

**Retiree's Choice of Community:
The Importance of Recreation and Parks**

Kenneth F. Backman, Ph.D.

Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management/
The Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs
Clemson University

Clemson, SC 29634-5203

Sheila J. Backman, Ph.D.

Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management
Clemson University

Clemson, SC 29634-1005

Submitted June, 1997

Revised October, 1997

Submitted exclusively to the *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*

Abstract

The economic vitality of many communities has declined as a result of changes in their economic structures. In some places, economic growth is being fostered by the immigration of retirees. This exploratory study investigated the importance of public recreation services and parks in retirees' choice of community, using a random sample of retired persons who had moved to South Carolina in the past twelve months. The instrument developed for the study was comprised of three sections: (a) importance of recreation and parks; (b) demographics, and (c) personal characteristics. Results suggest that retirees who perceive recreation or parks to have been important in their selection of a community appear to have different values and feel more attached to their new community than do those who do not perceive these services to have been important. The findings suggest that recreation park agencies have a vital role to play in the attraction of new residents.

Keywords: retiree relocation decisions, recreation parks, community attachment, values.

Retiree's Choice of Community: The Importance of Recreation and Parks

The economic vitality of many communities has declined as a result of changes in their economic structure. Economic growth in most communities had traditionally been fostered by the location of new businesses. A highly competitive situation exists between community economic development groups who are competing to attract a smaller number of businesses (Longino, 1995). Hence, for communities to emerge from the shadows of economic decline, they must develop innovative economic development policies. One facet of economic development which appears to be attracting much attention in North America is the competition between areas to attract retirees rather than companies to stimulate local economies (Longino & Biggar, 1981; Reeder & Glasgow, 1990).

Retiree migrants represent an attractive segment to many communities attempting to stimulate local economic development, because they have steady incomes and are not vulnerable to normal downturns in the national economy. Although income earned from stocks and interest fluctuates, a relatively stable income is derived from personal and federal pension benefits. This income spent locally provides economic spending benefits to the community. Hence, spending in local communities by retirees contributes to the economic health of the local community. Migrant retirees also pay taxes which support schools and other public services. The number of positive tax payers (residents who use fewer services than they pay for), the financial deposit base, the level of expertise in the community, and the volunteer base in the community represent a portion of contributions retirees give to communities.

The quality of recreation and park facilities in communities may be a significant factor which pulls retirees to new communities. Longino (1995), Haas and Serow (1993) pointed out that retirees who engage in social and cultural activities and develop ties to their new communities are more likely to be satisfied with their community, their quality of life, and tend to stay in that community. Available recreation opportunities, including parks, are likely to be important to permanent and temporary (seasonal) retiree relocaters because of their significant contribution to quality-of-life

(Aday & Miles, 1982; Glasgow, 1995; Reeder, Schneider & Green, 1993). Retiree migrants tend to be active (Craig, 1992; Longino & Marshall, 1990), participating in vigorous activities (hiking, jogging, skiing, tennis, biking, swimming) on a regular basis.

Subsequently, the quality of the recreation and park facilities may play a substantial role in retaining relocaters. The opportunity to participate in recreational, social and cultural opportunities in a community may be critical to the community's economic development efforts. If facilities are satisfactory, then relocaters are likely to stay in the community, and continue to contribute to the local economy. This information suggests that recreation professionals need to better understand the role recreation and park facilities have in retiree relocation.

Although, where retirees choose to live has been linked to recreation and park resources (Bennett, 1990; Cuba, 1992; Searle & Mahon, 1989), very little is known about how important recreation and parks are to retirees and their decision to relocate. The purpose of this paper is to examine the retiree migration market within South Carolina to gain insights into how important recreation and parks are to retiree migrants by examining the characteristics of retirees moving to a new community.

Demographic and Retirement Trends

In the 1980's, the population of Americans aged 65 and older grew rapidly. According to the 1990 census, 31.2 million Americans are aged 65 or older, an increase of 22% since 1980. The elderly now comprise 13% of the total population in the United States and this "aging trend" is accelerating. The first Baby-Boomer turned 50 in 1996. The 50 plus age group now outnumbers teens. By the year 2010, people aged 55 and over will comprise 27% of the total population: individuals 65 years and older will increase 26% over this period and people 85 years and older will increase 99% (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992).

