adventure plays an important role in the respondents' lives.

[INSERT TABLES 2 & 3 NEAR HERE]

Motives of the mountaineer tourists

The findings presented next concern the motives which encouraged respondents to engage in mountaineering activities while on holiday. The findings are evaluated alongside previous research about recreational mountaineers and mountaineer tourists, and about the motives of outdoor adventure activity participants. Discussion focuses, firstly, on responses to the open question 'Why did you come on this mountaineering holiday?', and on the pull motives (Dann, 1977) attracting respondents to the Chamonix region. Secondly, the discussion considers the extent to which respondents agreed with various mountaineering-specific push motivational statements (Dann, 1977).

82% of the sample of independent mountaineer tourists answered the optional open question, and varied motives for going on the holiday were mentioned. Respondents frequently stated more than one motive in their responses. Socialising (26%), challenge (26%), the natural environment (25%), and achievement (23%) were most frequently noted. Socialising was reflected in respondents' comments about meeting new people and enjoying mountaineering experiences with friends. Often, comments highlighted that people the respondents were with during their mountaineering activity participation were important for their overall enjoyment. This is illustrated in comments such as 'had some good days with friends in beautiful surroundings pushing our grades', 'a good supportive crowd to be in scary situations with', and 'good mates to spend time with'. The significance of challenge as a motivational force was illustrated by such remarks as 'because it's always good to challenge yourself', 'fulfilling personal challenges', 'doing exciting routes that challenge me' and 'testing my limits'. Similarly, respondents expressed a strong need for achievement, often associated with challenge, in comments such as 'a good sense of achievement and physical challenge', 'to challenge myself and the feeling you get when you reach the top', and 'hardship and physical achievement'.

Comments such as 'enjoying wilderness and nature', 'spectacular and awe-inspiring views', 'being in inaccessible places and lovely scenery', and 'beautiful and natural surroundings' reflected the importance of the natural environment for respondents. Natural settings provide important backdrops within which outdoor adventure activity participants often enjoy their experiences and emotions (Curtin, 2009; Vespestad & Lindberg, 2011; Williams & Harvey, 2001). Other pull motives also drew respondents to take their mountaineering holiday in the Chamonix region. When asked to rank in order of importance their pull motives in a question related to the Physical Setting motivational dimension (Ewert, 1985), the top ranked responses were the mountaineering opportunities available (31%), the area's natural mountain environment (23%), and a previous mountaineering holiday in the region (17%).

Table 4 shows responses among the independent mountaineer tourists to a list of mountaineering holiday motive statements developed from work by Ewert (1985) and Loewenstein (1999). Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with statements, on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). The statements are presented in Table 4 in order of importance – those listed first had

the highest significance as motives for the respondents (the scale used shows these as scoring the lowest mean values). The most important motives were developing mountaineering experience (mean = 1.60), having an adventure (mean = 1.65), and taking on new challenges (mean = 1.65). As noted above, challenge was a common response (25%) to the open question. Buckley (2011) also identified challenge as a key motive encouraging adventure activity participation. Experience, adventure and challenge are also key motives driving other types of adventure tourism activity participation, as shown in Table 1 about the motivations of adventure tourists.

Previous qualitative research (Pomfret, 2012) concerning tourists on commercially-organised mountaineering holidays in Chamonix also identified challenge as an important motive. For instance, one respondent noted 'There was no way I would have gone by myself, but it's nice to challenge yourself in an almost safe environment with a guide on hand to make all the important decisions' (p.149). Gaining experience and skills development were other key motives influencing these package adventure tourists. The guide's role in facilitating fulfilment of these motives is integral to this type of mountaineering experience. Operators of such holidays concentrate on developing the skills of their clients, such as through constant guided instruction, with the intention that they become more autonomous in the mountains. This is noted by one Chamonix tourist, who commented that 'I've gained some really good practical experience so far and I guess that helps me to feel safer in the mountains and gives me reassurance to go out independently in the future' (Pomfret, 2011, p.507).

In the present survey the motive statements about going on a mountaineering holiday which scored the highest mean values, indicating more disagreement, were concerned with being recognised as a mountaineer (mean = 3.25) and improving self-esteem (mean = 2.91). These high mean scores suggest there may have been some reluctance among respondents to respond positively to these two motives. Admitting to boosting one's self-esteem as a reason for mountaineering may have been perceived as a weakness by some respondents. The statement related to the risk element of mountaineering elicited a quite mixed response (mean = 2.49), reflecting conclusions drawn from previous research that risk can be either an essential or a secondary element of adventure (Ewert, 1985; Kane & Tucker, 2004; Martin & Priest, 1986; Robinson, 1992; Varley, 2006; Walle, 1997).

[INSERT TABLE 4 NEAR HERE]

Flow as a motive

Both recreationists and tourists are motivated to replicate their mountaineering experiences because potentially they then can enjoy intrinsically fulfilling flow experiences (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Delle Fave et al, 2003; Pomfret, 2012). 85% of respondents in this current study of independent mountaineer tourists had past mountaineering activity experience while on holiday, and thus it was possible to ascertain the influence that flow experiences had on their continued participation in this activity. 87% of these respondents agreed that while engaging in mountaineering activities during their current or past holidays they had enjoyed feelings of happiness and elation – considered to be the ultimate benefits associated with flow experiences.

Achievement of self-set goals was an important antecedent evoking these feelings, with respondents commenting on the accomplishment of various aspirations, most notably reaching the summit of a mountain and successfully completing a climbing route. A key dimension of flow experiences is clearly defined goals, which are either planned out in advance or developed once participants are engaged in an adventure activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Remarks made in the completed questionnaires, such as 'topping out on a perfect ice route as the sun sets', 'achieving a difficult rock climbing route' and 'reaching the high point of that day's objectives', reflect the association of goal-attainment with intensely positive emotions.

