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Abstract

Wilderness tripping is male dominated and women are in the minority. Due to the gender inequality that is associated with the wilderness, the question of how gender affects one’s wilderness tripping experience was examined, throughout time. A conceptual framework for understanding gender effects was created from a basic literature review. The assertions in the framework were evaluated against a case study of four books (The Long Labrador Trail by Dillon Wallace, A Woman’s Way through Labrador by Mina Benson Hubbard, Rowboat in a Hurricane by Julie Angus, and Beyond the Horizon by Colin Angus), and eight interviews. The book comparison and interviews focused evenly on male and female opinions and experiences, unlike other research. It was discovered that gender is presently less of an influence on one’s wilderness tripping experiences than it was in the early 1900s. The stereotypically male desire for challenge and conquering nature has remained similar to what it was in the 1900s, while females’ tripping methodologies have changed, due to the lessening of cultural constraints.

1. Introduction to the Goddess of Wilderness Tripping

The wilderness has lured people into it for centuries. The attraction of wilderness is composed of the combination of the terror brought from the unknown and the beauty of the landscape. Some people go kayaking for an afternoon, but others go on kayaking expeditions that are days or weeks or months in duration. The risk is always greater when going away from the protection of society into the wild world where there are far fewer people. The desire to explore what is unknown has been highlighted throughout history including the goal of walking on the moon and discovering what is in outer space. The diversity of wilderness tripping is great, and the adventure enthralling.

In modern European culture, and its transplanted versions in North America, women have not traditionally belonged to the outdoor world. Rather the wilderness is a male dominated world, where male characteristics and masculine goals prevail (Norwood 1998; Newberry 2004; Little 2002b). However, the outdoors is becoming an increasingly popular recreation venue for both males and females (Pohl 2000; Boulware 2004).

Much of the research about how gender affects one’s wilderness tripping experience focuses on the testimonials of women about their experiences in a male dominated world. Little has been done in regards to comparing the actual experiences of men and women. Men are not often asked for their testimonials in terms of gender and wilderness adventure, as they are seen as the dominators who are causing the problems.

Canada used to be an unknown landscape whose wilderness was explored in order to find more resources and to map the mysteries of the land. After Canada’s wilderness seemed to disappear, there was an urge for the male upper classes of society to venture into the woods in order to become “men” and “real” Canadians (Churchill 1992). There has been a transformation from nature being an unknown desolate place to one where it is sought out to provide adventure and a place for risk-taking. Despite National Parks and other wilderness areas being more easily accessible by the general public, there are still some divides between who is socially encouraged
to partake in wilderness experience and who is not. One of these divides is along the continuum of gender.

Answering the research question of whether over time, one’s gender has affected his or her wilderness tripping experience is the objective of this study. The key research questions are as follows:

1. Does gender affect the wilderness tripping experience?
2. Do males and females experience the wilderness tripping experience differently?
3. Has either of these changed over time?

The purpose is to discover what the implications of these differences are. The findings may be able to be related to the changing gender roles in society and the changing field of outdoor recreation, over time.

In answering the research question, the following questions arise:

1. Do accounts in the literature correspond to people’s actual experiences, where they may not be thinking of gender’s effects on their activities?
2. As males’ opinions are generally excluded from gender conversations, what do males have to say about how gender affects one’s wilderness tripping experiences?
3. Does the gender composition of the group embarking on the wilderness trip matter when investigating how gender affects one’s wilderness tripping experience?

For the purpose of the study, two terminology clarifications will be made:

**Definition of Wilderness Tripping:** Wilderness tripping refers to a specific form of outdoor recreation, where the participant is camping for at least one night away from the luxuries of civilization surrounded by the wilderness or nature. The term does not include “car camping”. Yet the term wilderness tripping is left broad enough to encompass various definitions of the term, as there are many alternate views on the term’s definition. The paper will not be going into the debate of whether going on a canoe trip in Algonquin Park falls under the definition of wilderness tripping or not. It is the view of the author that slight adjustments of the definition will not decrease the validity of the results of the paper, and has thereby decided to have a broad interpretation of the term.

**Definition of Outdoor Recreation:** Many times throughout the paper, the field of outdoor recreation will be explored to highlight trends that also occurred in wilderness tripping. Outdoor recreation is seen as the umbrella that encompasses wilderness tripping.

**Methodology**

Methods for gathering information included a literature review, a book comparison, and interviews. The literature review focused on how gender and the field of outdoor recreation have changed over time. The correlation of gender over time and the field of outdoor recreation over time show how the effect of gender on one’s wilderness tripping experience has changed over time. The time periods identified range from before the 1900s to present day. The literature focuses on gender issues in that time period, the evolution of the outdoor recreation field, gender in relation to the outdoor recreation field, and the use of profile explorers. The literature review will provide a framework for what will be compared and contrasted in the book comparison and
the questions that will be asked in the interviews. The framework will be tested by the book comparison and interviews.

The purpose of the book comparison is to give an in-depth perspective of how gender and wilderness expeditions affect one another in different time periods. It will provide the opportunity to investigate the real life applications of the literature review. Four books covering two different time periods (a century a part from one another) will be reviewed. For each time period two books will be reviewed: one with a male perspective and a second with a female perspective.

The first two books are of two separate journeys with the same purpose of mapping and traveling the entirety of a river network in Northern Labrador during 1905 for the first time by European people. Both of the explorers are connected by the unsuccessful expedition of Leonidas Hubbard Jr. The male narrative of Dillon Wallace is *The Long Labrador Trail* and is juxtaposed with *A Woman’s Way through Unknown Labrador* by Mina Benson Hubbard.

The narratives of a journey from 2004 to 2006 are fueled by the desire to circumnavigate the world using only human-power. The male narrative of Colin Angus, *Beyond the Horizon*, will be compared to the female narrative of Julie Angus’ *Rowboat in a Hurricane*. The main logistical difference between the narratives of the two time periods is that Julie and Colin Angus traveled together, while Mina Hubbard and Dillon Wallace did not. Both sets of narratives are of two people traveling the same land. This set of books provides a unique basis for looking at the relationship between gender and wilderness adventure, as the landscape being visited in each timeframe is the same. The books will be summarized, compared, contrasted and related back to the literature review.

The third stage of the research was gathering information from ordinary people who partake in wilderness trips today through semi-structured interviews. The interviews help to identify the implications of the book comparison and literature review. The interviews were useful in identifying any gaps, generalizations or any further identification about gender’s relationship with wilderness expeditions.

The interview portion included two different stages: a questionnaire and an interview. The questions focus around the person’s experiences and are built around the framework created by the literature review. The questionnaire was given to each participant and then returned before his or her interview through e-mail. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain answers to survey questions about how many wilderness trips the participant had been on, etcetera. The interviews took place over the telephone, through Skype and in person.

The interviewees were selected conveniently through personal contacts of people who have canoe tripped before or know people who have. A purpose was to interview both males and females on their experiences in relation to gender. One gap that has been found in the literature is males’ experiences and thoughts of females in adventure recreation. A scenario examined is when males are on outdoor wilderness trips with only female leaders. The interviews allow for voids in the literature research to be filled.
The three methodologies used in this study will work together to create a fuller picture of whether and how women’s wilderness adventures differ from those of men.

**Boundaries, Limitations and Conceptualization**

The study focuses on a Western context, and is from a European perspective. In particular the emphasis is on both Canada and the United States, as wilderness adventure is usually included in the American and Canadian identities. In general, Canada is a greater focal point than the United States. These are countries with many white, middle class, privileged people, whom the literature identifies as being the ones most involved in outdoor recreation. The implications for these countries are also important, as there are still many possibilities for wilderness recreation within them. The study includes both men and women.

The study was limited by the time of the researcher. The lack of time led to an inability to interview a more diverse pool of people, as many of the interviewees had experiences similar to those of the interviewer. There were also a limited number of experiences reported. The study’s conceptualization is based on the concepts used in the research literature, which will be extrapolated to the study at hand.

PHOTO: Girl power on a portage affectionately called the death march. (Courtesy of Sarah Warren, 2006).
2. Timeline of Gender and Outdoor Recreation

The literature review is organized by time period, ranging from before the 1900s to now. Within each time period are themes that pertain to each one. The literature that was reviewed answers the following questions that are relevant to whether men and women experience wilderness outings in a viably different way throughout time:

1. How has the field of wilderness tripping changed over time?
2. How has the role of gender changed over time in western society?
3. How has the role of gender in society affected the world of wilderness tripping?
4. Do men and women experience wilderness trips differently from one another? If so, is this a problem?
5. What is the difference between wilderness adventurists of the past and present?
6. Are men’s and women’s motivations and constraints for participating in wilderness trips different from one another? If so how?

Before 1900

The era before the 1900s was devoted to exploring new lands and is thereby dominated by explorers. There is also the prominent theme of Canada’s and the United States’ identities being formed by their expanses of wilderness.

Exploring a Country

Canadian explorers are highlighted to describe the trend of how explorers experienced wilderness. The first reasonably well-documented explorer of Canada was Jacques Cartier, who lived from 1491 to 1557 (Sugars and Moss 2009). The goal of Cartier’s voyage was to find the elusive passageway through the continent to Asia. Upon failing at this task, Cartier validated his voyage by discovering the St. Lawrence Seaway; kidnapping Donnacona and his sons whom he brought back to France with him; working to spread Catholicism to the indigenous peoples; and inquiring about other riches in the land (Sugars and Moss 2009).

Samuel de Champlain, who lived from 1570 to 1635, followed in Cartier’s footsteps as he continued to explore what would later become Canada (Sugars and Moss 2009). He became the Father of New France, as he put his efforts into settling the new colony (Sugars and Moss 2009). Among his other accomplishments, Champlain also mapped and explored the St. Lawrence, and introduced the local native people to firearms when he allied himself with the Algonquians in their war against the Iroquois Confederacy (Sugars and Moss 2009).

While Jacques Cartier and Samuel de Champlain focused on expanding an empire, Samuel Hearne, who lived from 1745-1792, worked with the Hudson Bay Company in order to explore the rest of the continent and expand the commercial fur trade (Sugars and Moss 2009). On his quest to discover the Coppermine River, he witnessed a massacre of Inuit led by Hearne’s companions (Sugars and Moss 2009). He revolutionized exploration by living and traveling, following the customs of his native companions. While doing so, he shared the native peoples’ eating habits, nomadic lifestyle, survival methods and hardships (Sugars and Moss 2009).