Not only is the population aging, but the age at which people retire is declining, thus extending the number of years in retirement. From 1950 to 1980 labor force data show that retirement age has declined between four and five years for men and women (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1992). As more of the population ages, and the decline in the age of retirement more people are reaching the age of retirement sooner, and a substantial proportion of retirees relocate in retirement.

Each year more than 250,000 American households retire and relocate to another state. For some of the retirees, the move is permanent, while for others, the initial move is followed by a second. According to Hawkins (1996), 25,000 retirees will relocate again following their initial move. The number of interstate in-migrants has grown in each decade from 931,000 during the five years prior to 1960 to nearly 2 million in the five years prior to 1990 (Longino, 1995). Retiree migrants often move to destinations that offer climatic conditions conducive to their chosen activities.

In many regions of the United States, retirees are seasonal migrants, moving during the summer and winter months, but returning to their usual place of residence in the off-season. Retirees who move temporarily may have not selected a desired permanent retirement site, or they may desire only to relocate for a small proportion of the year. Seasonal migrants are predominantly white and retired, are healthy, married couples in their mid to late sixties with higher levels of income and education than the older population in general (Longino, 1995).

A substantial proportion of seasonal migrants are Canadians. According to Statistics Canada, Canadian seasonal migrants in Florida account for a quarter million people (Longino, 1995). Similar to U.S. retiree migrants, Canadian retiree relocaters usually vacation at several destinations prior to selecting a retirement destination and are married couples (Longino, 1995). Gradually, the length of the vacation is lengthened and extended to five months. In many cases, Canadian retirees return home after five months to continue their participation in the Canadian health care program. Seasonal migration to the U.S. is more common for Canadians than is permanent migration to the U.S.

The related literature suggests that retirees' decisions to relocate (permanent or seasonal) is influenced by push (those attributes that are viewed as negative in a donor community) and pull factors (those factors that make a receiving community seem attractive). The degree to which communities possess dimensions such as climate, recreational amenities, rural character, cost of living, tax policies, health and social services and opportunities for social participation will influence their perception as a push or pull dimension. Haas and Serow (1993) found that pull factors, those that attract a retiree to a community, were more salient to the migrants than push factors. The most important pull factor reported by Haas and Serow (1993) was environmental amenities of climate and scenic beauty including park resources. A second, but less important, grouping was activity amenities (including recreation and cultural attractions).

The findings of Haas and Serow (1993) should be interpreted with caution because the retiree migrants in their study had already moved to Western North Carolina, an area known for its favorable climate and scenic beauty. A sampling bias, inclusive of only those who had moved to Western North Carolina as noted by the authors, may have been interjected into the data set. Those retirees may place more importance on environmental amenities than other amenity-seeking migrants who relocate in other regions of the country. Additionally, the authors pointed out that the operationalization of important/not important as a dichotomous question limited the data analysis. The groupings of pull factors were not derived statistically, but represent arbitrarily drawn grouping in the data. For example, twenty-nine percentage points separated the first grouping (environment) from the amenity grouping. However, only three percentage points distinguished between the amenity grouping and the next item "modest tax rate." Because items were grouped by the researchers, not by statistical procedure, the reliability and significance of the groupings is suspect.

Haas and Serow's (1993) findings point to the importance of recreational opportunities as pull factors. However, the failure to provide quality recreational opportunities in these new communities may become push factors, and subsequently, retirees will leave the community. Longino

(1995) suggests that one of the keys to understanding the factors that influence retirees' likelihood to remain in the new community is understanding retirees' attachment to the new community. Attachment can be viewed as a positive affective association between individuals and their community (Shumaker & Taylor, 1993). Many researchers suggest that individuals give meaning to communities, a sense of attachment that give meaning to their lives (Buttimer, 1980; Relph, 1976). Marcus (1992) postulated that a strong sense of attachment to a community is related to an individuals' sense of well being. Opportunities for socialization and recreation contribute to the development of the retirees' attachment to the community.

Christinson (1979) pointed out that several researchers (Dillman, 1973; Plogh, 1978) have suggested that values also provide rich insights into relocation selections. Personal values are related to one's attitudes and behavior. Personal values are more stable than attitudes because they are more centrally related to the individual's cognitive system (Rokeach, 1973). According to Homer and Kahle (1988), values are better predictors of an individual's behavior over long periods of time and further serve as the determinants of attitudes.