In this current study of independent mountaineer tourists the respondents often set themselves highly challenging goals, pushing themselves outside their 'comfort zone'. Although they took part in activities which potentially exceeded their abilities, by keeping completely focused, some achieved 'the golden rule of flow' (Jackson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1999, p.16) and accomplished a positive challenge–skills balance. The arduous process that they underwent to reach their goals in their current and past mountaineering holidays resulted in intense feelings of contentment, as expressed by one respondent who completed 'a difficult pitch on a high-altitude rock route that I had seen a friend struggle on and I felt really nervous about'. Another respondent was elated and relieved after successfully tackling his first alpine peak. Only once he was 'back on the glacier after a long and complicated route with the danger over' did he experience these feelings. The natural environment was an important backdrop which, combined with involvement in demanding activities, prompted respondents to feel happy and elated. Comments in the current study, such as about enjoying 'a feeling of being free in such an amazing environment', and 'climbing to the top of a pinnacle of a rock and getting amazing views and a feeling of euphoria', reflect the importance of the mountain setting as a necessary element of flow experiences.

A majority of respondents (90%) became wholly absorbed without distractions from the immediate environment during their mountaineering activity participation while on their current and past holidays. One respondent encapsulated the all-consuming nature of climbing, stating that 'while you are climbing, there is nothing else going on in the world.' Complete absorption, another flow dimension (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), was apparent, particularly when respondents were engaged in highly demanding activities, such as 'hard' climbing in which they were pushing themselves beyond their limits. One respondent stated that 'focus, concentration and tunnel vision, complete blanking of all the drudgery of daily life, and increased adrenalin and elation' were integral to his mountaineering experience while on his past and current holidays. In some cases, concentration levels became more intense when respondents perceived themselves to be in dangerous situations.

Feelings of risk and fear were alluded to in the earlier discussion about the challenge–skills balance. 85% of respondents said they had felt at risk during their current holiday or on previous mountaineering holidays. Thus, one respondent noted that:

> 'You have to concentrate and be focused! It's a dangerous environment. There are some points where all that matters are moments. Split-second decisions mean life or death! It is a very clarifying way to live.'

The flow experience is influenced considerably by perceptions of risk and competence. Participants who positively view the risks associated with a particular

adventure activity, and who feel competent enough to overcome these risks, have a higher propensity to experience flow (Martin & Priest, 1986; Priest & Bunting, 1993). When respondents were asked about how they dealt with risk during mountaineering activity while on past and current holidays, just over half (52%) noted that they had perceived it positively and dealt with potentially hazardous situations carefully and calmly. This is summed up in one respondent's comments, who stated that an element of risk 'helps me to focus. I have a strong belief in my own abilities and I've just to remind myself that it is something I can do.' Others (45%) stated that they had coped with risk both positively and negatively at different stages during the activity while on past and current holidays. These respondents often felt negative about risk at the outset of a perceived risky situation; they then felt more positive once they had realised they could deal with the risks. This is reflected in comments such as 'fear if the level of risk is too high, but excitement then satisfaction when the risk or difficulty is overcome', and 'had to drop a tear but conquered the fear.' Only 3% of respondents answered that they had dealt with risk negatively during their prior experiences. These findings explain why a majority of respondents (87%) considered they had experienced the deeply satisfying feelings that are associated with flow.

An earlier survey using interviews with tourists in Chamonix on packaged mountaineering holidays also found that many of them experienced emotional peaks and troughs during activity participation while on holiday, yet ultimately most enjoyed a flow or flow-like state (Pomfret, 2012). Due to the challenging nature of the activities they were doing, they encountered emotional low points when they doubted their own abilities and they had to push themselves outside their 'comfort zone'. This is reflected in one respondent's comments, who noted that 'I had to push myself mentally to do things out of my comfort zone, but I did it and I felt on a real high afterwards' (p.151). Some of these respondents experienced feelings of deep satisfaction, either while engaging in demanding mountaineering activities or post-activity after having a chance to reflect on their experience. For example, one respondent noted that 'once I reached the top, I felt great but I still had to get down. It was only later that I felt a deep satisfaction which I find hard to achieve any other way. It's a real sense that you've achieved something tangible' (p.151). It was apparent that most tourists in this earlier Chamonix study (Pomfret, 2012) achieved a positive challenge–skills balance, which facilitated their experiences of flow. This balance is engineered through mountaineering tourism operators carefully matching the tourists' skill and experience level with the holiday type using pre-holiday screening.

Influences on the motives of mountaineer tourists

Using findings from the case study of independent mountaineer tourists, the analysis next discusses the key influences on their motives, using the influences reviewed earlier in the paper, namely, experience level, age, and gender. Questionnaire responses are examined together with previous research related to these influences. The discussion begins with experience level as an influence, with this having been more comprehensively examined in previous research.

Mountaineering experience level

Previous research indicates that the experience level of outdoor adventure activity participants is influential for their motives. Nonetheless, there have been mixed research findings about the association between intrinsic or extrinsic motivation and participants' level of experience, as highlighted earlier in this paper (Celsi et al, 1993; Ewert et al, 2013; O'Connell, 2010; Seiffert & Hedderson, 2009). In the current study of independent mountaineer tourists, motivational differences were found between respondents with different levels of experience in response to the open question 'Why did you come on this mountaineering holiday?', yet differences were less apparent in response to the motive statements about going on a mountaineering holiday. Additionally, the view that novice adventurers are more extrinsically driven than their more experienced counterparts was not supported.