Samuel Hearne was the mentor for David Thompson (1770-1857), who became a famous cartographer (Sugars and Moss 2009). Thompson became even more closely connected to the native peoples in his explorations, as he married a Métis woman (Sugars and Moss 2009).
The last explorer to be mentioned is John Franklin, who lived from 1786-1847 (Sugars and Moss 2009). He is most famous for exploring the Arctic Ocean. His last expedition has become mythical due to the fact that the whole crew died despite having a ship filled with canned food (Sugars and Moss 2009).

All of the famous Canadian explorers that have been mentioned are male, which is not without its historical implications. Catharine Parr-Traill and Susanna Moodie published novels about settling in the Canadian backcountry in the mid-1850s (Sugars and Moss 2009). Both of them have a domestic perspective on the wilderness, especially in comparison to the previously mentioned explorers, but nonetheless their works helped to create a female perspective of being surrounded by nature at the time (Sugars and Moss 2009).

**Female Adventurists**

Women are said to have begun exploring in the Victorian era (Norwood 1988), from 1837 to 1901. During the Victorian era, female adventurists were trailblazers as “no one in their right mind would have thought of asking a girl to rough it in the outdoors… In fact, the ability to swoon at the right moment was considered more of an asset than to endure hardship or stand on one’s own feet” (Churchill 1992).

Two examples to compare to the fore mentioned male explorers are Anna Murphy Jameson, who lived from 1794 to 1860 and Elizabeth Taylor, who lived from 1856 to 1912.

Jameson is the first recorded European woman to have run a three quarter of a mile rapid in a ten-foot canoe that was steered by a native in Sault Ste. Marie (Hoyle 1987). She traveled with her equally strong-willed and determined husband (Hoyle 1987).

Taylor was described as being frail, small and sickly, but her enthusiasm outweighed her physical deficiencies (Hoyle 1987). Over a three-month trip traveling to the Delta of the Mackenzie River, Taylor collected flowers, birds and butterflies, which were sent to Washington (Hoyle 1987). Her trip was considered remarkable for a woman traveling alone at the time although it would be tame in comparison to men traveling at her time or to women who traveled just after her (Hoyle 1987). Taylor was the only woman included in the 1908 list of Great Explorers in the North American region (Hoyle 1987).

Through a comparison of male and female expeditions at the time, it is easy to see that they were very different entities both in numbers of participants and in how they are portrayed to the audience. The male trips tended to be ones about discovering unknown geographical landmarks or about finding a valuable resource, while the female trips tended to be about self-development and cataloguing nature. It is also emphasized that women began exploring North America much later then men did.

**1900-1930**

Between 1900 and 1930, traveling into the wilderness as a leisure pursuit became more common. At the turn of the nineteenth century, outdoor living, which was once done out of necessity, became a popular leisure pursuit in North America as the strength of the nation was correlated with physical regeneration (Churchill 1992). At this time, the wilderness was receding into the North, but was still accessible within a day’s drive of most cities (Hoyle 1987). The increasing
distance between the people and the wilderness influenced people’s sense of loss about the lost experience of exploring and settling in the backcountry.

The perceived needs to explore and develop a largely uninhabited land, and to regain the adventure and romance associated with the pioneers were prominent at this time (Churchill 1992). These feelings and needs drove the private boys summer camp movement (Churchill 1992). It wasn’t until the end of this period, in 1926, when women would stop wearing long skirts on wilderness trips (Hoyle 1987). The time period of the early 1900s changed wilderness from being ever-present to a landscape that was sought by adventurists.

**Going into the Woods**

At the turn of the century, men started climbing, hiking or just generally going into the woods in order to fulfill ideas of what it meant to be a man, as it was society’s expectation that men battle both one another and the natural world (Sackman 2006). With industrialization, man’s role was changed in society and created a chronic insecurity as what it took to be a man as the men moved from the physical labour of working on the farm to the inactivity of working in a factory (Churchill 1992).

*Rod and Gun* magazine in 1904, asked, “Are we Anglo-Saxons degenerating? Is the Englishman, the American and the Canadian less hardy than his fore-fathers?” (Churchill 1992). The questioning of the “sturdiness” of the current-day men led to the call for “every Canadian male to go into the woods and lakes at least once a year in order to prevent them from becoming soft and luxurious” (Churchill 1992). Advice like *Rod and Gun*’s makes “going into the woods” a solution to a societal problem about manhood, adding it to the pre-mentioned problem of a Canadian identity to be solved through this method.

The “masculine primitive” was given as a definition for what it meant to be a male at the time (Churchill 1992). The archetype associated primitive qualities to those of being a man, including being physically active. These qualities were supposed to serve a man well in the “wilderness” of the city (Churchill 1992). Boys’ summer camps, for example, were supposed to solve the problem of making men out of sissy boys as told in Taylor Statton’s 1928 manual, *Talk to Counselors*, (Churchill 1992). The physical expertise of males made them the anti-thesis of femininity (Churchill 1992). At the time, it was also believed that lower class boys could not appreciate the strength and virtue of the woods (Churchill 1992).

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, summer camps focused almost completely on boys, as the idea of co-educational camps was almost irrelevant (Churchill 1992). The camping movement is closely related to wilderness out-tripping as summer camps was one of the methods through which people go on them.

**Discovering a New World**

It is said that “women followed men into the wilderness” (Goldman 1992), when the participation of women on canoe trips and other wilderness trips increased in the early twentieth century after the rise of men’s desire to “go into the woods”. Women have not traditionally claimed the wilderness as their space (Goldman 1992). Men at many times went to conquer nature, bringing women along as Governor’s wives, and the wives of Hudson Bay Company officers (Hoyle 1987), where they served as symbols of civilization and domestication (Goldman
The women who went into the wilderness without men brought the male framework of conquering wilderness with them instead (Goldman 1992).

During the twentieth century women’s participation in bicycling, basketball, and hockey increased, but sports that may injure a woman’s reproductive system were discouraged (Stanley 1992). At the same time, women were beginning to be incorporated into canoe trips and other wilderness adventures. Activities like canoe trips were thought of as activities that would make a woman a better wife as she would better understand her husband’s passion for being in the wilderness (Stanley 1992). As men were sent into the woods to make themselves into men, women made going into the woods into a female activity so that they could also participate.

A woman’s role on a canoe trip at the time was usually limited to the position at the bow of the canoe and many girls’ camps had men portage their belongings in between waterways (Stanley 1992). It seemed obvious that the tension between the advertised benefits of females pursuing outdoor activities and the constraint of women’s clothing, which had to protect their modesty and femininity, could only be resolved by ensuring that their canoe trips follow feminine guidelines (Stanley 1992). It is more difficult to know what a canoe trip meant to the individual woman at the time (Stanley 1992). Anna Kalland and Kathrene Pinkerton found their wilderness trips to be liberating, as they were introduced to new worlds and routines (Stanley 1992). But it is not easy to determine how typical they were.

Women are said to have been motivated differently than men to go into the wilderness. Men conquered nature or proved themselves to be men, while women attempted to establish their equality when climbing mountains or paddling rivers (Sackman 2006). At the time there was a pressure to differentiate the sexes due to society’s changing form, and each gender’s reasons for going on wilderness adventures showcases this. There is also the surprise people at the time had towards female adventurists, which Anna Kalland comments about in speaking of onlookers’ astonished looks to see two females on a canoe trip alone in Hudson Bay (Stanley 1992).

The Surprising Few
The breath-taking adventures of a few brave women during this period will be examined in order to further explore women’s wilderness trips of the era.

Ethel Augur ventured alone to the western United States to be a teacher from 1911-1914, but used the time to explore the unsettled area (Cowell 2007). When writing to her family, she included remarks about the beauty of Yellowstone and the economic potential of the Nevada desert and defended her subject matter by saying, “You don’t like this talk I know, you had rather hear how I’m wearing my hair, but these are the majority of my thoughts” (Cowell 2007). Augur went against the norm by instead of settling the west, she explored it and most importantly she went alone.

Florence Tasker, who lived from 1880 to approximately 1950, wrote a book called A woman through Husky land, about her five month adventure paddling from the town of Missinaibie up the Missinaibie River, and then through Hudson Bay to Fort Chimo in Ungava Bay with her husband, Stephen (Hoyle 1987). Although Tasker did not initiate the adventure, she was a part of its planning, participated as an equal in the paddling and setting up camp. Unlike her husband, Tasker did not want to partake in any more wilderness adventures after this one (Hoyle 1987).
Lady Clara Vyvyan who lived from 1885 to 1976, planned a trip with her friend Gwen Dorriens across Canada to Alaska and then down into Vancouver Island (Hoyle 1987). They had not expected to paddle during the trip, but were forced to for a portion of the trip due to a lack of a guide (Hoyle 1987). The success of the guideless aspect of their trip is what makes their trip special, as they were able to travel unassisted alone. Vyvyan’s writing and traveling defined her life (Hoyle 1987).

Lillian Alling, traveled for a reason other than leisure; she traveled from New York to Siberia (a 6000 mile journey) by foot in order to return to her hometown in Russia through the only way possible for her. She was intercepted and jailed for her safety by the police in British Columbia, but nonetheless continued her journey afterwards (Hoyle 1987).

Ella Wallace Manning, born in 1910, was brought North for two and a half years by her husband who partook in arctic exploration for science in a land even unknown to the Eskimos (Hoyle 1987). The difference between Manning and the others was that she was actually cut off from the rest of civilization without amenities. Her recounting of the adventure is factually stated, without feeling (Hoyle 1987).

All five of these women were determined and ground breaking in how they took part in wilderness adventures at this time. The fact that these women’s stories are intriguing while most of the male adventures of the time do not bring the same amount of curiosity in the present day is telling in how at least the outward appearance and constraints the two genders experienced are different.

While the depictions of the genders of the time period between 1900 and 1930 seem to be easily distinguishable, it is notable that not all adventures may be as easily distinguished. John Muir, who created the Sierra Club, combined the masculine and feminine when he forged the “domestic vision of the sublime” and insisted that, “going to the mountains is going home” (Sackman 2006). Muir changes the image of wilderness traveling away from one of conquering nature to become a man and into an image of being where one belongs.

The number of remarkable individual female adventurists can be correlated to feminism being active during the period (Famous Five and women acquiring the right to vote). During this period, children’s books were more likely to feature women than during the mid-1900s reinforcing the notion that this was a period of strength for women (McCabe et al. 2011).