Value and values systems and their role in consumer decision-making have received increased attention in recent years (Kahle, 1983; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994). In the context of leisure services, Pottick (1983) reported that leisure was perceived to be frustrating by individuals placing a high value on security. However, those who believed they benefited from leisure placed high value on warm relationships with others. The link between personal values and recreation activity preferences was reported by Beatty, Kahle, Homer, and Mirsa (1985). Personal values have been used successfully to differentiate between active and passive discontinuers (Backman & Crompton, 1990) and continuers and discontinuers (Backman & Crompton, 1989) of selected leisure activities.

In the context of tourism, Madrigal and Kahle (1994) found that personal values systems were better predictors of tourists' preferences than were demographic differences. Demographic differences do, however, enhance the knowledge of value segments related to tourists' selection of

attractions (Pitts & Woodside, 1986) to visits and trip planning behavior (Muller, 1991), and independent travel behavior (Madrigal, 1995).

The literature suggest that personal values will influence retirees' choice of relocation community, the importance they place on opportunities for recreation and park experiences, and attachment to the community. It is likely that the personal values of retirees who place high importance on recreation and park amenities differ from those who place low importance on recreation and park amenities.

In sum, opportunities for participation in recreational and park activities appear to be a pull factor for a segment of retiree migrants. Participation in recreation and park opportunities may be the vehicle for retiree migrants to develop a positive attachment to their new community. Retiree migrants who have developed a positive attachment to their new community are likely to perceive recreation and park opportunities as important. Personal values may provide insights into understanding differences between those retirees who place more importance on recreation and park opportunities and those who do not.

The purpose of this study was to gain insights and an understanding of the importance of recreation and park amenities to retiree migrants. Further, the study sought to profile retiree migrants in terms of their personal values and attachment to their new community. In addition to their demographic characteristics, objectives of this study were (a) to determine the importance of recreation or park services in retiree migrants' relocation decisions, (b) to identify differences between retiree migrants perceiving recreation or parks services as important in their relocation decision and those who did not, and (c) to examine the relationship between community attachment and importance of recreation or park services.

Three research questions were developed to guide this exploratory study:

1. Do retirees perceive recreation or park services as an important factor in their choice of a new community?

2. Do retirees who perceive recreation or park services as important differ with respect to age, gender, education, marital status, income, values and health from those who do not perceive recreation or parks as important in their selection of a new community?

3. Do retirees who perceive recreation or park services to have been important in their relocation decision perceive a stronger affiliation to the new community than those retirees who did not perceive recreation or park services to have been important?

This study was exploratory and was limited to individuals relocating to South Carolina. South Carolina was selected because the state is one of the four most popular retirement destinations in the eastern sunbelt. Longino et al., (1995), noted that South Carolina was one of the four major receivees of retirees to nonadjacent states. Although, it is not the intention to make causal inferences or generalized beyond this state, the insights from this study provide starting point for further research.

Method

The sample for this study was randomly selected from a group of retired people (aged 55+) who moved to South Carolina during 1990 from either the Northeast or the North Central region of the United States. The list of names used in the study was purchased from a mailing list broker. The initial list was developed from magazine, credit card, bank, newspaper, and change of address requests.

A modified Dillman Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978) mail survey was used to collect the data in the summer of 1991. The Total Design Method was modified by not including a certified mailing. A total of 595 surveys were mailed. Of these, 97 were nondeliverable and 278 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 55.8 percent. No significant differences were found in a nonresponse bias test between respondents and nonrespondents for age and income. Therefore, the achieved sample was judged to be representative of the sample of names employed in this study. Age and income were selected as comparison variables because the relocation literature suggests that retirees' age and income are related to relocation decisions.

Instrument

A self-administered survey instrument was used to collect the data. The instrument was comprised of three sections. The first section focused on how important recreation or park services were in the selection of a new community and the extent to which retirees felt a part of their new community. The second section measured migrant retirees' values and the third contained demographic questions (age, marital status, health, education, income, and gender).

The importance of recreation and park services in migrant retirees' decision to relocate was operationalized by asking migrant retirees to indicate on a five-point Likert scale (1 = very important; 5 = very unimportant) how important recreation, parks, and other public services (police, fire, garbage, sewer, public schools, water, library, public welfare and highways) were in their decision to relocate to a South Carolina community. The Cronbach Alpha reliability of this scale was .82.