Although some motivational differences according to experience level were seen in response to the open question, it should be noted that there were considerable variations in the number of mountaineer tourists in each experience category, which may have affected these findings. Novices (15% of respondents) were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. They referred mainly to challenge, the natural environment and new experiences, as seen in such comments as 'it's an exciting, completely new experience, challenging me both physically and mentally' and 'wilderness and nature'. Lower intermediates (27% of respondents) commented on the natural environment, and social interaction, as key extrinsic motives for participation, although the intrinsic motives of challenge, developing skills, and achievement were also important. Some of these motives are reflected in one respondent's comments: 'I enjoy meeting lots of like-minded people. It's relaxing yet challenging, and I've learnt new skills and gained confidence in the mountains.' Intermediates (46% of respondents) were influenced both intrinsically and extrinsically, mostly noting achievement, the natural environment, challenge, and the weather as key reasons driving their participation. For example, one respondent wrote that 'escape from routine, thrill of exposure and of achievement, company of other climbers and surrounded by nature with little sign of human interference' were key reasons for him engaging in mountaineering activities while on holiday. The advanced group (11% of respondents) were similarly motivated by both external and internal motives, primarily influenced by social interaction, escapism, challenge, and mountaineering opportunities.

Differences were less evident in response to the motive statements identified in Table 4. Table 5 shows the motive statements (short versions) and the mean scores according to respondents' mountaineering experience level. The lowest means, and hence the most important motives, are presented in bold in the Table. As indicated in this Table, no major motivational disparities for the three most important motives – experience, adventure and challenge – were found across the different levels of experience, although there were some slight differences. Novices, lower intermediates and intermediates were similarly motivated. Novices were strongly motivated by the three most important motives of challenge (mean = 1.50), mountaineering experience (mean = 1.60) and adventure (mean = 1.73). A similar pattern of results emerged for the lower intermediate group, although developing competence in mountaineering (mean = 1.59) was slightly more important than challenge (mean = 1.67). The largest group, which were intermediates, were also very slightly more strongly motivated by developing competence in mountaineering (mean = 1.68) than challenge (mean = 1.69). Interestingly, developing competence (mean = 2.25) and gaining experience (mean = 2.00) did not feature as important

motives for the advanced group, probably because they already felt sufficiently skilled and practised in mountaineering, yet getting away from it all (escapism; mean = 1.69) was important to these respondents. These findings contrast with those in earlier research (Ewert, 1985), which indicated that experienced climbers were more likely to be intrinsically motivated by meaningful and complex motives, such as decision making and challenge. By comparison, inexperienced climbers were more extrinsically motivated, such as by getting away from it all, and socialising. Similarly, Ewert (1994) also established that, although exhilaration and excitement were important for all mountaineers, novices were more externally influenced by such climbing elements as skills development and image, intermediate-level mountaineers were motivated more by decision-making, whereas self-expression was an important internally-generated motivation for advanced-level climbers. However, in more recent research (Ewert et al, 2013) it is argued that internal and external motives have unclear boundaries, making it difficult to categorise experienced and less experienced adventurers in this way. The findings in Table 5 support this latter view, indicating that the mountaineer tourists in this study are driven by a mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motives which are independent of their experience level.

[INSERT TABLE 5 NEAR HERE]

Age and gender

As highlighted earlier, previous research has established motivational differences according to the age and gender of outdoor adventure activity participants. Most research has focused on the motives of older adventurers (Boyes, 2013; Cater, 2006; Patterson & Pan, 2007; Sugerman, 2001), yet such studies have not usually examined other age groups. In this present study, comparisons were made between different age groups of the independent mountaineer tourists. Only minor differences were found, however, and similarly the gender of respondents seemingly did not greatly influence motive choice, although minor disparities were apparent.

As mentioned earlier, most respondents in the study were younger than 45 years (93%), and there was only a very small number of older respondents (5% were aged 46-55 and 2% were aged 56-65). Comparison across a wider range of age groups may have resulted in more notable motivational differences. In response to the open question 'Why did you come on this mountaineering holiday?', only slight motivational differences were found and the most common motives across all age groups were challenge and socialising. Challenge was mentioned slightly more frequently than socialising for the 18-25 (19% and 17% respectively), 26-35 (29% and 26% respectively) and 36-45 (19% and 14% respectively) year old age groups. The natural environment was cited equally as frequently as socialising for those aged 18-25 (17%), and for those aged 36-45 it was mentioned as often as challenge (19%). Achievement was the 4th most commonly noted motive for 18-25 year olds (11%), and that motive along with skills development were joint 3rd most frequently identified for 26-35 year olds (17%).

In response to the motive statements (Tables 4 and 6), the younger mountaineer tourists were most strongly motivated by the opportunity to gain mountaineering experience, while the older tourists placed more emphasis on having

an adventure. The mean scores in Table 6 were developed in the same way as in Table 5, and again low mean scores indicate the most important motives. Table 6 shows that developing mountaineering experience (mean = 1.36) was the most important motive for those aged 18-25, followed by adventure (mean = 1.42) and challenge (mean = 1.45). Similarly, for 26-35 year-olds developing experience was the most important motive (mean = 1.66), closely followed by competence (mean = 1.68) and challenge (mean = 1.73). Those aged 36-45 were most strongly motivated by adventure (mean = 1.81), followed by challenge (mean = 1.93) and then experience (mean = 2.00). The most significant motivations for the 46-55 age category were escape and adventure (mean for both = 1.43), and challenge (mean = 1.57). For the 56-64 age category the most significant motives were adventure and competence (mean for both = 1.75), and risk (mean = 2.00).

The discussion turns next to the influence of gender on motivation. In response to the open question 'Why did you come on this mountaineering holiday?' (70% males and 30% females), 19% of males and 30% of females most frequently mentioned challenge and socialising as equally important reasons for taking a mountaineering holiday. Gender differences were apparent only when comparing the third most commonly mentioned motive, which was achievement for males (11%; 'sense of achievement') and the natural environment for females (17%; 'keeping active in beautiful surroundings'). In response to the motive statements (Table 4), only minor differences were evident according to gender, as shown in Table 6. The most important motives for females (again indicated by the lowest mean scores) were to develop their mountaineering experience (mean = 1.44), challenge (mean = 1.58), and competence (mean = 1.60). The most significant motives for males were to have an adventure (mean = 1.65), to develop mountaineering experience (mean = 1.66), and challenge (mean = 1.68). These findings contrast with those found in previous work (Bialeschki & Henderson, 2000; Ewert et al, 2013; Hvenegaard, 2002; Jackson & Henderson, 1995; McClintock, 1996; Lee, Graefe & Li, 2006) reviewed earlier in the paper.

