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The goal of this dissertation is to investigate the lived experiences of multi-locational actors and the production of unique forms of socialization and community using the seasonal movements and settlements of the Québécois population (also referred to as “Floribécois”) in Broward County, Florida during the winter months. This study employs interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) which is theoretically rooted in hermeneutic phenomenology. IPA recognizes that there are shared perspectives and lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon. This analysis comprises of collectively shared meanings, while being mindful of the unique experience of a single individual and/or subgroup. The IPA methodology is especially applicable in this study because its emphasis is on the construction of meaning, context, and various aspects of everyday life practices within social phenomena. The findings of this thesis tie together meanings from the narratives. What emerged were themes of familiarity, consistency and reliability vis-a-vis space, a relationship between spontaneity/adventure
and limitations of sameness, repetition, and routine in relation to the concept of “freedom”. The narrative of mobility as freedom in these cases converged to stories about having a place where individuals carve out private spaces and have “freedom” of choice about everyday routines. Such different practices and subjectivities display another way of interacting with existing forms of space and mobility, unlocking lifestyles untethered from the restraint of existing theories. In sum, this study reveals how a new sense of self is formed and redefined, and how mobility and space configurations are constantly shifting within existing structures.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Map of Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) park
City of Hollywood, Broward County (Florida ARVC, n.d.)

Map of RV Parking Spaces at TY Park
(Florida ARVC, n.d.)
This guy arrives tomorrow.
This one has a cold.
This one doesn’t speak English.
This one is a prof.
This one is an accountant and goes to library.
(February 2020)

The 88-year-old Québécois campground host pointing to RVs as he and the researcher drive by each spot.
Naturally, I have always been curious about mobility and space. As an Iranian national, my mobility rights have been limited at best and visas denied at worst. When I joined my father, who had applied for asylum in Bonn, Germany, my Iranian passport was replaced with a folded piece of paper that was to be my ID card. We were not allowed to move beyond the vicinity of the town we were living in without prior permission from the authorities. There were discussions about why refugees had less space to move about in their communal refugee shelters than what was legally permitted for a German shepherd dog. Police were allowed to stop and ask for an ID wherever we were. We were not allowed to work or study until we had a “status” and until then, we were considered “Staatenlos” or a person without a state. As a 19-year-old, I was not bothered by any of this. The one thing that was agonizing was being on stand-by for five years, watching young women of my age go to university, hang out with their peers and graduate. After my family received their refugee status, it was difficult to apply for jobs that required international travel, join fellow students on international exchanges, or jump on a plane to go to another country. Later, my mobility came to a grinding halt when I came to the U.S. and applied for a Green Card. Due to status complications, I could not exit the U.S. for 15 years. Not surprisingly, I imagined what it would be like, the things I would do, and where I would go once I had a U.S. passport and all the privileges that came with it. For a long time, despite the vastness of the US, I was living an immobile life.

During my walks around the lake in Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) park (155 acre park, established in 1972, City of Hollywood, Broward County, which is near my home) I would go by the recreational vehicles (RV) with license plates that had the inscription “Je
During the winter months, our neighborhood, from the beaches to the grocery store to the yoga studio, expanded to include Canadians fleeing the cold weather. I was fascinated by the notion that people who were not necessarily retirees or snowbirds came to the same spot year after year. Why would one want to go to the same place for ten to fifteen years when there was so much more to explore in the world? Why take the exhausting three-day drive south in an RV, pay almost $2,100 a month for a small concrete slab to park the RV when one could fly to Lisbon in nine hours and spend a fraction of that per month? I came to this community as an academic who did not share all their interests, but with a curiosity and sensitivity to this type of seasonal lifestyle mobility. I wanted to learn more. Furthermore, it was important that I approach the participants’ experiences through their descriptions, and for me to lay aside (or bracket) my biases, assumptions, and the tendency to use my past principles to describe or analyze their narratives (Giorgi 2009). The use of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) method has impacted my interpretations and basic assumptions specifically around the concept of mobility and freedom. Although the COVID-19 pandemic has been challenging, thankfully I had just finished my last interview in February 2020 before the park and the RV spaces were closed in March 2020.

Recent scholarship in “seasonal lifestyle tourism” has indicated that it is driven by individuals whose moderate wealth allows them to explore a more comfortable lifestyle (Williams & Hall, 2002; Miyazaki, 2008; Åkerlund & Sandberg, 2015; Weiske, Petzold & Schad, 2015). Situated in an indeterminate state between migration and tourism, this occurrence has been variously labelled as “second home tourism” (Hall & Müller, 2004; Hiltunen, 2007), “residential tourism” (Tomas, 2006; O’Reilly, 2007; McWatters,
2009), and “lifestyle migration” (Sato, 2001; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Benson, 2011a, 2011b). These scholars point out: 1) Seasonality, both in migration and tourism, can be ascribed to institutional and climatic factors (Hartman, 1986; Butler, 1994); 2) The important role of retirement migration (Gustafson, 2002); and 3) Annual seasonal migration - also known as “repeat visitation”. The latter are also known as “holiday repeats”, “destination attachment”, “revisit intention”, or “destination loyalty” (Gitelson & Compton, 1984; Oppermann, 1998, 2000; Lehto, O’Leary & Morrison, 2004; Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Li, Cai, Lehto & Huang, 2010; Morais & Lin, 2010). Overall, lifestyle migration is centered on the sense that there is a more satisfying way of life offered elsewhere (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Åkerlund & Sandberg, 2015).