Kahle's (1984) List of Values (LOV) was used to assess respondents' values. Respondents were presented with a list of eight values (excitement, fun and enjoyment in life, being well respected, self-respect, self-fulfillment, sense of belonging, security, and sense of accomplishment) and ask to indicate on a five-point Likert scale (1 = extremely important; 5 = very unimportant) how important each is to his or her life. The LOV scale has performed well in investigations of tourists'

behavior (Madrigal & Kahle, 1994) and recreation behaviors (Backman & Crompton, 1990). The Cronbach Alpha reliability of this scale was .81.

Community Attachment

Two perceptual measures of community attachment developed by Fernandez and Dillman (1979) were used in this study. The first measured the degree to which respondents identify with their communities and the second measured the degree of satisfaction with their present community. The question used to indicate community attachment and satisfaction were respectively as follows: How much do you feel a part of the community in which you live? (a) not at all, (b) not very much, (c) It makes no difference to me whether I live here or in another community, (d) I would probably be more satisfied living in another community, and (e) I would really like to leave this community if I had the opportunity.

Results

Research Question #1

To examine the importance of recreation and parks as a factor in retirees' relocation decisions, respondents were asked to rate the importance of recreation in their relocation decisions. The data in Table 1 show that recreation was the fourth most important factor, of eleven, in the retirees' choice of community whereas parks did not fare as well, ranking ninth.

Research Question #2

Do retirees who perceive recreation or parks as important differ with respect to age, gender, education, marital status, income, health and values from those who do not perceive recreation or parks as important in the selection of a new community?

Respondents were classified in four groups: (a) high recreation importance; (b) low recreation importance; (c) high parks importance; and (d) low parks importance. Those individuals indicating that recreation was extremely important or important in their selection of a community (n = 194) were classified in the high recreation importance group. Those who felt recreation was unimportant or extremely unimportant in their selection of a community were classified in the low recreation importance group (n = 56). Twenty-three "neutral" respondents were not included in this analysis. Similarly, those individuals who indicated that parks were extremely important or important (n = 135) to their selection of a new community were classified as high parks importance. Likewise, individuals were classified in the low parks importance group (n = 106) because they indicated that parks were extremely unimportant or unimportant in their decision to move to a new community. Thirty-seven "neutral" respondents were not included in this analysis.

Recreation. Results of the chi-square analysis of demographic characteristics (see Table 2) revealed that there were significant differences in family income ($\chi^2 = 10.19$, $p = .03$), and gender ($\chi^2 = 5.30$, $p = .02$), between the high and low recreation importance groups. Those reporting higher family incomes placed more importance on recreation than did lower income groups. However, using the Bonferroni procedure (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991), the adjusted p-value level became insignificant at the .05 level. Males placed more importance on recreation than did females. Further, no significant differences were found between these two groups for age, level of education, marital status, and health.

Parks. The data in Table 2 shows no significant differences were found for marital status, family income, health, age and years of education. A significant difference ($\chi^2 = 3.67$, $p = .05$) for gender was found. The largest contribution to the chi-square was found for females who did consider parks important in their decision to move. Similar to the Bonferroni correction in the context of recreation, the difference for gender became no longer significant.

Recreation. Stepwise regression was used to examine the relationship between recreation importance and respondents' values (see Table 3). Kahle and Kennedy (1988) suggested that regression analysis is the most straight forward way to examine the relationship between LOV data and the criterion variable recreation importance. No substantial correlations were found between the eight predictor variables. Using the Cp statistic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) the best fitting model contained two values (see Table 4); 9a) fun and enjoyment in life, and (b) sense of belonging and was significant ($F = 8.69$, $p = .001$). The overall adjusted R^2 for this model was .14 indicating that only a small proportion of the variance was explained. The most important predictor variable, using standardized Beta values was feeling of fun and enjoyment in life (.23).

Parks. Table 3 also depicts the stepwise regression used to examine the relationship between values and parks importance. No substantial correlation among predictor variables were found. The results suggest that a two value model which included the variables excitement and sense of belong-

ing was the best fitting model. The decision to accept this model was guided by the Cp statistic value of 1.05. The model was significant $F = 9.71$, $p = .001$; however, the adjusted R^2 value of .07 reveals that only a small proportion of the variance is explained by this model. Examination of the standardization Beta weights revealed that the most important predictor value was sense of belonging (.14).

Research Question #3

Is there a difference in level of community affiliation between those perceiving recreation or parks as important in their relocation decisions?