[INSERT TABLE 6 NEAR HERE]

Conclusions and future research directions

This paper has developed insights into outdoor adventure tourists, insights which can help to progress research on outdoor adventure tourism, outdoor adventure recreation, and tourist motivations. The findings can also help the rapidly growing adventure tourism industry, such as in more effectively managing its visitors, resources and participant experiences, and also in better marketing its destinations.

While there is relatively little research on outdoor adventure tourists, it is important to build from what prior research there is. More is known about outdoor recreational adventurers, and there are likely to be many similarities with their outdoor adventure tourist equivalents. Thus, in order to develop our understanding of the characteristics of outdoor adventure tourists and their motivational decisions, the paper synthesised previous research about both outdoor recreational adventurers and outdoor adventure tourists, and it further introduced a case study about mountaineer tourists.

Some conclusions can be made about the character of outdoor adventure tourists, despite there being relatively few studies of these tourists, that research including differing definitions of adventure tourism, and the varied nature of adventure tourism activities. The research on these tourists indicates that they are very diverse, and that they have differing demographic profiles, travel behaviours, and activity preferences. The paper's case study of mountaineer tourists also extends existing understanding of the character of outdoor adventure tourists.

Similarly, while there is a reasonably good appreciation of the motives encouraging recreational adventure activity participation, only a few studies have investigated the motives encouraging adventure activity participation specifically on holiday (see Table 1). Despite the limited research, it seems that the motives of adventure tourists overlap with those of recreational adventurers. Both types of adventurer appear to share broadly similar but diverse intrinsic and extrinsic motives. However, adventure tourists are also considerably influenced by pull factors (Dann, 1977), such as the special features of the destination's natural environment, and the destination's supply of adventure tourism products and services (Pomfret, 2006). The case study, for example, highlighted the Chamonix Region's natural environment and mountaineering opportunities as important pull motives.

The paper's review of motivational constructs related to outdoor adventure activity participation noted the importance of flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), reversal theory (Apter, 1982), and edgework (Lyng & Snow, 1986). These have been examined in recreational settings, but there has been only a limited application to adventure tourism contexts, particularly concerning reversal theory and edgework. The case study findings begin to address some of the gaps here. They reveal, for example, that a majority of respondents (87%) with past mountaineering experience had enjoyed the euphoric feelings associated with flow either during their current holiday or while on past mountaineering trips.

The influence of experience level, age and gender on the motivational decisions of outdoor adventure activity participants was also examined in the paper. Most previous research has explored how motives change with more adventure activity experience, and how intrinsic motives become more important. The case study findings also indicate there were some motivational differences according to respondents' experience levels, but there was no evidence to suggest that novice mountaineer tourists are more extrinsically driven or that experienced mountaineer tourists are more intrinsically driven. Previous assessments of the relationships between age and motives have tended to focus on older age groups, and these studies have found that there are age-specific motives as well as more generic adventure motives. Previous research has also suggested that men and women are motivated differently in their decisions about outdoor adventure activities. In the case study of mountaineer tourists, however, no major motivational differences were found according to age or gender, although some minor variations were apparent.

Finally, attention is now directed to some important gaps in existing research on outdoor adventure tourists and to future research directions to address those gaps.

First, there is a need for research which compares the characteristics and motivational decisions of outdoor recreational adventurers with those of outdoor adventure tourists. Unlike most other studies, the case study in this paper considered for independent mountaineer tourists their patterns of outdoor recreational adventure

activity when in their own home environment. The findings indicated that many mountaineer tourists in the holiday environment were continuing with the recreational adventure activities that they engage in within their own home setting (41% participated in climbing and 16% in mountaineering in their home environment). Other work has established that mountaineering forms an important part of mountaineer tourists' broader lifestyles (Pomfret, 2011), yet such continuities between outdoor recreational activities, outdoor tourist activities, and lifestyles are a relatively untouched research area. Future work, therefore, could further explore the extent to which outdoor recreational adventurers participate in the same type of outdoor adventure activities while on holiday as they do at home. As part of this, it could examine the pull motives attracting outdoor adventure tourists to particular destinations to engage in particular adventure activities. Such research would enhance our understanding of motivational similarities and differences between outdoor recreational adventurers and outdoor adventure tourists.

Second, previous research generally has considered package adventure tourists and independent adventure tourists together rather than separately, when there is a need also to consider similarities and differences between these two groups of tourists in their characteristics and motivational decisions. Through choosing packaged adventure holidays, tourists tend to experience commodified forms of adventure, which are guided, carefully controlled, and involve little real risk. But it is comparatively difficult to commodify the adventure experiences of independent adventure tourists due to the involvement of real risk and the need for self-sufficiency (Varley, 2006). Research comparing package and independent adventure tourists could reveal motivational similarities and dissimilarities between the two groups, as shown in the case study findings and also in Pomfret's (2011) study of mountaineer tourists. It would also be useful to compare these two tourist groups across a range of activities, given the diverse nature of outdoor adventure activities, variations in the intensity and duration of the experiences, and differences in the level of required skill.

Third, future research using reversal theory could usefully consider the metamotivational states experienced by adventure tourists before and also during activity participation in order to establish the presence and importance of these different states. Future research on edgework might usefully focus in particular on experienced, independent adventure tourists because this construct is defined by the need for outdoor adventure activity participants to test out their skills and expertise and to voluntarily take risks, and also because package adventure tourists are thought to prioritise safety and caution over risk.