While this scholarship has produced meaningful analyses of “lifestyle migrants” whose economically privileged status to relocate affords them a general ease of mobility and border-crossing, it has less to say about the lived experiences of “Movers” who often change their mobility practices (expected and known mobility changes and subtle mobility changes through time). This matters all the more as the concept of lifestyle mobilities has been invigorated and enabled under accelerating global circumstances and has slowly come to gain increasing significance among a growing scholarship on lifestyle migration.

---

1 Here, the term “Movers” refers to seasonal lifestyle tourists. All subsequent references that are used in the text will have the first letter in caps and without quotation marks. This term originates from the development of the “mover-stayer” model (Blumen, Kogan, and McCarthy 1955 that identifies two types of individuals: stayers, those who remain permanently in their states of origin, and movers, who are homogeneous in their transition behavior and follow the Markov probability process. The term “Movers” has now come to be loosely used by most mobility scholars to refer to persons and/or groups who move from one geographical location to another for a period of time.
In examining seasonal lifestyle mobilities in relation to experiential properties of space (Buttimer & Seamon, 1980; Pred, 1984; Featherstone, 1987; Massey, 1997; Thrift, 1999; Crouch, 2001; Thrift, 2004a, 2004b; Cresswell, 2010; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Anderson & Harrison, 2010), my dissertation offers a broader perspective than the divide between migration and tourism, breaking down the binary divide between the two. The call to view mobile lifestyles implicates a broader understanding of linkages in present-day travel. More work needs to be done on the adaptable and flexible processes involved in translocal movements, including concepts of fixed/fluid territorially, how temporal and spatial dimensions are renegotiated, and the ways in which locations become sites of multi-perspective arrangements, role reclassifications, social relationships, distance and language are navigated.

The primary goal of the dissertation is to investigate the lived experiences of multi-locational actors and the production of unique forms of socialization and community using the seasonal movements and settlements of the Québécois population in Broward County, Florida during the winter months (also referred to as “Floribécois”).

At the heart of the research strategy is an interest in the personal narratives of the Québécois who come to Broward County Florida during the winter season on an annual basis (between November to April). Specifically, I am curious about English-speaking

---

2 Used by Alvarez et al. (2014) to highlight the diverse scales through which cross-border interactions occur. “Translocality” underlines the significance of space and scale in relation to actions, that is, not only are individuals shaped by “being” but also by their social, geographical, economic, and political space. At the same time, their accessible mobility is situated within time/space.

3 According to Rémy Tremblay (2009), “it is hard to pinpoint the origin of the word ‘Floribécois’ (Floribec in English) but it appears to have been adopted in the 1970s by Quebec residents wintering in Florida and made official in a study by Louis Dupont in the 1980s”. All subsequent references that are used in the text will have the first letter in caps & without quotation marks.
and working professionals, semi-retired, and retired residents of Quebec who come to Broward County and stay at Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) RV park.

The research that is closest to my project is Godefroy Desrosiers-Lauzon’s *Florida’s Snowbirds: Spectacle, Mobility, and Community Since 1945* (Desrosiers-Lauzon’s, 2011). However, he only devotes one chapter, “A Canadian Snowbird Case Study” to both English-Canadian and French-Canadian snowbirds who come to Florida in the winter months. The participants in my study are not snowbirds, most are working professionals or business owners who fly back and forth between Broward County and Quebec during the winter months. Also, Desrosiers-Lauzon’s view is that of a historian; using a historiographical approach to tourism in Florida, his body of academic work is in line with “Sunbelt scholarship”. The focus in his chapter is chiefly on the sociability and neighborliness aspect of the Québécois population in Hollywood (Broward County).