Recreation. The data in Table 4 reveal significant differences was found between the two groups with respect to both how much they feel a part of their community ($\chi^2 = 21.72$, $p = .05$), and how much they liked living in their community ($\chi^2 = 21.21$, $p = .05$). Those indicating recreation to be low in importance to their choice of a new community were most likely to not feel very much a part of their new community.

In contrast, individuals who perceived that recreation was important in their decision to relocate indicated they pretty much felt a part of their community. This group of respondents also reported liking their community more than did those who did not feel that recreation was important in their decision to relocate.

Parks. Similar results were found for parks (see Table 5) as was found for recreation. Those respondents who perceived parks to have been important, were more likely to feel pretty much, or very much, a part of their community than were those indicating parks as low in importance.

A significant difference was also found between high and low park importance and how well individuals like living in their community ($\chi^2 = 12.20$, $p = .05$). The data in Table 5 show that individuals who perceived parks as highly important, are less likely to leave their new community than those who perceive parks not to have been an important factor in their relocation decision.

Discussion

Retirees do not appear to view recreation or park services to have been equally important in their decision to relocate to South Carolina. The finding that recreation services were seen as more important than sewage, garbage or highway services is consistent with those of Haas and Serow (1993). This perception of recreation may be attributed to the notion of self-selection. Because these retiree migrants were pulled to an area known for its scenic beauty and abundance of recreational opportunities and retirement communities, it is likely that these pull factors were important to them. Perhaps the lower ranking of sewage, garbage or highway services can be explained by retirees' assumptions that such essential services were provided in all communities at an adequate level. It would be unlikely that retirees would be pulled to a community because of its sewage, garbage and highway services. However, communities that do not provide those services at an adequate level may push retirees out of their community, thus sending them to new communities. Furthermore, communities which did not provide adequate level of services are unlikely to be considered by retirees in the final stages of the relocation decision.

The findings from this exploratory study show no significant demographic differences between individuals who perceived recreation or parks to have been important in their relocation decision and those who did not. It is interesting to note that no significant differences were found based on retirees perceived health or age. The majority of all respondents felt that they were very healthy, and were relatively young. These findings are consistent with Longino (1995) who found that retirees tend to be healthy, younger, married and educated.

Individuals who felt recreation was an important influence in their decision to relocate to South Carolina place the greatest importance on the value "fun and enjoyment." In contrast, the value "excitement" was most associated with individuals who perceived parks as important. However, the findings from the current study suggest that this segment of retiree relocators who perceive

either recreation or parks as important to their decision to move are going to be active in their new communities. These values (fun and enjoyment and excitement) were once assumed to be associated primarily with younger adults, but now best describe people who appreciate life regardless of age (Kahle & Kennedy, 1988). Further, these retirees seem likely to take advantage of recreation and park amenities. Therefore, these new residents will place greater demands on recreation and park service providers. Recreation and park professionals will face challenges to continue to develop and deliver high quality services as the demand for services grows. Combined with greater demands for services, recreation and park professionals will also be challenged to provide services equitably to both old and new residents.

Retirees who place high importance on recreation and park services may also increase the breadth of the current services by volunteering their time. These individuals may become active recreation and park board members and or advocates for recreation and park services in the community.

Perhaps the most interesting finding relates to the relationship between importance of recreation and parks and community attachment. Those respondents most likely to feel a part of their new community, and who liked living in the new community, placed importance on recreation and parks as a factor in their decision to relocate. Place of residence may provide retirees with opportunities for sociability, sense of identity, community attachment and leisure and recreation. The data are consistent with research by Golant (1984) who argued that the impact of the community involvement is greatest on older people, and that community attachment is important for retirees' quality of life. Also, Lemon, Bengston and Peterson (1972) reported that participation in activities was positively related to life satisfaction among new movers to a community.

Recreation and park agencies have an important role to play in the recruitment and integration of the retiree migrants to their new community. In addition, personnel from recreation and park agencies can play an active role as new residents adjust to their new communities. The breadth of

senior programs may need to be expanded in terms of the types of services offered. For example, focus group interviews might be held with new residents to ascertain their likes, dislikes, complaints or complements related to the quality of recreation and park services. By using such a process, adjustments could be made in current programming. Additionally, a community's recreation programs may provide initial access to the community for retirees seeking places to relocate. An expanding dynamic recreation program focused toward retiree relocaters is essential in communities highly impacted by this demographic-cohort.