Fourth, while studies of the characteristics and motivational choices of adventure tourists often categorise these tourists according to their participation in either soft or hard adventure activities, further research is needed to develop more detailed profiles of adventure tourists and of their activities. While evidence does suggest that package adventure tourists are more likely to experience soft adventure, and hard adventure tourists are more likely to be experienced and skilled in the adventure activities that they engage in, this categorisation should not be adopted uncritically and without considering more complex relationships. This categorisation, for example, does not consider the transition that some tourists make over time (often based on their accumulating experience) from soft to hard adventure activity participation, and nor does it consider the potential motivational changes which accompany this transition. A key consideration here is the potential transition from

extrinsic to intrinsic motivation with increased experience in an outdoor adventure activity within an adventure tourism context. Hence, future research could focus on developing a more comprehensive continuum of adventure tourists and their motivational decisions, while also recognising the complex nature of adventure and also the differing, subjective ways in which its activities are experienced by different individuals.

Fifth, there is a need for more research on particular adventure tourist market segments. For instance, little is known about variations between men and women who participate in adventure activities during their holidays, despite apparent gender differences in adventure activity participation rates and motivational decisions in recreational settings. In addition, recent studies (ATTA, 2010, 2013; Mintel, 2011) highlight strong growth in the female adventure tourist market, and in consequence a rise in the provision of women-only holidays. Further work is also needed on different geographical markets. Adventure tourism's continued likely growth means that research is necessary on emerging markets in the world's different geographical regions outside Europe and the Americas. For example, the ATTA's (2010; 2013) work on adventure tourists from these geographical areas reveals differences in characteristics according to nationality. While this current paper has not explored how nationality influences adventure tourists, it seems likely to be a factor, and one that should be a prominent theme in future studies.

A key argument of this paper has been that we know relatively little about the characteristics and motivational decisions specifically of outdoor adventure tourists, with relatively more known about these issues for general outdoor adventure activity participants. The paper developed a fuller appreciation of these tourists through synthesising the scattered literature on these themes, and through its exploration of a new case study of mountaineer tourists in relation to that literature. The analysis is intended to prompt further research on outdoor adventure tourists, and it has identified a number of new research directions that could advance our understanding of their characteristics and motivational decisions.

References

Adventure Travel Trade Association (ATTA), George Washington University & Xola Consulting (2010). *Adventure tourism market report*. Seattle: ATTA.

Adventure Travel Trade Association (ATTA) & George Washington University (2013). *Adventure tourism market study*. Seattle: ATTA.

Allman, T. L., Mittelstaedt, R. D., Martin, B., & Goldenberg, M. (2009). Exploring the motivations of BASE jumpers: Extreme sports enthusiasts. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 14*(4), 229–247.

Apter, M. J. (1982). *The experience of motivation: The theory of psychological reversals*. London: Academic Press.

Beedie, P., & Hudson, S. (2003). Emergence of mountain-based adventure tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(3), 625–643.

Berger, I. E., & Greenspan, I. (2008). High (on) technology: Producing tourist identities through technologized adventure. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 13*(2), 89–114.

Bialeschki, M. D., & Henderson, K. (2000). Gender issues and recreation management. In M. Allison & I. Schneider (Eds.), *Diversity and the recreation professions: Organizational perspectives* (pp. 73–97). State College, PA: Venture Publishing Inc.

Boyes, M. (2013). Outdoor adventure and successful ageing. *Ageing and Society, 33* (4), 644–665.

Bozionelos, N., & Bozionelos, G. (1999). Playfulness: Its relationship with instrumental and expressive trait. *Personality and Individual Difference, 26*, 749–760.

British Mountaineering Council (2012). Annual Report 2012. Retrieved from https://www.thebmc.co.uk/ (Last accessed 21/10/13).

Bryan, H. (1977). Leisure value systems and recreational specialization: The case of trout fishermen. *Journal of Leisure Research, 9*, 174–187.

Brymer, E., Downey, G., & Gray, T. (2009). Extreme sports as a precursor to environmental sustainability. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 14*(2/3), 193–204.

Buckley, R. C. (2007). Adventure tourism products: Price, duration, size, skill, remoteness. *Tourism Management, 28*(6), 1428–1433.

Buckley, R. C. (2010). *Adventure tourism management*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Buckley, R. C. (2011). Rush as a key motivation in skilled adventure tourism. *Tourism Management, 33*(4), 961–970.

Carnicelli-Filho, S., Schwartz, G. M., & Tahra, A. K. (2010). Fear and adventure tourism in Brazil. *Tourism Management, 31*(6), 953–956.

Carr, A. M. (1997). Guided mountaineering clients in New Zealand's Southern Alps. In J. Higham & G. W. Kearsley (Eds.), *Proceedings of trails, tourism and regional development* (pp. 23–32). Centre for Tourism and IGU, University of Otago, Cromwell, New Zealand.

Carr, A. M. (2001). Alpine adventurers in the Pacific Rim - the motivations and experiences of guided mountaineering clients in New Zealand's Southern Alps. *Pacific Tourism Review, 4*(4), 161–170.

Cater, C. (2006). Playing with risk? Participant perceptions of risk and management implications in adventure tourism. *Tourism Management, 27*(2), 317–325.