1930-1960
The period from 1930 to 1960 is not filled with any major changes to the field of outdoor recreation or wilderness tripping. The Great Depression and the Second World War probably pre-occupied the minds of people instead of the desire to go on a wilderness trip.

Gender
The sexual freedoms and changes in gender norms of the 1920s were counterattacked in the 1930s (McCabe etc 2011), which led to a decreased emphasis on feminism and gender rights. The trend is mirrored in children’s books, where males are most likely to be featured in the title or as the main character than in the adjacent decades (McCabe et al. 2011). Both of these claims may sound odd due to the fact that World War II brought a large flow of women into the workforce, challenging women’s “proper role” (Hoyle 1987).
Outdoor Recreation
During the 1930s, the number of women in prominent positions within the Sierra Club and other organizations declined, along with participation in all-female climbing (Sackman 2006). While women’s participation was declining, the amount of recreation areas grew. From 1921 to 1941, there was a lively rate of growth in the American National Parks, as the park system was expanded, roadways were improved, and automobile ownership increased (Clawson 1985). Summer camps began to emphasize their educational factors rather than just the benefits of being exposed to nature (Churchill 1992). Alongside this, leadership skills became more important than learning skills such as canoeing, swimming and sailing (Churchill 1992). In 1959, there was a new record for attendance in each area of outdoor recreation due to four major forces: population forces (total number and distribution in suburbs); income factors (higher); transportation (greater availability) and leisure (Clawson 1985), which aided the growth of outdoor recreation throughout the period.

1960-1990
After the increasing participation in National Parks of the 1930s to 1960s, the 1960s to 1990s are filled with greater changes to both the outdoor industry and to gender in the field.

Outdoor Recreation
The annual increase in attendance in National Parks in the United States throughout the previous period and into this period implies that “the more people who try it, the more people want it” (Clawson 1985). A report in 1985, which looked at the changes in outdoor recreation over a 25-year period, highlighted many trends for the field. In 1985, there was greater technology, more interest in physical activity, increased attention for wilderness areas, more wilderness areas, and an annual growth rate in park attendance, than in 1959 (Clawson 1985). The growth rate of attendance in the parks was decreasing annually but attendance was still rising. People also felt less confident in their personal and their property’s safety (Clawson 1985).

The Gender Adventure
The 1960s brought the first real surge of female recreationalists and scientists to travel north (Hoyle 1987). With the insurgence of female explorers, came some theories in the late 1980s about woman’s role in outdoor recreation and the wilderness. It was established that men pioneered wilderness exploration, where they established the codes of behaviour for the activity and created the meaning to be taken from such adventures (Norwood 1988). Conquering nature was found to be an important male pursuit (Norwood 1988).

Along with the theories about male exploration, came theories on female exploration including whether women mimicked everything males did in the wilderness. When women became explorers, they undertook a male occupation (Norwood 1988). Women are said to do two things upon undertaking this male occupation: the first is to compare their achievements against the male codes of behaviour and secondly to find a balance between the perceived male behavioural codes for wilderness tripping with society’s role for females (Norwood 1988). Upon becoming explorers or adventurists, women are conflicted between their own values and the male values that dominate the field.

Along with the conflict women feel in regards to gender, women bring two things into adventures that set them apart from men: the first is entering the wilderness with feminine qualities of veneration and nurturing; and the second is a woman’s dedication to succeeding
without risking her life (Norwood 1988). Women allowed the land to mold their progress and altered their adventure plan accordingly (Norwood 1988).

At the time, there was emphasis placed on how being female negated one’s wilderness experience. Like the belief that men cannot cook, there was the belief that poor adventurers were seen as women, and if a woman was a good adventurer, then she was no longer a woman (Norwood 1988). At the same time it must be remembered that Norwood’s theories may not have been typical of the time period, as girls’ summer camps were popular and the women’s movement had arisen. The period of Norwood’s criticism included times when leading thinkers were rejecting the definitive categories made for men and women in the 1950s and 1960s.

Hoyle reminds us that despite the wilderness being designated as male; women’s spirits also crave the adventure it brings (1987). The clothing and social codes of the early twentieth century are no longer constraining women, so they are able to participate (Hoyle 1987). There are still reasons that are equally compelling for women in the 1980s, as conquering the social and physical barriers that were present in the early 1900s, such as the primeval need for contact with wilderness (Hoyle 1987). The question remains if the present day’s theories are the same as those of the late 1980s or even the early 1900s.

1990- present

The literature on outdoor recreation throughout time has become more inclusive of females though gender related discussion in that literature has focuses on how women are at a disadvantage when partaking in wilderness pursuits. The present era has journal articles dominated by the issue of female gender inequity.

Thoughts about Gender Currently

The final era to be discussed begins with the third wave of feminism in the 90s (McCabe et al. 2011). In regards to feminism, some prevalent feminist theories that can be related to gender and wilderness tripping need to be discussed. Sex-role theory involves passive recipients receiving society’s respective gender role for them, while ignoring the biological gender (Newbury 2004). The social-constructionist theory believes that society and not biology gives oppressed roles to women (Newbury 2004). Both of these theories focus on society’s role of dictating how people come to behave according to their gender.

Economically, women are moving towards par with men as approximately 71% of women between the ages of 18 and 64 are in the labour force and a male earner is the sole provider for only 20% of married couples (Hamilton et al. 2011). Nevertheless, many girls and women are conflicted between the gender values of the domestic woman and the progressive professional woman (Denny 2011). In children’s books, where children learn about their cultural heritage, there is a move towards gender equality, but it is still unequal as the over-represented main characters and title characters are male (McCabe et al. 2011).

Instead of traditional gender values being overtly expressed, they may now be subtly expressed through less controversial issues (Hamilton 2011), meaning that although sexism may not be as clearly denoted as in the past, it is still present. Female behaviour is presented as dependent, passive, nurturing, and sharing decision-making with others (Little 2002a). In comparison, male behaviour includes the tendency to make decisions independently rather than in a group setting (Little 2002a). Gender differences are more pronounced in single sex
environments, as there are fewer restrictions on how to act in accord with one’s gender expectations (Denny 2011).

**Becoming Empowered in the Wilderness**

Women are slipping their way into the male dominated adventure recreation literature, which shows how the minorities of women participating in outdoor recreation are beginning to make their mark (Little 2002a). The many organizations created to make a man out of the boy are, however, still reducing women’s experiences and access in the wilderness (Little 2002a). Even today, women are prone to following a male model of wilderness tripping, where it is woman versus the mountain (Goldman 1992). In response to tripping organizations based on male frameworks, many organizations have made an effort to create a separate framework in order to empower women and to celebrate female values while experiencing the wilderness (Goldman 1992).

Going into the wilderness with a female code of conduct, especially with other females, is supposed to create empowering, woman-positive experiences (Goldman 1992). Women in these experiences may never believe that women are incapable in the outdoors, as one just does the portage (Newbury 2004). There is an emphasis on women being able to see their bodies positively and do “girl” differently in the outdoors (Newbury 2004; Goldman 1992). Women obviously also gain the culturally assigned male traits of advanced technical skills and abilities, as well as confidence in their physical beings (Boniface 2006). While women are able to acquire the advanced technical skills and abilities, many are not able to recognize their skill level or lack confidence in their abilities (Warren and Loeffler 2006).

Beyond the concrete details of women being a minority in the outdoor field, there is the question about whether wilderness experiences can empower them. There is the myth that “going into the woods equalizes genders” (Newbury 2004), but this does not mean that there is no empowering element in the outdoors for women. There are many sources that say that there is a connection between wilderness recreation and social change for women (Pohl 2000), yet women’s advances in the outdoor field often lagged movements of gender equality in society. The empowering that women experience is not enough to change social dynamics, but positively influences a woman’s self development through creating self-esteem, assertion, self-control, self-identification, transformation of body image, clearness of perception and facility of change through challenge (Pohl 2000). High-risk activities are more beneficial than every day life as they benefit self-esteem, confidence and competence (Boniface 2006).

**Differing Experiences**

Two factors that have been identified as being different for males and females in relation to wilderness tripping are their motivations to participate and the constraints that keep them from participating.

The current, culture-based motivations that encourage men and women to participate in outdoor recreation are different. Women are more intrinsically motivated than men (O’Connell 2010). Women are primarily motivated to participate by the desire to interact with and learn from nature (O’Connell 2010). Men and women are said to have differing understandings of nature (Boniface 2006). Women also want to create connections with other people (O’Connell 2010). Another motivation for women is to have their bodies feel physically active (Boniface 2006).
Men are more driven by the challenge-oriented aspect of wilderness tripping than women are (O’Connell 2010).

The literature’s discussion of constraints focuses on how women are constrained in ways, which men are not. The social norms pressure women to feel constrained in gender specific ways. For example, married women who work in the outdoor field and are away for extended periods of time in the wilderness enjoy less acceptance in society (Newbury 2004). Other constraining factors involve certain behaviours like women having hairy legs being unacceptable in the city (Newbury 2004). Women are also constrained to participate through gender related feelings of objectification, vulnerability, and fear for their personal safety in the outdoors (Wesley and Gaarder 2004).

Modern Day Adventurers
Modern day adventurers are found in many places including the media, and through film festivals like the Reel Paddling Film Festival (http://www.reelpaddlingfilmfestival.com/) and the Banff Mountain Film and Book Festival (http://www.banffcentre.ca/mountainfestival/worldtour/). A large aspect of wilderness tripping and going on adventures remains sharing the experience with the people who stayed at home through films, books, the newspaper, and the Internet (i.e. blogs and websites). Some modern day adventurers will be explored in order to get a better comparison to trips of the past and present. The first will be youth who have become the youngest to sail around the world solo, and the second will be people who have won the title of Adventurer of the Year 2012 by National Geographic.

On January 21st 2012, a Dutch teenager, Laura Dekker, aged 16 claimed to be the youngest person to sail solo around the world (Associated Press 2012). After departing from St. Maarten on 20 January 2011, Dekker sailed 27,000 nautical miles (Associated Press 2012). She stopped at ports along the way including the Canary Islands, Panama, the Galapagos Islands, Tonga, Fiji, Bora Bora, Australia, and South Africa. Dekker’s claim cannot be confirmed by the Guinness World Records or the World Sailing Speed Record Council, as in order to discourage dangerous attempts, they no longer recognize records for youngest sailors (Associated Press 2012).