Although, most research attention has been focused on the receiving community, sending communities will also be faced with challenges as retiree migration continues. One of the issues policy-makers in the communities of origin must face regarding retirees who migrate for the winter or permanently, is the loss to the local economies. To demonstrate this impact consider a community of 100,000 of which 20,000 are retirees. If five percent or 1,000 of these retirees leave the community for 20 weeks each year to travel to warmer areas, the direct economic loss to the community is \$2.5 million (Henderson, 1994). This financial loss is substantial to most communities the size of our example, not to mention the loss of jobs that would come from removal of this money from the local economy.

The majority of retirees making moves are wealthier, younger, and healthier than most of the retired population in their community of origin (Hazelbrigg & Hardy, 1995). Thereby leaving generally the more dependent (either financially or physically) older retired population in the community for the local public and private services to care for. The sending communities not only lose direct economic impact but may also lose social and cultural opportunities and recreation and park advocates. This decrease in the expanse of recreation programs and services may be attributed to the financial inability of the community (both government and residents) to support these programs.

Sending communities also lose potential recreation and cultural program leaders, as individuals migrate south for the winter. Community recreation programs will be challenged to find skilled individuals willing to lead programs from the population which has chosen to age in place.

Implications for Professional Practice

The findings from this study suggest that:

- a. Recreation and park professional should be key players in the drafting of economic development policy in communities.
- b. Recreation and park amenities need to be designed and developed with retirees in mind.
- c. The quality of recreation and park services in local communities must meet retirees' expectations, if the community wishes to retain this segment.
- d. Retiree migrants represent a potential pool of volunteers for park and recreation departments.
- e. Retiree migrants are active healthy persons who will become involved in local programs/services, thus increasing the demand for selected leisure opportunities.

Conclusion

Certainly, the attraction of retiree migrants is now highly competitive. People retiring and vacationing according to McCarthy and Morrison (1979), are emerging as key economic growth areas. In essence, these economic growth arenas have tremendous potential for influencing a community's economic stability as well as the range of services offered. Retirees who relocate are truly attractive economic development "targets" for many communities because they are healthy, educated, active and financially stable individuals. Recreation and park agencies have an important role to play in economic development, because the availability and diversity of recreation and park opportunities is a key decision factor in relocation decisions. "Recreation and leisure services have become critical components in our economy. In local economies, public recreation and parks can play a role in economic enhancement by contributing to the quality of life in ways which attract businesses and new residents" (Dateline: NRPA, 1993).

References

Aday, R.H., & Miles, L. (1982). Long-term impacts of rural migration of the elderly: Implications for research. The Gerontologist, *22* (3), 331-336.

Backman, S.J., & Crompton, J.L. (1989). Discriminating between continuers and discontinuers of two public leisure services. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, *7* (4), 56-71.

Backman, S.J., & Crompton, J.L. (1990). Differentiating between active and passive discontinuers of two leisure activities. Journal of Leisure Research, *22*, 197-212.

Beatty, S.E., Kahle, L.R., Homer, P.M., & Mirsa, S. (1985). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values. The list of values and the Rokeach value survey. Psychology and Marketing, *3*, 181-200.

Bennett, D.G. (1990). The impact of elderly in-migration on private and public economic development efforts in predominantly rural areas along the South Atlantic coast. Springfield, VA: U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service.

Buttimer, A. (1980). Home, reach and the sense of place. In A. Buttimer & D. Seamon (Eds.), The human experience of space and place (pp. 166-187). London: Croom Helm.

Christinson, J.A. (1979). Value orientations of potential migrants and nonmigrants. Rural Sociology, *44* (2), 331-344.

Craig, W.J. (1992). Seasonal migration of the elderly: Minnesota snowbirds. Southeastern Geographer, 32 (1), 38-50.

Cuba, L. (1992). Aging places: Perspectives on change in Cape Cod community. The Journal of Applied Gerontology, 11 (1), 64-83.

Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D.A. (1973). Population distribution policy and people's attitudes: Current knowledge and needed research. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing.

Frenandez, R.R., & Dillman, D.A. (1979). The influence of community attachment on geographic mobility. Rural Sociology, 44 (2), 345-360.

Glasgow, N. (1995). Retirement migration and the use of services in nonmetropolitan counties. Rural Sociology, 60 (2), 224-243.

Golant, S.M. (1984). A place to grow old: The meaning of environment in old age. New York: Columbia University Press.