Celsi, R. L., Rose, R. L., & Leigh, T. W. (1993). An exploration of high-risk leisure consumption through skydiving. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20* (1), 1–23.
Cogan, N. A., & Brown, R. I. F. (1999). Metamotivational dominance, states and injuries in risk and safe sports. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*, 503–518.
Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1985). Reflections on enjoyment. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine, 28*(4), 489–497.
Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1992). Flow: *The psychology of happiness.* London: Rider.
Curtin, S. (2009). Wildlife tourism: The intangible, psychological benefits of human-wildlife encounters. *Current Issues in Tourism, 5-6*, 451–474.
Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 4* (4), 184-194.
Delle Fave, A., Bassi, M., & Massimini, F. (2003). Quality of experience and risk perception in high-altitude rock climbing. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 15*(1), 82–98.
den Breejen, L. (2007). The experiences of long distance walking: A case study of the West Highland Way in Scotland. *Tourism Management, 28* (6), 1417–1427.
Ewert, A. W. (1985). Why people climb: The relationship of participant motives and experience level to mountaineering. *Journal of Leisure Research, 17* (3), 241–250.
Ewert, A. W. (1989). *Outdoor adventure pursuits: Foundations, models and theories.* Columbus OH: Publishing Horizons.
Ewert, A. W., & Hollenhorst, S. J. (1989). Testing the adventure model: Empirical support for a model of risk recreation participation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 21*, 124–139.
Ewert, A. W. (1994). Playing the edge: Motivation and risk taking in a high altitude wilderness environment. *Environment and Behaviour, 26*(1), 3–24.
Ewert, A. W., Gilbertson, K., Luo, Y., & Voight, A. (2013). Beyond "because it's there": Motivations for pursuing adventure recreational activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 45*(1), 91–111.
Fletcher, R. (2010). The emperor's new adventure: Public secrecy and the paradox of adventure tourism. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 39*(1), 6–33.
Fluker, M. R., & Turner, L. W. (2000). Needs, motivations and expectations of a commercial whitewater rafting experience. *Journal of Travel Research, 38*(4), 380–389.
Hales, R. (2006). Mountaineering. In R. Buckley (Ed.), *Adventure tourism* (pp. 260-285). Wallingford: CAB International.
Holden, A. (1999). Understanding skiers' motivation using Pearce's 'travel career' construct. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*, 435–38.
Holyfield, L. (1999). Manufacturing adventure: The buying and selling of emotions. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 28*(1), 3–32.
Holyfield, L., Jonas, L., & Zajicek, A. (2004). Adventure without risk is like Disneyland. In S. Lyng (Ed.), *Edgework. The sociology of risk taking* (pp. 173-185). London: Routledge.

Houge Mackenzie, S., Hodge, K., & Boyes, M. (2011). Expanding the flow model in adventure activities: A reversal theory perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research, 43*(4), 519–544.
Houge Mackenzie, S., & Kerr, J. H. (2012). Multiple motives for participating in adventure sports. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*, 649–657.
Hsieh, S., O'Leary, J. T., and Morrison, A. M. (1994). A comparison of the travel arrangements of international travellers from France, Germany and the UK. *Tourism Management, 15*(6), 451–463.
Icicle Mountaineering (2011). Icicle December 2011 Newsletter. Retrieved from http://www.icicle-mountaineering.ltd.uk/ (Last accessed 06/01/2012).
Jackson, S. A., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). *Flow in sports: The keys to optimal experience and performances.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
Jackson, E. L., & Henderson, K. A. (1995). Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences, 19*, 31–51.
Jackson, S. A., & March, H. W. (1996). Development and validation of a scale to measure optimal experience: The flow state scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 18*(1), 17–35.
Jones, C. D., Hollenhorst, S. J., & Perna, F. (2003). An empirical comparison of the four channel flow model and adventure experience paradigm. *Leisure Sciences, 25*, 17–31.
Kane, M. J., & Tucker, H. (2004). Adventure tourism: The freedom to play with reality. *Tourist Studies, 4*(3), 217–234.
Kane, M. J., & Zink, R. (2004). Package adventure tours: Markers in serious leisure careers. *Leisure Studies, 23*(4), 329–345.
Kerr, J. H. (1990). Arousal seeking in risk sport participants. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 613–616.
Kerr, J. H., & Houge Mackenzie, S. (2012). Multiple motives for participating in adventure sports. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*(5), 649–657.
Kerr, J. H., & Svebak, S. (1989). Motivational aspects of preference for and participation in risk and safe sports. *Personality and Individual Differences, 10*, 797–800.
Klenosky, D. B., Gengler, C. E., & Mulvey, M. S. (1993). Understanding the factors influencing ski destination choice: A means–ends analytic approach. *Journal of Leisure Research, 25*, 362–379.
Laurendeau, J. (2006). "He didn't go in doing a sky dive": Sustaining the illusion of control over an edgework activity. *Sociological Perspectives, 49*(4), 583–605.
Lee, S., Graefe, A. R., & Li, C. (2007). The effects of specialization and gender on motivations and preferences for site attributes in paddling. *Leisure Sciences, 29*(4), 355–373.
Lester, L. (2004). Spirit, identity and self in mountaineering. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 44*(1), 86–100.
Lipscombe, N. (1995). Appropriate adventure for the aged. *Australian Parks and Recreation, 31*(2), 41–45.
Loewenstein, G. (1999). Because it's there. The challenge of mountaineering … for utility theory. *Kyklos, 52*(3), 315–343.
Lois, J. (2005). Gender and emotion management in the stages of edgework. In S. Lyng (Ed.), *Edgework: The sociology of risk taking* (pp.117–152). London: Routledge.