Before Dekker, the youngest sailor to solo around the world was Jessica Watson from Australia, who sailed 23,000 nautical miles unassisted and non-stop. She completed her journey in May 2010 after 7 months at sea (Batty 2010). Watson and her predecessor, Jesse Martin who completed the journey at 18 in 1999, were confirmed as the youngest to sail solo around the world upon completion of their journeys (Batty 2010). The influence of regulations and titles on wilderness tripping is there, and may be a driving force for many expeditions.

In addition to the youngest sailors to sail around the world, a breakdown of the 2012 Adventurers chosen by National Geographic will be given in order to display what the modern world of adventure and wilderness tripping entails. Three of the eleven winners were female. The seven adventurers of the year, whose adventures pertain most with wilderness tripping, will be explored below.

The 2012 Winners of the People’s Choice Adventurers of the Year were Sano Babu Sunuwar and Lakpa Tsheri Sherpa (National Geographic 2012a). The pair completed the
“Ultimate Descent Expedition,” which included summiting Mount Everest, paragliding down it, and then kayaking to the sea. The expedition included no corporate sponsors, borrowed gear and a limited budget (National Geographic 2012a).

Like Sunuwar and Tsheri Sherpa, Cory Richards also took a new approach to mountain climbing. He was the first American to summit Pakistan’s Gasherbrum II in winter, which is an 8,000-meter peak (National Geographic 2012c). Two experienced winter climbers accompanied him on his summit (National Geographic 2012c). Along with believing that they would die due to an avalanche, Richards documented the experience in the film “Cold” (National Geographic 2012c).

Following in the popularity with climbing mountains, Gerlinde Kaltenbrunner, an Austrian, is the first woman to summit all 14 of the world’s 8000-meter peaks without supplemental oxygen or porters (National Geographic 2012f). K2 was the most difficult peak for her to climb, as her partner died during one of her attempts to reach its summit (National Geographic 2012f). Her adventure took 14 years to complete (National Geographic 2012f).

Another female adventurer of the year was Jennifer Pharr Davis, 28, who broke the speed record for the Appalachian Trail by going against the conventional wisdom (National Geographic 2012d). Instead of running faster, she hiked for a longer period of time. Pharr Davis hiked for 17 hours a day, and completed the trail in 46 days, 11 hours, and 20 minutes, which was 26 hours shorter than the previous record (National Geographic 2012d). The record had been long held by a man, and it was expected to continue as such (National Geographic 2012d). Pharr Davis believes that, “‘records are made to be broken’” (National Geographic 2012d).

While Pharr Davis took the Appalachian trail by storm, Jon Turk and Erik Boomer completed what polar experts claimed was to be the last great polar expedition (National Geographic 2012e). They were the first to circumnavigate Ellesmere Island over 104 days by skis, kayak, and foot (National Geographic 2012e). The men’s biggest danger was the polar bears, as they could encounter 9 or 11 a day (National Geographic 2012e).

Alastair Humphreys, 35, spent the year going on micro-adventures from the doorstep of his UK home. He purposely shunned exotic adventure challenges. He stated that he wanted to “‘Break down the elitism in adventure’” (National Geographic 2012b). In the past, he was an elite adventurer who cycled 46,000 miles around the world and traveled unsupported to the South Pole by foot (National Geographic 2012b). His adventures from home included swimming across the Thames, sleeping under the stars, hiking England’s M25 highway, and living off the land for 4 days (National Geographic 2012b).

The adventures of the adventurers of the year can be compared to the explorers from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is obvious in the 2012 Adventurers of the Year that going to remote locations such as mountains is still popular. There is also an aspect that wasn’t seen before, which is the creative twist to adventures to make them new and unique, like how Sunuwar and Tsheri Sherpa paraglided down Everest and how Humphreys coined micro-adventures. This may have something to do with how many firsts have already been accomplished and with the decreased area of unexplored wilderness. Both the youth and the
adults are shown to be trying to break records and accomplish something new and unprecedented with their adventures.

The women are still able to complete records that have been completed by men in order to become the first woman to do so. It is interesting how the youngest people contending for the record to sail around the world unassisted are females. Men and the women may use different strategies to accomplish records. For example, Pharr Davis just hiked for a longer period of time instead of running faster. In comparison to the explorers identified in earlier periods, the women’s adventures more closely match the males, despite them being able to become adventurer of the year for less spectacular adventures.

**Literature Review Conclusion**

There are many findings from the literature review that pertain to the question of whether men and women experience wilderness out-trips in a viably different way throughout time. The findings are listed below:

1. **How has the field of wilderness tripping changed over time?**

   The field of outdoor recreation has physically changed through the creation of more national parks, a greater focus on outdoor recreation in society, greater participation and access to wilderness trips, increased technology and equipment, and a decreasing area of wild nature as the world becomes more industrialized and urbanized.

2. **How has the role of gender changed over time in western society?**

   The role of gender in society has changed over time in an un-uniform way, meaning that there have been peaks where the genders are on more equitable footing (three peaks in feminism) and ones of greater gender disparity (i.e. Great Depression). Currently gender discrimination tends to happen in a more subtle way through less extreme statements (for example saying that women shouldn’t be in the work place has become taboo, but emphasis on “family” with traditional connotations is still fine).

3. **How has the role of gender in society affected the world of wilderness tripping?**

   After women first began going into the wilderness, their efforts went from being veiled under feminine pretenses to the present day where a woman’s participation is more often examined through a feminist lens.

4. **Do men and women experience wilderness trips differently from one another? If so, is this a problem?**

   There is a documented academic difference between male and female experiences, including reasons why each gender participates in wilderness out-trips, and their respective constraints. Women are seen as more intrinsically motivated than men, while men are more challenge motivated. Women are also more motivated by the connections to other people on their trips.

5. **Is there a difference between wilderness adventurists of the past and present? Is so what is it?**
Wilderness tripping began as a male occupation, where boys went into the wilderness to become men, or on jobs of exploration. There was an emphasis on conquering nature. The male narrative has been tweaked to one where gaining leadership skills and being educated through nature is now prominent instead of just needing to spend time outdoors like the beginning of the twentieth century. Nowadays, the element of challenging oneself remains as a prime motivation for men to participate in wilderness trips. Over time, more women have participated in wilderness trips. The present day women who experience wilderness trips are not as overtly constrained as their predecessors were through their long skirts, the emphasis on domestic activities such as cooking, not being permitted to portage, etcetera.

6. Are men and women’s motivations and constraints for participating in wilderness trips different from one another? If so how?

Yes, the motivations and constraints for participating in wilderness tripping are different for men and women. Even in current culture, women are more intrinsically motivated than men. Women are more interested in learning from and interacting with nature when going on their trips than men are. Women are also more interested in connecting with other people on their trips. Men in comparison are more greatly motivated by challenge than women are. In terms of constraints, women face more constraints that keep them from participating than men do. The constraints that women face more than men include: societal constraints (i.e. women going on wilderness trips not being the norm in society, etcetera), and through feelings of objectification, vulnerability and fear for personal safety.
3. The Framework for Analysis

The following framework gained from the literature review will be used when analyzing the book comparison and the interviews. The framework includes statements that will be confirmed or denied in the following two stages of the study. The framework is constructed of the following assertions:

1. Males and females experience wilderness trips differently from one another.
2. Women are more self-motivated for personal development than men when desiring to partake in wilderness trips. This may also be a culturally based self-motivation. Women also care more about learning from and being immersed in nature than men, as well as connecting with other people on their wilderness trips.
3. Men are more challenge-oriented than women on wilderness trips.
4. Women face more societal constraints, as well as constraints through feelings of objectification, vulnerability and fears for personal safety than men do.
5. Women bring the qualities of veneration and nurturing, and a dedication to succeeding without risking their lives, onto wilderness trips, which men do not.
6. There is a need for females to have a female-centred tripping methodology, which is different from the male challenge-oriented wilderness tripping methodology. These female-centred tripping methodologies focus on self-development. There is a need for this because of the negative repercussions for females being in scenarios where they have to partake in organizations where the male model is the norm.
7. Women are less confident in their technical skills, or less aware of their technical abilities, than men.
8. Women are at a disadvantage when it comes to wilderness tripping, whether physically or through the trip’s organization.
9. Gender traits are more pronounced in a single sex environment.
4. Focusing on Four Narratives

The seven findings from the literature review will be used to study four individual narratives in order to see if the assertions relate to some individuals who were not writing their tales for academic research on the role of gender in wilderness tripping. First the books will be summarized to give an idea of what they are about and then they will be compared to one another.

Summaries of the Books

The Long Labrador Trail by Dillon Wallace

The fire sparked by exploring unknown lands and the desire to finish the expedition begun by Leonidas Hubbard Jr. and him in 1903 drives Dillon Wallace’s journey. Hubbard died on the initial exploration trip, which had been impossible to complete. The title of the book is fitting to the adventure told within. Wallace’s journey through Labrador and Northern Quebec along the George River was indeed long as it took over 11 months, beginning on June 27th 1905 and ending in April 30th 1906. It involved paddling the Nascaupee River and the George River, with the paddling ending at Ungava Bay. At Ungava Bay, Wallace and his companion then decided to travel over land through snow and partially by dogsled to the final destination point, which led them back to civilization. Getting lost on old Indian portages, decreasing group numbers due to food shortages, and near-death experiences, marked the journey.

A Woman’s Way through Unknown Labrador by Mina Benson Hubbard

Mina Benson Hubbard decided to complete the work of her late husband, Leonidas Hubbard Jr., paddling from the Northwest Post to Ungava Bay in Labrador/Quebec. Her journey began on the 27th of June 1905 and ended on August 27th 1905. As George Elson (“chief among [them]… had loyally served Mr. Hubbard in 1903”), Joseph Iserhoff (“Russian half-bred”), Job Chapies (“pure blood Cree Indian”) and Gilbert Blake (“half bred Eskimo boy trapper”) led her through the wilderness (Hubbard 44), she remarked on the beauty of the land, experienced local native cultures and was overwhelmed by experiencing the Caribou migration her late husband had dreamt of seeing. She mapped the region she paddled through and took records of the flora and fauna. The reader is drawn in to Hubbard’s experiences of being a woman at the turn of the century exploring a land so unknown to her sex in European cultures, where she battles the insects and works to discover her role in the team.
Mina Hubbard’s diary has also been published, but for the sake of comparing an equivalent piece of work from each individual, Mina’s book was chosen for the study.