Haas, W., III, & Serow, J. (1993). Amenity retirement migration process: A model and preliminary evidence. The Gerontologist, 33 (2), 212-220.

Hawkins, M. (1996). South Carolina as a retirement state. The South Carolina Policy Forum, 7 (1), 26-33.

Hazelrigg, L.E., & Hardy, M.A. (1995). Older adult migration to the Sunbelt: Assessing income and related characteristics of recent migrants. Research on Aging, 17 (2), 209-234.

Henderson, D. (1994). Estimates of retiree spending in the retail and service sectors of a community. Journal of the Community Development Society, 25, (2), 259-276.

Homer, P., & Kahle, L. (1988). A structured equation test of the value-attitude behavior hierarchy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 638-646.

Kahle, L.R., & Kennedy, P. (1988). Using the list-of-values (LOV) to understand consumers. The Journal of Services Marketing, 2 (4), 49-56.

Kahle, L.R. (1984). The values of Americans: Implications for consumer adaptation. In R.E. Pitts, Jr., & A.G. Woodside (Eds.), Personal values & consumer psychology (pp. 77-86). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Kahle, L.R. (1983). Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America. New York: Praeger.

Lemon, B., Bengston, V.L., & Peterson, J. (1972). An exploration of the activity theory of aging: Activity types and life satisfaction among in-movers to a retirement community. Journal of Gerontology, 27 (5), 511-523.

Longino, C.F. (1995). Retirement migration in America. Houston: Vacation Publications.

Longino, C.F., & Biggar, J.C. (1981). The impact of retirement migration on the South. The Gerontologist, 21, 283-290.

Longino, C.F., & Marshall, V.W. (1990). North American research on seasonal migration. Aging and Society, 10, 229-235.

Madrigal, R., & Kahle, L. (1994). Predicting vacation activity preferences on the basis of value-system segmentation. Journal of Travel Research, 4, 22-28.

Madrigal, R. (1995). Personal values, traveler personality type, and leisure travel style. Journal of Leisure Research, 27 (2), 125-142.

Marcus, C. (1992). Environmental memories. In I. Altman & S.M. Low (Eds.), Human behavior and environment (pp. 87-112). New York: Plenum.

Muller, T.E. (1991). using personal values to define segments in an international tourism market. International Marketing Review, 8, 57-70.

McCarthy, K.F., & Morrison, P.A. (1979). The changing demographic and economic structure of nonmetropolitan areas in the United States, (R.2399-EDA). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Pitts, R.E., & Woodside, A. (1986). Personal values and travel decisions. Journal of Travel Research, 25, 20-25.

Plogh, L.A. (1978). The reversal in migration patterns: Some rural development consequences. Rural Sociology, 43, 293-303.

Pottick, K.J. (1993). Work and leisure. In L.R. Kahle (Ed.), Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America (pp. 117-142). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Reeder, R.J., Schneider, M.J., & Green, B.L. (1993). Attracting retirees as a development strategy. In D.L Barkley, (Ed.), Economic adaptation: Alternatives for nonmetropolitan areas (127-144). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Reeder, R.J. & Glasgow, N.L. (1990). nonmetro retirement counties' strengths and weaknesses. Rural Development Perspectives, 6 (2), 12-17.

Relph, E. (1976). Place and placeness. London: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (1991). Essential of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Searle, M.S., & Mahon, M.J. (1989). Recreation as a motive for moving among older adults. Paper presented at the National Recreation and Park Association Symposium on Leisure Research, San Antonio, TX. 1989 Abstracts of Presentations.

Shumaker, S.A., & Taylor, R.B. (1993). Towards a clarification of people-place relationships: A model of attachment to place. In R. Feinmer & E.S. Geller, (Eds.), Environmental Psychology (pp. 219-251). New York: Prager.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1989). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

U.S. Bureau of Census, (1992). U.S. census of population: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Williams, R.M. (1979). Individual and group values. Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 37 (1), 20-37.