Lyng, S. (1990). Edgework: A social psychological analysis of voluntary risk taking. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(4), 851–886.
Lyng, S., & Snow, D. (1986). Vocabularies of motive and high-risk behaviour. The case of sky-diving. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group process, Vol. 3,* (pp.157–179). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
Mannell, R., & Kleiber, D. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure.* State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
Martin, P., & Priest, S. (1986). Understanding the adventure experience. *Adventure Education, 3*, 18–21.
Maslow, A. (1977). *Religion, values and peak experience*. Hammondsworth: Penguin.
Massimini, F., & Carli, M. (1986). La selezione psicologica humana tra biologia e cultura. In F. Massimini & P. Inghilleri (Eds), *La esperienza quotidiana* (pp.65–84). Milan: Franco Angeli.
McClintock, M. (1996). Why women's outdoor trips. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Women's voices in experiential education* (pp. 18-23), Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
McKercher, R. (1996). Differences in tourism and recreation in parks. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(3), 563–575.
Mintel Oxygen (2008). Activity/special interest holidays: UK. April 2008. Mintel Marketing Intelligence.
Mintel Oxygen (2011). Adventure tourism in South Africa. September 2011. *Mintel Marketing Intelligence*.
Muller, T. E., & Cleaver, M. (2000). Targeting the CANZUS baby boomer and adventure segments. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 6*(2), 154–169.
Muller, T. E., & O'Cass, A. (2001). Targeting the young at heart. Seeing senior vacationers the way they see themselves. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 7*(4), 285–301.
Murgatroyd, S., Rushton, C., Apter, M. J., & Ray, C. (1978). The development of the telic dominance scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 42*, 519–527.
O'Connell, T. S. (2010). The effects of age, gender and level of experience on the motivation to sea kayak. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning, 10*(1), 51–66.
Outdoor Foundation (2012). *Outdoor recreation participation report 2012*. Boulder: The Outdoor Foundation.
Park, D-B., & Yoon, Y-S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study. *Tourism Management, 30*(1), 99–108.
Patterson, I. (2006). *Growing older: Tourism and leisure behaviour of older adults.* Wallingford: CABI.
Patterson, I., & Pan, R. (2007). The motivations of baby boomers to participate in adventure tourism and the implications for adventure tour providers. *Annals of Leisure Research, 10*(1), 26–53.
Pomfret, G. (2006). Mountaineering adventure tourists: A conceptual framework for research. *Tourism Management, 27*(3), 113–123.
Pomfret, G. (2011). Package mountaineer tourists holidaying in the French Alps: an evaluation of key influences encouraging their participation. *Tourism Management, 32*(3), 501–510.
Pomfret, G. (2012). Personal emotional experiences associated with packaged mountaineering holidays. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 4*, 145–

154.
Priest, S. (1999). The adventure experience paradigm. In J. C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.) *Adventure programming*. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing, Inc.
Priest, S., & Bunting, C. J. (1993). Changes in perceived risk and competence during whitewater canoeing. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 18*(4), 265–280.
Richards, G. (1996). Skilled consumption and UK ski holidays. *Tourism Management, 17*, 25–34.
Robinson, D. W. (1992). A descriptive model of enduring risk recreation involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research, 24*(1), 52–63.
Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 54–67.
Schneider, P. P., & Vogt, C. (2012). Applying the 3D model of personality and motivation to adventure travellers. *Journal of Travel Research, 51*(6), 704–716.
Schrader, M. P., & Wann, D. L. (1999). High-risk recreation: The relationship between participant characteristics and degree of involvement. *Journal of Sport Behaviour, 22*, 426–441.
Seifert, T., & Hedderson, C. (2010). Intrinsic motivation and flow in skateboarding: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 11*(3), 277–292.
Sharpe, E. K. (2005). Going above and beyond: The emotional labor of adventure guides. *Journal of Leisure Research, 37*(1), 29–50.
Sport England (2008). Active people survey. Loughborough: Sport England.
Sugerman, D. (2001). Motivations of older adults to participate in outdoor adventure experiences. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning, 1*(2), 21–33.
Sung, H. H. (2004). Classification of adventure travellers: Behaviour, decision making, and target markets. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*, 343–356.
Swarbrooke, J., Beard, C., Leckie, S., & Pomfret, G. (2003). *Adventure tourism: The new frontier*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
Tangeland, T. (2011). Why do people purchase nature-based tourism activity products? A Norwegian case study of outdoor recreation. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 11*(4), 435–456.
Tsaur, S. H., Lin, W. R., & Liu, J. S. (2013). Sources of challenge for adventure tourists. Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management, 38*, 85–93.
Varley, P. (2006). Confecting adventure and playing with meaning: The adventure commodification continuum. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 11*(2), 173–194.
Vespestad, M. K., & Lindberg, F. (2011). Understanding nature-based tourist experiences: An ontological analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism, 14*(6), 563–580.
Walle, A. H. (1997). Pursuing risk or insight: Marketing adventures. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(2), 265–282.
Weber, K. (2001). Outdoor adventure tourism: A review of research approaches. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 360–377.
Willig, C. (2008). A phenomenological investigation of the experience of taking part in 'extreme sports'. *Journal of Health Psychology, 13*, 690–702.
Williams, S. (2003). *Tourism and recreation*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
Williams, K., & Harvey, D. (2001). Transcendent experiences in forest environments.

Journal of Environmental Psychology, 21(3), 249–260.
Williams, P., & Soutar, G. N. (2009). Value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions in an adventure tourism context. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(3), 413–438.
Woodman, T., Hardy, L., Barlow, M., & Le Scanff, C. (2010). Motives for participation in prolonged engagement high-risk sports. An agentic emotion regulation perspective. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11*(5), 345–352.
Worcester, R. M., & Burns, T. R. (1975). A statistical examination of the relative precision of verbal scales. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 17*(3), 181–197.
Wu, C. H. J., & Liang, R. D. (2012). The relationship between white-water rafting experience formation and customer reaction: A flow theory perspective. *Tourism Management, 32*(2), 317–325.