_Beyond the Horizon by Colin Angus_

Colin Angus realized one day that no one had yet completed a circumnavigation of the world relying solely on human power. He adds this goal to his list of accomplishments of sailing solo for five years, rafting down the entirety of the Amazon River, and being the first to paddle the length of the Yenisey, the world’s fifth longest river. He wants his circumnavigation to be a role model for others recognizing the need to change one’s lifestyle in order to cope with the dilemma of climate change. From the beginning of his journey, he is burdened with various problems: logistics, funding, finding a partner and the heartbreak of leaving his fiancé, Julie Wafaei, behind for two years. Beginning on June 1 2003, Colin begins the adventure of a lifetime as he is the first to row across the Bering Sea, first Western man to bike and hike across the Siberian wilderness, rows across Europe, rows across the Atlantic Ocean (with Julie Angus (nee Wafaei)) and finally bikes home to the same Totem Pole in Vancouver where he began 720 days earlier. National Geographic Adventure recognized Colin and Julie Angus as Adventurers of the Year for their shared adventures.

_Rowboat in a Hurricane: my amazing journey across a changing ocean by Julie Angus_

In 2005-2006 Julie Angus becomes the first woman to row nearly 10,000 kilometers from mainland to mainland across the Atlantic Ocean in a rowboat. Her motivation began as a young child when she imagined what it would be like if she existed in a fish’s world. When her fiancé, Colin Angus began his journey to circumnavigate the world through manpower, Julie decided to row with him across the Atlantic Ocean adding womanpower. Julie’s journey is a challenging exploration involving living for 5 months like she never left the underneath of her kitchen table, experiencing three hurricanes, physical pain and seeing the world around her in a new light. She emerges changed as a person, her romantic relationship made stronger, and her desire to experience climate change first-hand was successful in this poetic account of her exploration.

_Comparing and Contrasting the Narratives_

_The Labrador Adventures of 1905_

Both Dillon Wallace and Mina Benson Hubbard share the same goal of completing the expedition that Leonidas Hubbard Jr. started but failed to survive. Remarkably, neither one of them speaks of the other during their adventures, despite a tension between the two reported in outside media and in Hubbard’s diary. The pair of them were both technically the leaders of their respective expeditions, although George Elson, who had outdoors expertise and knowledge of the area, led the Hubbard expedition while on the trail.

The main difference between the two trips, which left their departure points on the same day, was the duration of the adventures, as Wallace’s was 11 months long and Hubbard’s was 2 months long. Wallace chose to take an Indian portage, which hadn’t been traveled in centuries, instead of the current trail, making his expedition take two weeks to do a portage that took Hubbard’s expedition a couple of hours. Wallace focused on going off of the beaten path, while Hubbard was anxious about making it to the last ship of the season that was supposed to depart from the George River post at Ungava Bay at the end of August. Wallace’s constant need to make detours to explore was contrasted with Hubbard being constrained by her trip-mates from exploring due to the risk of danger to her person.
Hubbard was new to the world of exploring. She was in a constant state of awe and surprise as she viewed her surroundings. While recollecting about her journey, she stated: “How little I had dreamed when setting out on my journey that it would prove beautiful and of such compelling interest as I had found it. I had not thought of interest- except of getting the work done- nor of beauty” (Hubbard, 119). Hubbard came into her expedition expecting her sole enjoyment to be finishing her husband’s job, when in fact she is astounded by her natural surroundings. Wallace in contrast had been partially drawn to the trip by the burning fire of exploration. When Wallace describes scenes of nature they are done in a mechanical manner. Most of his focus is on over-coming challenges and escaping near-death situations, which follows the male narrative of wilderness tripping of the time.

Of the two exploration narratives, Hubbard’s appears to be the most successful due to the length of the trip, her personal gains (healing from husband’s death, realizing the beauty of nature, etc.) and how Hubbard states it, “best of all, there came the full realization that I was the first in the field and the honour of exploring the Nascaupee and George Rivers was to fall to me” (78). Hubbard’s statement is very competitive and goes against the cultural norms for women at the time. It is noted that this is the first time that Hubbard mentions achieving this goal, which decreases her competitive nature.

The World Adventures of a Century Later
The most interesting thing about comparing Julie and Colin’s experiences is that they are both speaking about an adventure that they were on together. Beyond how Colin’s narrative encompasses a longer trip (the circumnavigation of the earth), while Julie’s narrative focuses on the row across the Atlantic Ocean, there are many differences between the narratives. Some differences may be due to the number of pages each gives to their corresponding adventure. Julie is able to devote a whole book to their cross-Atlantic row, while for Colin it is only a part of his book. It may be due to this that Julie’s narrative is more poetic and philosophical than Colin’s narrative.

One of the prominent differences is their level of physical strength and outdoors experience beforehand. Colin has gone on many extreme adventures beforehand, while Julie felt inexperienced and less physically prepared. Julie commented on how Colin never complained about physical pain or a lack of endurance while she sometimes felt like her two-hour rowing shift would never end. Julie comments on how neither her nurture nor nature had prepared her for the journey ahead.

Another difference between the pair is their motivations for undertaking their adventures. Julie embarks on the adventure due to her desire to learn more about climate change through the ocean. Her ability to become the first woman to cross the ocean from mainland to mainland is a second priority that is not focused on very much. Colin is motivated to go on his adventure due to his desire to explore unknown lands. He is problem and challenge focused throughout the journey as time and speed mean a lot to him in accomplishing his goal of being the first to circumnavigate the earth through the use of human power. Going hand in hand with this motivation is his desire to be a role model to people in demonstrating the importance and possibility of lifestyle change in the face of climate change. It is fair to say that Julie’s motivations are more related to personal development than Colin’s are.
In the terms of leadership, both Colin and Julie are strong leaders in a specific sense for their journey. Julie’s strength is in the logistics and organization of the trip, while Colin is a greater leader while on the trip in terms of expedition knowledge.

Another difference between Colin and Julie is what dangers worry them the most. Colin is worried the most by budget, the hurricanes, group dynamics and not being allowed into Siberia. Julie on the other hand, also experiences the hurricanes but seems more panicked by Colin scrubbing off the hull of the rowboat, which attracts sharks or thinking that Colin has gone over board when a big wave hits the boat. Julie is more alarmed by the personal dangers than the big practical problems that occupy Colin.

The Boys
Both Dillon Wallace and Colin Angus have the desire to explore unknown lands. They are both challenge-oriented, although Angus’ challenges are oriented towards speed and don’t include meandering off-route like Wallace’s do.

They both also have many near death experiences. Wallace’s include capsizing a canoe in frigid conditions, and nearly starving in the snowy Labrador conditions. Angus’ include getting lost in a blizzard where he hides in a snow cave, and being in a rowboat during hurricanes. They both pointedly speak of their near-death experiences.

Another small similarity is that both men do not end up finishing their journeys with the group they began with. Wallace sends most of his party back to the beginning of the journey and continues on with only one comrade due to a lack of food and fear that he may not be able to complete the journey with that many people. Angus splits with Tim Harvey, his partner at the beginning due to team conflict and differing views on how to complete their goals.

Remarkably both of the narratives are very similar at the core, as they are both challenge-focused and describe their adventure in an event-to-event basis with little philosophy or personal reflection.

The Girls
The women’s narratives are more obviously different than the men’s, and the similarities are seen beneath the surface. Hubbard is more visibly hindered by her gender, as she is quoted saying about a particular instance, this was “one of the very many things on trip that made me wish I were a man” (66). Hubbard is unable to explore the land freely and is repeatedly prohibited from going near the rapids, etc. for fear of her physical well-being. She doesn’t take part in as much of the work as the rest of the team, but this may in part be attributed to her high economic status. Her clothing is also a hindrance to her. Julie never says anything about wishing to be a man, but does mention the grievances of her period and fearing pregnancy while on the trip.

Both Hubbard and Julie speak of being in charge of the logistics and planning of their journeys. They both also claim to be inexperienced in the realm of wilderness tripping. Hubbard and Julie are both also ecstatic about the wilderness they observe while on their trips. To both of the women, their journey is one of personal growth. They both understated the recognition their achievements will gain in the world from going on the expedition (being the first of their kind to
do so). While, Hubbard comments on how the men don’t complain of the bugs, Julie similarly comments on how Colin never complains of physical exertion.

Using the Framework to Analyze the Books
After comparing the books to one another by gender and time period, the books will be studied against the nine assertions in the framework created from the literature review. The findings will be used to reveal whether the four narratives affirm or deviate from the literature review.

1. Males and females experience wilderness trips differently from one another.

It can be said, as is shown in the individual comparisons of the novels, that the experiences of the men were different from those of the women. Julie and Colin’s trips were more similar to one another than Hubbard and Wallace’s trips were. Julie and Colin’s narratives may have been even more similar if Colin had been able to devote the same number of pages to the Atlantic row as Julie did.

2. Women are more self-motivated for personal development than men when desiring to partake in wilderness trips. This may also be a culturally based self-motivation. Women also care more about learning from and being immersed in nature than men, as well as connecting with other people on their wilderness trips.

Hubbard did not go into her adventure with the expectation that she would care about nature while on her adventure. In the end, however, nature was a larger element of Hubbard’s narrative than of Wallace’s. Hubbard was the person least connected to any of the other people on her journey, so connecting with other people cannot be said to be one of her motivations. This may be related to the gender and class norms of the time.

Julie Angus was motivated to go on her trip to learn about the ocean and to be able to go on an adventure like her fiancé. She was more intrinsically motivated than Colin, as he was motivated by the desire to explore land, rather than personal growth. One of Julie’s main motivations was to learn about the ocean and the world as she traveled through it, while Colin did not state this motivation. Julie did not desire to connect with other people any more than Colin did. Both Julie and Colin worried about the adventure ruining their relationship.

It can be said that the women were both more self-motivated for personal development than the men. Being immersed and learning from nature, also, ended up being a higher priority for the women than it was for the men. There is no evidence from the given examples that women desire to connect with other people any more than the men desired to do so.

3. Men are more challenge-oriented than women on wilderness trips.

Both Dillon Wallace and Colin Angus were more challenge-oriented than the women, although the women did overcome challenges. The women just did not present over-coming challenges to be as big of a priority as they were for the men in their narratives.

4. Women face more societal constraints, as well as constraints through feelings of objectification, vulnerability and fears for personal safety than men do.
The books that were compared show this item of the framework to be true. Although Mina Benson Hubbard does not speak of anyone trying to keep her from going on her adventure, while she is on her adventure she is kept from exploring and doing other activities by the men on her trip due to her gender for reasons like her person safety and femininity.