Table 1. Importance of Services in Relocation Decisions

Service	Mean	Std.	Rank
Fire	1.78	.82	1
Police	1.84	.89	2
Water	1.88	.86	3
Recreation	2.09	.82	4
Sewer	2.11	.97	5
Garbage	2.19	.93	6
Highways	2.20	.96	7
Library	2.39	.99	8
Parks	2.61	.98	9
Public School	3.57	1.31	10
Public Welfare	3.61	1.85	11

(1 = very important; 5 = very unimportant)

Table 2. Results of Analyses of Demographic Characteristics

	Recreation Importance		Parks Importance	
	High	Low	High	Low
Marital Status (%)				
Never Married	4.1	3.6	5.7	1.8
Married	85.1	75.0	80.0	87.3
Separated/Divorced	4.1	7.1	5.0	4.6
Widowed	6.7	14.3	9.3	6.3
	X² = 4.42, df = 3, p = .22		X² = 6.46, df = 3, p = .33	
	adjusted p = .88		adjusted p = 1.32	
Family Income (%)				
Less than \$15,000	2.2	9.8	3.9	3.9
\$15 - 29,999	22.5	23.5	26.6	17.3
\$30 - 44,999	22.0	31.4	26.6	22.1
\$45 - 59,999	18.1	13.7	17.2	16.3
Over \$60,000	35.2*	21.6	25.7	40.4
	X² = 10.19, df = 4, p = .03		X² = 6.46, df = 4, p = .17	
	adjusted p = .12		adjusted p = .68	
Gender (%)				
Male	81.4*	68.1	66.2	77.3*
Female	18.6	31.9	33.8	22.7
	X² = 5.30, df = 1, p = .02		X² = 3.67, df = 1, p = .05	
	adjusted p = .08		adjusted p = .20	
Health (%)				
Very Healthy				
Somewhat Healthy	57.5	55.4	59.4	53.6

Table 2 (continued)

	Recreation Importance		Parks Importance	
	High	Low	High	Low
	STD = 9.11	STD = 10.85	STD = 9.918	STD = 8.90
Not Very Healthy	40.9	41.1	37.7	44.6
	1.6	3.5	2.9	1.8
	X² = 0.92, df = 2, p = .63		X² = 1.36, df = 2, p = .51	
	adjusted p = 2.52		adjusted p = 2.04	
Age (x)	62.1	61.7	61.7	61.9
	t = .26, p = .78		t = .03, p = .96	
Level of Education (x)	14.9	14.3	14.7	14.7
	STD = 2.176	STD = 2.54	STD = 2.34	STD = 2.33
	t = 1.56, p = .12		t = .01, p = .98	
Bonferroni Correction p	$\frac{P_j \sum W}{W_j}$ adjusted =			

Table 3. Stepwise Regression of Values on High vs. Low Recreation and Park Importance to Community

Selection

Values	Recreation ¹		Parks ²	
	Order of entry into the model	Standardized B-Value	Order of entry into the model	Standardized B-Value
Excitement	4	0.042	2	0.082*
Fun and enjoyment in life	1	0.232*		
Being well respected	3	-0.069		
Self respect				
Self-fulfillment				
Sense of belonging	2	0.082*	1	0.149*
Security				
Sense of accomplishment			3	0.067

* Significant at the p = .01 level

1. The two variable model adjusted $R^2 = 0.14$ for recreation.

2. The two variable model adjusted $R^2 = 0.07$ for parks.

Table 4. Results of Chi-square Analyses of Community Affiliation by Importance of Recreation

	Importance		X ²
	High	Low	
How much do you feel a part of your community? (%)			21.72*
Not at all	2.5	5.4	
Not very much	14.7	41.1	
Pretty much	50.8	26.8	
Very much	32.0	26.7	
How much do you like living in this community? (%)			21.21*
I would never consider leaving here.	1.52	16.0	
I would move to another community if I had to, but would be reluctant to leave here.	71.1	46.4	
It makes no difference to me whether I live here or in another community.	6.6	26.8	
I would probably be more satisfied living in another community	5.0	9.0	
I would really like to leave this community if I had the opportunity.	2.1	1.8	

* Significant at the p = .05 level

Table 5. Results of Chi-square Analyses of Community Affiliation by Importance of Parks

	Importance		X ²
	High	Low	
How much do you feel a part of your community? (%)			9.37*
Not at all	2.8	3.6	
Not very much	14.8	30.0	
Pretty much	47.9	41.9	
Very much	34.5	24.5	
How well do you like living in this community? (%)			12.20*
I would never consider leaving here.	19.3	8.2	
I would move to another community if I had to, but would be reluctant to leave here.	67.1	64.4	
It makes no difference to me whether I live here or in another community.	10.0	14.6	
I would probably be more satisfied living in another community	2.9	9.1	
I would really like to leave this community if I had the opportunity.	.7	2.7	

* Significant at the p = .05 level