CHAPTER III: ATTRACTIVENESS ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Attractiveness analysis began early in the CORD Study, as did work on visitor flow models, but initially this research was not closely tied to visitor flow modelling. Attractivity of a park was treated as an exogenous variable by Cheung in TN 1. In fact, while the work plan for an overnight-use model was being produced, and while Cesario was making his initial proposal to develop a model, Ross was developing attractivity indices for twelve parks in Saskatchewan. To develop measures giving an ordinal indication of the relative attractiveness of different parks, he proposed a procedure that has been used to analyze the attractiveness of shopping centres. His scheme was accepted and is reported in TN 2.

From the articles in Chapter 2, one knows not only that Cheung developed attractiveness measures for Saskatchewan parks; the reader also finds that the Cesario modelling effort produced a methodology for calculating park attractiveness. The Cesario model has been used to calculate attractiveness measures for the same Saskatchewan parks for which Cheung and Ross have calculated attractiveness values. So, three different procedures have been used to calculate attractiveness measures for certain Saskatchewan parks. The results achieved are compared in CORD Study TN 9 which raises the question as to whether Cheung, Cesario, and Ross were measuring the same thing. But the matter of how to compare the Cheung, Ross, and Cesario measures of attractivity has been a cause of some controversy. CORD Study TN 28 was developed by Cheung because he felt that a comparison should be made on the basis of the "effectiveness" of various attractiveness measures in models. Cesario has objected to Cheung's use of his measure in models for which it was not designed. He argues that unless his measure can be appropriately transformed for use in other models it should be used only in the type for which it was developed. But this introduction is not the place for discussion. "Best", "effectiveness" and "appropriateness" have to do with the proper structuring of models, a problem which is taken up in CORD Study TN 19 and 35 in Chapter VII.

One paper in this chapter, although related to attractive analysis, is not directly related to the other papers. In the years 1971-3, the Planning Division of Parks Canada carried out Wild River Surveys to collect data that would be used to designate rivers with National Park potential. The first methodological report produced (based on data from the 1971 survey) was Quantitative Comparison of River Landscapes, which described the application of a technique developed by Luna B. Leopold to select wild rivers for designation as National Wild Rivers. Leopold's technique did not focus on perceptions but on determining certain properties of the resource base. This analysis and other reports about the wild rivers studied were produced “outside” the CORD Study.

The only CORD Study paper having to do with the Wild River Survey is TN 27, which reports on how data collected in a 1972 Wild River Study have been used to develop predictions of how expert canoeists will perceive the attractiveness of various sites on wild rivers. The major point made in the paper is methodological; nevertheless it is included in this chapter. The paper also has practical implications for campsite design, roadway scenic quality evaluation, and a number of other tasks which involve the evaluation of landscape.