Julie Angus, in contrast, speaks of how her parents warn against her rowing across the Atlantic Ocean. Julie also voices her concern for Colin’s personal safety, as one of her top worries, while a reciprocal concern is not emphasized in Colin’s account. The books coincide with the framework on the point of women facing more constraints in these areas than men. Feelings of objectification and vulnerability were a larger issue for Mina than for Julie.

5. **Women bring the qualities of veneration and nurturing, and a dedication to succeeding without risking their lives, to wilderness trips, which men do not.**

Mina Benson Hubbard is more nurturing towards animals in that it is emphasized how she doesn’t want to kill the animals. The men that Mina is juxtaposed with from both narratives of that time period take great pride in shooting and killing animals. It must be noted that some hunting was required to gain the sustenance required for the journeys. Julie also shows a bit of nurturing towards the animals in her desire to name the fish that are following their boat. Mina’s nurturing behaviour in this respect is emphasized more than Julie’s is.

Both Mina and Julie are more inclined to appreciate, perhaps even venerate, the world around them than the men are, which could also be because for both women this is their first time on that sort of adventure. Likewise, Mina is more concerned with not risking her life than Julie is. Mina takes great deliberation in deciding whether or not to continue up to Ungava, as she would risk missing the last boat home of the season. Julie ends up in several hurricanes, but these are also not because of a risky decision. The women are seen to possess these qualities more than the men.

6. **There is a need for females to have a female-centred tripping methodology, which is different from the male challenge-oriented wilderness tripping methodology.** These female-centred tripping methodologies focus on self-development. There is a need for this because of the negative repercussions for females being in scenarios where they have to partake in organizations where the male model is the norm.

Neither Julie nor Mina speaks of the need for a female-centred tripping methodology, although Mina is constrained by her gender on her trip. Neither of the women speaks of an inner conflict surrounding her gender. If anything, the women benefit from the men on their adventures.

7. **Women are less confident in their technical skills, or less aware of their technical abilities, than men.**

Mina does not speak of her technical skills in regards to paddling a canoe, etcetera. From the way she speaks, the men on her trip do not believe in her technical river skills. She does highly regard her photography, journaling and nature collection, though. Julie mentions how she feels less skilled than Colin, and speaks of how she will never become a professional rower, or be known for her skills as a rower. For Julie this piece of the framework is true, although it is unknown for Mina.
8. Women are at a disadvantage when it comes to wilderness tripping, whether physically or through the trip’s organization.

Mina was at a disadvantage on her trip due to her gender. Julie felt disadvantaged due to her weaker physical body and limited experience. Both women felt at a disadvantage, but Julie’s disadvantage was shown to be more experience-based than directly linked to gender.

9. Gender traits are more pronounced in a single sex environment.

This aspect of the framework does not apply to the narratives at hand as all of them except Dillon Wallace were in co-ed environments.

Conclusions for the Framework Analyzing the Book Comparison

Through testing the assertions with the book comparison, it was found that the narratives affirmed statements 1, 2 (except for connecting to other people), 3, 4 (to less of an extent for Julie), 5, 7 (Mina does not speak of own skills, though), and 9. Some of the statements were affirmed with more confidence than others. Statements 6 and 9 did not apply to the narratives. The lack of confidence in a few of the assertions shows that the influence of gender is not black and white. It is sometimes difficult to interpret people’s actions and words in terms of gender, when they are not directly speaking of gender.
5. Individuals’ Opinions and Experiences

To discover how individuals of the current time affirm or deviate from the literature review I interviewed eight people. The objective was to find out how ordinary people, who may not have thought about gender when going on their expeditions, think about the topic. I also wanted to juxtapose the opinions and experiences of men and women first-hand, as most of the research on this subject focuses on women only. For this reason, I chose to interview the same number of males and females (4 males and 4 females). All of the females were in their low to mid-twenties, while the males ranged from low-twenties to middle aged. The participants had varying depths of experiences with wilderness tripping. In order to better relate the individual’s experiences, I labeled the interviewees from 1 through 8 with their gender.

The females’ experience levels were similar, while the males had both the most and least experienced people among the interviewees. One of the participants, male 4, comes from India, while the rest of the participants are Caucasian. The participants’ experiences ranged from going on one wilderness trip to more than fifty of them; going on family trips to trips with an organization; and five of the participants had gone on mainly mixed gendered trips. Most of the participants’ wilderness tripping experiences came from canoe or backpacking trips in Canada.

The interviews involved two phases. The first was to take part in a questionnaire in order to get the participants’ basic wilderness trip experience, while the second was an interview conducted over the telephone, over Skype or in person. Due to the nature of the interviews and interviewee responses, the specific questions for the interviews varied somewhat over time, so that certain interviewees answered different questions from one another. The specific questions are included in the Appendix.

Two areas of comparison in the literature are peoples’ motivations and constraints for participating in wilderness trips, and so views on these two topics were sought from my participants. The motivations that my participants had were similar to one another. They were based around getting away from the status quo and/or to spend time in nature. Male 8 mentioned how his motivations had changed over his lifetime from influences such as summer camp, being a guide, an academic, and having a family. Male 4 mentioned feeling an external pressure telling him to participate in wilderness out-trips. The literature speaks of the motivations for females being more self-motivated for personal development than males, but this does not seem to be the case with my participants whose reported motivations were similar.

The constraints that the participants brought up that may limit their participation in wilderness trips mainly included time, money, having young children, and the logistics of things like finding company, going by one’s self, etc, and two participants (one male and female) felt the physical constraints of either a poor fitness level or back pain.

The constraints for my participants were not as gendered as some reported in the literature, like feeling society’s disapproving glance when a married woman decides their profession is that of an outdoor guide. In fact some of the results went against traditional gender ideas; for example, both married males (male 5 and male 8) mentioned that their young daughters were their main constraint, and desired to adapt their trips to their children’s needs. They both spoke about their tripping styles becoming more family oriented and the desire to have their daughters enriched in wilderness trips in their childhoods.
Most of the participants actively try to overcome their constraints by modifying their way of going on wilderness trips, either by working as a guide and adapting the trip to new needs (making it shorter, closer, etc.), but male 4 stated that they never desired to overcome their constraints in order to participate. He was forced to overcome them. Another reported never being able to overcome the physical constraint of a bad back.

The main question that was asked similarly in both the questionnaire and the interview was whether people of different genders experience wilderness differently on trip or have different experiences based on their gender. The question garnered different responses. Some people were more confident than others in affirming that there is a difference based on gender. The answers were scattered with no true common reply.

No one was able to reply definitively that there is absolutely no difference in experience based on gender. Two females, 2 & 7, reported that there is an absolute difference in experiences based on gender. These two participants both mentioned how the division of labour is unequal on co-ed trips. Female 7 expanded upon this answer to include the traditionally viewed difference between the genders: one of males conquering something, while women are more desirous towards personal growth.

Male 8 stated that there is an academically established difference between the genders, but he has seen both “men and women desire long and hard & slow and soft” trips. Three people (male 4, female 3 & 6) stated that the differences were negligible, but still somewhat present. Female 3 spoke of how gender mostly affects one at a young age when they are still discovering who they are, and told of how a single gender group is more conducive to developing one’s self. The other two participants’ statements were similar to each other and are summarized by female 6’s statement: “Don’t think so [-that there is a difference-] if both [genders] go out by choice, [and] want to be with nature and experience it.”

The last two male participants (1 & 5) were more skeptical about there being a difference about how one’s gender affects their experiences, but both affirmed that they are sure there is a difference or there is probably a difference to a certain extent. Overall, the replies to the question show that despite the literature claiming that there is a difference between genders in the wilderness, the common participant on wilderness trips is much less sure of the difference. Most of the participants hinted that much more affects one’s wilderness experience than gender.

From my data collection, there is evidence showing that females are not expected to do as much physical labour as men on wilderness trips. A common answer for how women are at a disadvantage on trip is physically (male 1, female 6, 7). Male 1 speaks of being empowered by seeing the females on his trip who have a small stature carrying the same amount of gear as him, while female 2 speaks of being in an all-female setting and how the men they meet on portages are surprised and impressed by seeing an all girl group effectively carrying the gear across. The sense that a woman doing what a man does on wilderness trips is impressive was found in my research.

I also found that people noticed a difference between the workload divisions when on co-ed trips. Female 6 comments on how she doesn’t like it when “they [guys] assume that we can’t or don’t want to do as much [work]… [I/we girls] can go back two times to get same amount of stuff guys carry in one load”. The evidence also points to how females desire to do as much work
as males, and can succeed in a trip setting where females do the same work as men. These differences are more superficial than the differences in experiences still to be discussed.

Male 1 speaks of having an indescribable desire to have a male facilitator on his trip when he was a part of a trip with only female trip facilitators, despite not wanting to change the facilitators he had. Many of the females (3, 6, 7) noted that males have something to offer a group that you can’t get from an all female group. Another difference that females bring onto trips that was mentioned was women having their period. Male 5 mentioned having to be careful when his wife had her time of the month in bear country. Several female participants (3, 5, 7) stated that it is more about liking and getting along with your fellow wilderness trippers than about their gender. Female 7 strongly stated, “It depends on the Person [not the gender]!”

A main interview finding was the need for males and females to be together on trip to learn from and challenge one another. Female 7 stated that, “guys need to realize [that it’s] not about doing something bigger and better… [need to realize] companion aspect”. Male 8 mentioned how his tripping experience is “not overcoming obstacles, but working in relationship to land, water, etc.”. One’s wilderness tripping experience may be greatly related to what gender values one takes with them on their trip, and how these gender roles are valued on the trip. The last two comments that were discussed show the need to examine the gender values for wilderness trips in a context that shows which factors help create the most sustainable, enjoyable, educational, and beneficial trip. The comments from the participants hint at the fact that going into a landscape with the desire to conquer it can be damaging.

The interviews suggest that the differences between the two genders are less sharply defined than the framework assumes. The literature presents definite differences between the two genders, while the interviews show that there are many more factors affecting one’s wilderness tripping experience than one’s gender.

Using the Framework to Analyze the Interviews
In order to determine which aspects of the interviews correlated to the framework, and which didn’t, the assertions from the framework will be compared directly to the interviews.