Tables

Table 1: Motivations of adventure tourists

Adventure activity	Motives	Authors
Hiking	Relax mentally, get away, challenge, feel close to nature, sense of accomplishment	den Breenjen (2007)
Mountaineering	Aesthetic & physical enjoyment of mountain environment, educational, psychological, physiological, safety (use of guides), ease of organisation, skills development, gaining experience, natural environment, availability of mountaineering opportunities, mountain conditions, supporting infrastructure	Carr (1997), Pomfret (2006, 2011)
Multiple activities	Rush, fear, thrill, excitement, uncertain outcomes, danger & risk, challenge, anticipated rewards, novelty, stimulation & excitement, escapism & separation, exploration & discovery, absorption & focus, contrasting emotions, boredom avoidance, sense of adventure, change of environment, knowledge, insight, learn about other people, places & cultures	Buckley (2011), Cater (2006), Patterson & Pan (2007), Schneider & Vogt (2012), Swarbrooke et al (2003), Tsaur, Lin & Liu (2013), Walle (1997), Weber (2001)
Skiing	Thrill, relaxation, social atmosphere, snow conditions, fun, excitement, achievement, challenge, safety, quality of accommodation, hills and trails, resort services, range of ski runs & terrain	Holden (1999), Klenosky, Gengler & Mulvey (1993), Richards (1996)
White-water rafting & kayaking	New experience, enjoyment, socialising, natural environment, flow, playfulness	Fluker & Turner (2000), Wu & Liang (2012)

Source: the author, and developed from Buckley (2011)

Table 2: Previous mountaineering holidays of mountaineer tourists

Number of times per year mountaineering holidays taken	**Number/Frequency (Total = 146)**	**Percentage (%)**
None	20	14%
Less than once	21	14%
Once	25	17%
Twice	21	14%
Three times	19	13%
Four times	14	10%
Five times or more	26	18%

Table 3: Adventure activities on holiday and at home of mountaineer tourists

Adventure activity type on holiday	**Number (177)**	**Percentage (%)**	**Adventure activity type at home**	**Number (192)**	**Percentage (%)**
Climbing (ice, rock, high altitude, bouldering, big wall)	42	24%	Climbing	78	41%
Mountaineering (Alpine, UK, international, walking, trekking, scrambling)	55	31%	Mountaineering	30	16%
Skiing (downhill, cross country, Nordic, ski mountaineering) & snowboarding	21	12%	Skiing & snowboarding	25	13%
Water sports (diving, kayaking, surfing, water skiing, sailing, canoeing)	38	21%	Water sports	16	8%
Cycling (road, mountain biking)	11	6%	Cycling	22	11%
Multi-activities	10	6%	Running	21	11%

Table 4: Motives of mountaineer tourists

Motive Statement	Mean
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to develop my mountaineering experience. *Mastery (L)*	1.60
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to have an adventure. *Challenge and risk (E)*	1.65
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to take on new challenges. *Challenge and risk (E)*	1.65
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to become more competent in mountaineering. *Challenge and risk; mastery (E; L)*	1.76
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to get away from it all. *Catharsis (E)*	2.08
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to relax. *Catharsis (E)*	2.27
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to fulfil self-set goals. *Goal completion (L)*	2.32
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to use my mind. *Creativity (E)*	2.32
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to fulfil a dream. *Mastery (L)*	2.42
Risk is an important part of this mountaineering holiday for me. *Challenge and risk (E)*	2.49
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to develop new friendships. *Locus of control (E)*	2.49
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to develop my decision-making skills. *Locus of control (E)*	2.54
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to improve my self-esteem. *Need to improve self-esteem (L)*	2.91
I have come on a mountaineering holiday to become recognised as a mountaineer. *Recognition (E)*	3.25

The italics within the Table refer to the motive or motivational dimension identified by Ewert (1985, 1994) and Loewenstein (1999). E=Ewert; L=Loewenstein.

Table 5: Experience as an influence on the motivations of mountaineer tourists, based on motive statements

Motive Statement (short version)	**Novice** (Mean)	**Lower Int.** (Mean)	**Intermediate** (Mean)	**Advanced** (Mean)
Experience	**1.60**	**1.54**	**1.51**	2.00
Adventure	**1.73**	**1.62**	**1.69**	**1.50**
Challenge	**1.50**	1.67	**1.69**	**1.69**
Competence	1.91	**1.59**	**1.68**	2.25
Get away from it all	2.45	2.03	2.09	**1.69**
Relax	2.63	2.15	2.31	1.89
Self-set goals	2.54	2.21	2.31	2.31
Using mind	2.73	2.38	2.19	2.13
Dream fulfilment	2.55	2.49	2.37	2.38
Risk	2.45	2.85	2.38	2.13
New friendships	2.68	2.69	2.38	2.25
Decision-making	2.82	2.69	2.37	2.50
Self-esteem	2.91	2.97	2.96	2.56
Recognition	3.10	3.41	3.19	3.31

The numbers in bold within the Table refer to the lowest mean scores for respondents according to their mountaineering experience level.

Table 6: Age and gender as influences on the motives of mountaineer tourists, based on motive statements

Motive Statement	**18-25 yrs** (Mean)	**26-35 yrs** (Mean)	**36-45 yrs** (Mean)	**46-55 yrs** (Mean)	**56-64 yrs** (Mean)	**Female** (Mean)	**Male** (Mean)
Experience	1.36	1.66	2.00	1.86	3.00	1.44	1.66
Adventure	1.42	1.90	1.81	1.43	1.75	1.65	1.65
Challenge	1.45	1.73	1.93	1.57	2.25	1.58	1.68
Competence	1.61	1.68	2.07	2.14	1.75	1.60	1.83
Get away from it all	1.95	2.20	2.15	1.43	3.50	2.33	1.97
Relax	2.25	2.27	2.26	1.71	3.25	2.49	2.17
Self-set goals	2.39	2.34	2.19	2.14	2.50	2.44	2.26
Using mind	2.36	2.34	2.15	2.14	2.75	2.37	2.30
Dream fulfilment	2.35	2.54	2.26	2.71	2.75	2.44	2.41
Risk	2.33	2.78	2.37	2.43	2.00	2.63	2.43
New friendships	2.23	2.78	2.59	2.86	2.75	2.77	2.38
Decision making	2.50	2.59	2.52	2.57	2.75	2.49	2.56
Self-esteem	2.88	2.95	3.00	2.71	2.75	2.81	2.95
Recognition	3.09	3.41	3.33	3.29	2.75	3.16	3.28