1. Males and females experience wilderness trips differently from one another.

The interviewees gave mixed responses to this question, and suggest there is no definitive answer. None of the interviewees were able to say that without any constraints that there is no difference or that there is a difference between genders.

2. Women are more self-motivated for personal development than men when desiring to partake in wilderness trips. This may also be a culturally based self-motivation. Women also care more about learning from and being immersed in nature than men, as well as connecting with other people on their wilderness trips.

Most of the interviewees stated that any individual should be able to appreciate and be interested in nature as well as any other. Three of the females stated that their experience is more greatly affected by the people they are with rather than their gender, which shows that personal connections are important to the women interviewed. Whether women are more personally
motivated for self-development than men when going on wilderness trips was not discovered through the interviews.

3. Men are more challenge-oriented than women on wilderness trips.

Some interviewees stated that men are more challenge-oriented while another interviewee mentioned that it depends on the person, that gender isn’t enough to be able to determine this factor.

4. Women face more societal constraints, as well as constraints through feelings of objectification, vulnerability and fears for personal safety than men do.

None of the interviewees mentioned any of these constraints as affecting their abilities to go on wilderness out-trips. Participants of both genders re-iterated how important safety is to them. This component of the framework finds no support in the interviews.

5. Women bring the qualities of veneration and nurturing, and a dedication to succeeding without risking their lives, to wilderness trips, which men do not.

Again there was no support for this claim within the interviews.

6. There is a need for females to have a female-centred tripping methodology, which is different from the male challenge-oriented wilderness tripping methodology. These female-centred tripping methodologies focus on self-development. There is a need for this because of the negative repercussions for females being in scenarios where they have to partake in organizations where the male model is the norm.

Many of the participants mentioned how both single-gendered and mixed-gendered experiences are important to wilderness tripping experiences. There was an emphasis on learning from the other gender while on trip.

7. Women are less confident in their technical skills, or less aware of their technical abilities, than men.

If anything based on the interviewees, the men were less confident in their technical skills. This could be correlated to those particular interviewees having less experience on wilderness trips.

8. Women are at a disadvantage when it comes to wilderness tripping, whether physically or through the trip’s organization.

The disadvantage that was brought up by the interviewees for women on wilderness trips was their more limited physical strength, which many interviewees also mentioned should not be a disadvantage as the trip should be run in a way where going back on the portage is acceptable as long as the task is accomplished.

9. Gender traits are more pronounced in a single sex environment.
One of the participants mentioned how single gender trips are more important when you are younger so that the mixed gender environment would not interfere with personal development. Whether gender traits are pronounced more in a single sex environment or not, it can be seen that both single and mixed gender experiences are important.

Conclusions for Framework Analyzing Interviews

The interviews complicated all of the assertions of the framework. None of the assertions was fully affirmed or denied. Using the framework to analyze the interviews showed that there are many other factors that interfere with how gender affects one’s tripping experience. It is also understood that more people would need to be interviewed in order to obtain significant results from them, as there are many more than eight people who partake in wilderness tripping in the western hemisphere.

PHOTO: Canoe scenery (Photo Courtesy of Susannah Vanderhoeven, 2009)
6. Final Remarks

The research question – throughout time, how has gender affected one’s wilderness tripping experiences – was answered by (1) creating a timeline of gender and outdoor recreation using the technique of a literature review to answer some preliminary questions; (2) making assertions from the literature review to be tested by the following steps; (3) comparing four books ranging a period of one-hundred years, with two genders at each time period, to be tested against the framework; and (4) using a questionnaire and interview to get the experiences and opinions of eight people who currently take part in wilderness expeditions.

The literature review showed that academically there is a difference between people of each gender’s experiences. Women came into the field of wilderness tripping later than men did. It was found that the motivations and constraints for participating in wilderness tripping differ by gender. There are many different strategies for helping women to obtain an experience while wilderness tripping that is equivalent to the experiences of men. These include creating an alternative tripping methodology for women that differs from the male norm filled with challenge and creating “manliness”. This is sometimes accomplished through a single gender setting.

When the statements created in the framework were tested in the book comparison and questionnaires and interviews, it was found that the book comparison more closely fit the framework. The questionnaires and interviews complicated the framework by identifying restrictions and caveats, such as if the two participants go into the wilderness with the same expectations and attitude then there will not be any differences between the gender’s experiences.

The books showed that the differences are more complex than they appear in a different manner, as the male wilderness tripping methodology may not be better than the female way. An example is how Dillon Wallace repeatedly almost kills himself and takes nine more months than Mina Benson Hubbard to complete his journey. The differences are not black and white, as people of each gender are able to have qualities stereotypically belonging to the other. An example is how both Mina Hubbard and Julie Angus challenged themselves in accomplishing something unprecedented before. The differences are exemplified in the focus of each person’s narrative, whether on personal growth or challenge.

The framework from the literature review when used to analyze the book comparison and interviews, showed that how gender affects one’s wilderness tripping experience is complex, and surrounded too much by other factors to allow simple conclusions. It is shown that women in particular are more or less constrained by their gender depending on their situation and who they are as a person. Many of the aspects of the framework coincided with information from the book comparison and interviews.

The points of the framework where there was no agreement include the importance of a female framework for wilderness tripping (as in the books and interviews, learning from the other gender was found to be important); the types of constraints women face; and confidence in technical skills. The narratives were in a greater agreement with the framework from the literature review than the interviews were. In the interviews, there was disagreement about the extent of how gender does affect one’s wilderness tripping experience. In total, both the book
comparison and interviews showed that one’s wilderness tripping experience is affected by more than gender, and today gender may not be one of the greatest influences on one’s wilderness tripping experience.

The research in this study shows that gender does to some extent affect one’s wilderness tripping experience. In particular, gender is shown to affect one’s tripping framework, and the aspects of the trip that are important to the individual. Many other factors show how great the effect of gender is upon one’s wilderness tripping experiences. The males offered a unique viewpoint on gender, and showed the constraints in their own experiences in how a challenge-oriented mind can decrease the value of one’s experience. The gender compositions of groups going on wilderness trips may have more of an influence on how gender affects the experience than is known from this study. The study did show that both experiences are beneficial.

There have been changes in the outdoor field including it becoming more accessible to the general public, and becoming a more popular activity. Gender is no longer seen as something that can be used overtly to discriminate against someone, but there are still subtle ways of doing so. Gender can be seen as having a smaller effect on someone’s wilderness tripping experience than it did in the early 1900s, but there is still an effect nonetheless. Much of the research underlined how many other factors such as personality matter to one’s tripping experience.

The answer to the research question is that gender’s influence on one’s wilderness tripping experience has decreased since 1900. The male tripping narrative has remained similar to what it was a hundred years ago, as it still has a strong element of challenging oneself, and conquering either nature or a goal. Females tend to not emphasize those elements as much as men, and have a greater tendency to focus on the personal development aspects. The female tripping narrative has changed more than the male tripping methodology has over time. The two have perhaps become more alike, as women more successfully adopt the male strategies.

A strong point throughout the research was how similar the male tripping narrative of challenge was found to be in the book comparison. The main point of contention may not be treating women differently or giving them exclusive opportunities but in changing the wilderness tripping narrative to one that positively benefits both male and female experiences. In conclusion, how gender affects one’s tripping experiences is a combination of factors. The extent to which gender affects one’s experiences is related to cultural values, and how much gender matters to how the trip is run (i.e. program structure and the gender perspective of the people on the trip).

What Follows:

While conclusions were made from the study, certain research techniques were not able to used due to certain limitations. In the future, it is recommended that more interviews take place on the subject between both men and women, as a greater number of interviewees are needed. Some possibilities for future interviewees are married couples who go on wilderness trips together, a greater age variation in participants, a greater variation in ethnicity and a greater variation in experience level. Another alternative for a focus in the future is comparing the experiences of participants on single gender trips and/ or co-ed trips. There is also the potential to look at the effect of gender on wilderness experiences over someone’s lifespan. People who
don’t take part in wilderness trips could be interviewed to see if they are constrained by gender related variables.

Beyond whom the focus of further research could be on, from this research there was found to be some further applicable aspects into wilderness tripping programs. Further research needs to be done on how gender related narratives affect a person. Research could assist in creating a balanced narrative for tripping, so that males don’t miss out on the other aspects of wilderness tripping.

As a researcher, I would love to have the opportunity to take my research further, but have been unable to due to the limits of an undergraduate thesis.

PHOTO: A co-ed trip on the Dumoine River in Quebec with Outward Bound Canada College. (Courtesy of Susannah Vanderhoeven, September 2007)
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Appendix
Ethic’s Forms and Letters for the Participant

Ethics: Recruitment Letter

University of Waterloo

Date (Day sent to potential interviewee)

Dear (Recipient):

I am an Undergraduate student in the Department of Environment and Resource Studies at the University of Waterloo conducting research under the supervision of Professor Robert Gibson. I am researching the Affects of Gender on one’s Outdoor Recreation Experiences.

Communication research has shown that different people can interpret identical pieces of information differently because we do not all share the same interests, values, and social environment. It is this difference in interpretation that I am interested in.

There are two phases to this project. In the first phase, I selected a small number of people with wilderness tripping experiences and have sent each of these potential participants the enclosed questionnaire. You have been selected and I would appreciate if you would complete the attached, brief questionnaire.

Completion of the questionnaire would take 10 minutes of your time. Participation in this project is completely voluntary. If there are any questions that you prefer not to answer, you may skip them. If you would like to write additional comments on the questionnaire, please feel free to do so.

In the second phase of the study, I would like to conduct follow-up interviews with those who are willing from the group that has filled out this questionnaire. Participation in the interview would again be completely voluntary and you may decline answering any questions you prefer not to answer. Your involvement in the first phase of the study does not obligate you to participate in the second part. I shall contact you in about one week to determine if you would be willing to participate, and to decide on a mutually convenient time and location. You may indicate your preference at this time. The interviews may also occur by telephone if this method is preferred.

All information that you provide through your participation in this study will be kept confidential. Further, you will not be identified in the thesis or in any report or publication based on this research. There are no known or anticipated risks to participation in this study. The data collected through this study will be kept for a period of 1 year in a secure location.

It would be appreciated if you would return the completed questionnaire by e-mail to s5vander@uwaterloo.ca. If after receiving this letter, you have any questions about this study,
or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participating, please feel free to contact Professor Robert Gibson at 519-888-4567 ext. (33407), or myself, Susannah Vanderhoeven, at 226-747-7761 or e-mail at s5vander@uwaterloo.ca.

I would like to assure you that this study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo. However, the final decision about participation is yours. Should you have any comments or concerns resulting about your participation in this study, please contact Dr. Susan Sykes in the Office of Research Ethics at 519-888-4567 Ext. 36005 or ssykes@uwaterloo.ca.

If you wish to withdraw from this study, you may do so at anytime by contacting me, Susannah Vanderhoeven, with your wish to do so. At this time, all contact will be stopped in regards to the research. If you wish for any previous data collected from you to not be included in the study, it won’t be used.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation in my research.

Yours sincerely,

Susannah Vanderhoeven

Student Investigator
INFORMATION LETTER AND CONSENT FORM
FOR PHASE-TWO INTERVIEW

This letter will be sent to those participants who have completed the questionnaire and agree to participate in a short interview session.

Department Letterhead
University of Waterloo
Date

Dear (Recipient):

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in a follow-up interview. The interview is a fundamental component of my Undergraduate thesis research. The purpose of the interview is to examine some the responses that you have made in the questionnaire. For example, “How much have you enjoyed your wilderness tripping experiences?”.

Participation in this interview is completely voluntary. Completion of the interview is expected to take about one hour of your time. You may decline to answer any question that you prefer not to answer, and you may stop the interview at any time by notifying me you wish to stop. All the information you provide will be held in the strictest confidence. You will not be identified in any thesis, report or publication resulting from this study.

With your agreement, I would like to audiotape our interview to facilitate the discussion and to ensure the accuracy of the interview data. No quotations will be included in the thesis or publication without your explicit consent. The audio recordings will be kept for a period of up to a year.

This research study has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo. If you have any comments or concerns resulting from your participation, please contact Dr. Susan Šykes of the Office of Research Ethics at 519-888-4567 ext. 36005 or via her e-mail address (ssykes@uwaterloo.ca).

If you have any questions regarding the research itself, please contact either Robert Gibson at 519-888-4567 ext. 33407, by e-mail at rbgibson@uwaterloo.ca, or myself, Susannah Vanderhoeven at 226-747-7761 or by e-mail at svander@uwaterloo.ca.

From our telephone conversation, our interview has been set for:

Date: _________ at Time: _______, Place: ______________
If for any reason you would like to change this date, time or place, or wish to cancel the interview, please contact me at the above number or by e-mail. I thank you in advance for your assistance, and I look forward to speaking with you.

Yours sincerely,

Susannah Vanderhoeven
CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in a study being conducted by Susannah Vanderhoeven, an Undergraduate student in the University of Waterloo’s Department of Environment and Resource Studies who is working under the supervision of Robert Gibson. I have made this decision based on the information I have received in the information letter. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and request any additional details I wanted about this study. As a participant in this study, I realize that I will be asked to complete a questionnaire (Phase 1), take part in an interview (Phase 2), and take part in a supplementary interview/questionnaire (Phase 3). As a participant in this study, I am aware that I may decline to answer any question that I prefer not to answer or decline to participate in certain phases of the research.

I am also aware that I have the option of allowing my interview to be audio recorded to promote a more open discussion. All information that I provide will be held in confidence, and I will not be identified in the thesis or summary report. I was informed that I may withdraw my consent at any time by asking that the interview be stopped.

I am aware that this study has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo, and that I may contact Dr. Susan Sykes at 519-888-4567 ext. 36005 or ssykes@uwaterloo.ca if I have any concerns or comments resulting from my participation in this study.

I agree to participate in Phase One of this study

[Self-report questionnaires (10 minutes)]
YES   NO   (Please circle your choice)

I agree to participate in Phase Two
[An interview (60 minutes)]
YES   NO   (Please circle your choice)

Participant Name: _____________________________ (Please print)
Participant Signature: ____________________________
(or consent through telephone or e-mail is sufficient)
Witness Name: ________________________________
Witness Signature: ______________________________
Date: ____________________________
Ethics: Participant Feedback Letter

University of Waterloo
Date
Dear *(Insert Name of Participant)*,

I would like to thank you for your participation in this study entitled “Gender and Outdoor Recreation”. As a reminder, the purpose of this study is to identify the affects of gender on one’s outdoor recreation experiences.

The data collected during interviews will contribute to a better understanding of the correlation between gender and outdoor recreation.

Please remember that any data pertaining to you as an individual participant will be kept confidential. If you are interested in receiving more information regarding the results of this study, or would like a summary of the results, please provide your email address, and when the study is completed, anticipated by May 2012. I will send you the information.

In the meantime, if you have any questions about the study, please do not hesitate to contact me by email or telephone as noted below. You may also contact my supervisor, Professor Robert Gibson at 519-888-4567 ext. 33407, by e-mail at rbgibson@uwaterloo.ca. As with all University of Waterloo projects involving human participants, this project was reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo. Should you have any comments or concerns resulting from your participation in this study, please contact Dr. Susan Sykes, Director, Office of Research Ethics at 519-888-4567, Ext., 36005 or ssykes@uwaterloo.ca.

Susannah Vanderhoeven
University of Waterloo
Environment and Resource Studies
Contact Telephone Number: 226-747-7761
UW Email Address: s5vander@uwaterloo.ca
Questionnaire and Interview Questions

Stage 1: Questionnaire

Name:

Please answer the questions below, while keeping in mind that the terminology “wilderness trip” refers to experiences in the outdoors for a night or more using man powered transportation devices (i.e. Canoe trip, backpacking trip, kayak trip, dogsled trip, etc). Thank you very much for your co-operation. This survey shouldn’t take more than 30 minutes of your time.

1. Gender: Male or Female

2. When did you go on your first wilderness trip?

3. How many wilderness trips have you been on in your lifetime?

4. How long was the longest wilderness trip you have been on?

5. Have you been on wilderness trips with the opposite Gender? Yes or No
   a) If yes: Did that affect the wilderness experience? Did the different genders experience wilderness differently on trip?

6. Have you been on wilderness trips where all of the participants (leaders and students) are of one Gender (i.e. An all female or male trip)? Yes or No
   b) If yes: Did that affect the wilderness experience? Did the different genders experience wilderness differently on trip?

7. Which of the following best describes the participants on your wilderness trips?
   a) Mostly mixed-gender trips
   b) Mostly one gender trips
   c) An even balance of both types of trips
   d) Other: __________________

8. Do you have any preference for either mixed gender or one-gender trips? Why?

Stage 2: Core Research Questions to be asked during a telephone or in-person interview
Version 1 (Male 1, Female 2)

1. How much have you enjoyed your wilderness tripping experiences?
2. What does wilderness-tripping mean to you?
3. How would you say wilderness tripping has affected your life as a whole?
4. What constraints have you faced, which may have kept you from participating in wilderness expeditions? How have you overcome these constraints?
5. Did having a leader of one gender or another affect the wilderness experience?
6. Do you think there is a difference between the way that males and females experience wilderness tripping? If so what?
7. Do you feel like your gender affects your experience on wilderness trips? How so?
8. What are your thoughts about the other gender in relation to wilderness tripping?

Version 2 (Female 3, Male 4)

1. How would you define wilderness tripping?
2. What are your thoughts about nature/ the natural world?
3. How do you feel about your wilderness tripping experiences? How have they affected your life as a whole?
4. What motivates you to participate in wilderness tripping experiences?
5. What constraints have you faced, which may have kept you from participating in wilderness expeditions? How have you overcome these constraints?
6. Describe your wilderness out-tripping skills. How do you feel about your skills/ abilities? Have you ever compared your achievements to those of the opposite gender? If so, how so?
7. Do you think there is a difference between the way that males and females experience nature wilderness tripping? If so what?
8. Did having a leader of one gender or another affect the wilderness experience?
9. Describe your interactions with females on your out-tripping experiences. What qualities would you use to describe females on your out-tripping experiences?
10. Describe your interactions with males on your out-tripping experiences. What qualities would you use to describe males on your out-tripping experiences?
11. In your opinion has the importance of gender in relation to out-tripping changed over time or has it remained the same?
12. While experiencing wilderness out-trips, have you experienced any changes in the field?
13. Do you have any other comments about gender in relation to out-tripping?

Version 3 (Male 5, Female 6)

1. How would you define wilderness tripping?
2. What are your thoughts about nature/ the natural world?
3. How do you feel about your wilderness tripping experiences? How have they affected your life as a whole?
4. What motivates/motivated you to participate in wilderness tripping experiences?
5. What constraints have you faced, which may have kept you from participating in wilderness expeditions? How have you overcome these constraints?
6. How confident are you in your wilderness out-tripping skills?
7. What risks are you willing to take while on wilderness out-trip?
8. Do you think there is a difference between the way that males and females experience nature wilderness tripping? If so what?
9. Did having a leader of one gender or another affect the wilderness experience?
10. Describe your interactions with females on your out-tripping experiences.
    What qualities would you use to describe females on your out-tripping experiences?
11. Describe your interactions with males on your out-tripping experiences.
    What qualities would you use to describe males on your out-tripping experiences?
12. In your opinion has the importance of gender in relation to out-tripping changed over time or has it remained the same?
13. While experiencing wilderness out-trips, have you experienced any changes in the field?
14. Do you have any other comments about gender in relation to out-tripping?

Version 4 (Female 6, Male 7)

1. How would you define wilderness tripping?
2. How would you describe nature? What are your thoughts about nature’s role in your life?
3. How do you feel about your wilderness tripping experiences?
4. How have your wilderness tripping experiences affected your life as a whole?
5. What motivates/motivated you to participate in wilderness tripping experiences?
6. Why do you go on wilderness out-trips?
7. What constraints have you faced, which may have kept you from participating in wilderness expeditions? How have you overcome these constraints?
8. How confident are you in your wilderness out-tripping skills?
9. What risks are you willing to take while on wilderness out trips?
10. Do you feel empowered on wilderness out-trips? If so, how?
11. Do you act and feel differently in the woods versus the city? How? Why?
12. Who is a role model for you in relation to wilderness out-trips?
13. Do you think there is a difference between the way that males and females experience nature wilderness tripping? If so what?
14. Do men and women get different things out of participating in wilderness out-trips?
15. What are your thoughts on the following statement that: “going into the woods equalizes genders and allows women to be able to transcend society’s containment of female power?”
16. Are females put at a disadvantage that males do not experience while on wilderness out-trips?
17. Are women trying to follow or become like men when they go into the wilderness?
18. Other comments?