Another author, Louis Dupont who first characterized this community as the “Floribécois” highlights the businesses owned or operated by French speaking migrants who cater to the French-speaking tourists from Canada (Dupont, 1985). Building on the work of Dupont, Remy Tremblay’s work is also that of a historian centered on the French-speaking community in and around Miami Beach between 1946 and 1960 (Tremblay, 2006). Robert Harney’s 1989 article “The palmetto and the maple leaf: patterns of Canadian migration to Florida” also tackles this population from a historiographical perspective. Serge Dupuis’s 2016 work on the same population is in French with the title of *Plus peur de l’hiver que du Diable: Une histoire des Canadiens français en Floride* (More afraid of the winter than the devil: A history of French-Canadians in Florida). Betty Lou Lynn’s dissertation *Lifestyle change decisions and*
seasonal migration: A Canadian perspective (2000), submitted to the Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counseling at University of Toronto, includes interviews, questionnaires, and participant observations of seven elderly Canadian couples who migrate to Florida in the winter months. Her research and analysis are based on theoretical considerations in gerontology. In her study, the focus of the research is on the relationship of themes that arose out of the study to decision-making, social policy, and health care. These works were all useful in my research with regards to the history of the Québécois and demographics. However, almost all such publications were in French (Lynn’s dissertation and Desrosiers-Lauzon’s book are in English), the population they study are snowbirds and the elderly, none approach the study from the perspective of working professionals or semi-retired Québécois’ experiential properties of space using phenomenology (Jackson, 1996), nor do they consider the population’s experienced, lived, and conceived everyday practices with the analytical lens of interpretative methodologies (Lucius-Hoene, 2000; Creswell & Poth, 2017).

Although the value of examining the concept of lifestyle mobilities has come to gain increasing significance among a growing scholarship on lifestyle migration, it has not been subject to a deeper and more sustained investigation. Since seasonal lifestyle mobilities destabilize notions of “home”, this project also challenges binary ideas of spontaneity/familiarity, transience/rootedness, freedom/unfreedom, excitement/routine, and living an untethered and/or conventional lifestyle (Foley & Hayllar, 2007; Hardy, Hanson & Gretzel, 2012; Brooker & Joppe, 2014; Pearce & Wu, 2018). Such issues resonate in society as seasonal lifestyles, location clustering and the concept of rootedness become more commonplace. This study is urgent as seasonal lifestyle
mobilities have not been studied in relation to experiential properties of space, raising questions about how mobile lifestyles are formed between the grey zone of tourism and migration, in affective, embodied ways. In addition, this research will contribute significantly to studies about translocal spaces and evolving forms of lifestyle mobilities, more specifically, about how the Québécois conceptualize and experience space through the lens of social relationships and identities.

The theoretical framework that informs this study integrates two important fields of inquiry: mobility and experiential properties of space. My project will make significant contributions to the emerging field of research on seasonal lifestyle mobilities (Bell & Ward, 2000; Hall & Müller, 2004; Bell & Hollows, 2006; Cresswell, 2006; Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a; Benson, 2010; Benson, 2011a, 2011b; Duncan, 2011; Ralph & Staeheli, 2011; Bell, 2014), and is discussed in relation to experiential properties of space (Seamon, 1980; Pred, 1984; Featherstone, 1987; Massey, 1997; Thrift, 1999; Crouch, 2001; Thrift, 2004a, 2004b; Cresswell, 2010; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a; Anderson & Harrison, 2010). Traditionally, the concept of mobility has been viewed through a positivist lens in that it denotes the movement of people, money, goods, and ideas across space (Lyons & Urry, 2005; Pooley, Turnbull & Adams, 2005; Spinney, 2009; Bissell, 2010; Sheller, 2011; Shaw & Hesse, 2010; Pooley et al., 2012; McIlvenny, 2014; McIlvenny, Broth & Haddington, 2014). The “mobilities” turn (Hannam, Sheller & Ully, 2006; Merriman, 2007, 2009; Cresswell, 2010) has accentuated the social production of mobility and the accompanying “speed” and “slowness” of different undertakings and movements. Experiential properties of space shifts standard geographical treatments of space, where it is associated with the intangible form of space.
and place, with the more lived and experiential (Massumi, 2002; Davidson & Bondi, 2004; Thrift 2004a; Anderson, 2006; Husserl, 2006; Ihde, 2009; Bissell 2010; Dewsbury, 2010; Merriman, 2013; Spinney, 2015).

The everyday experience and rhythm of Movers is conditioned by their multilevel consumption across worlds and varying forms of belonging to local spaces (Lefebvre, 2014; Edensor, 2010). This form of temporary mobility as a multifaceted phenomenon reshapes established analyses of mobility, anchoring and mobility, and social relationships. Moreover, the constraints associated with translocal ties, ritualizations, local and virtual interactions, interdependencies between multi-local actors, as well as spatial and temporal aspects make possible a range of methodological processes for empirical studies on temporary mobility.

My research design connects phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994; Jackson, 1996), with the analytical lens of interpretative methodologies (Lucius-Hoene, 2000; Creswell & Poth, 2017) into seasonal lifestyle mobilities (Bell & Ward, 2000; Hall & Müller, 2004; Bell & Hollows, 2006; Cresswell, 2006; Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a; Benson, 2010; Benson, 2011a, 2011b; Duncan, 2011; Ralph & Staeheli, 2011; Bell, 2014). Arguing for a phenomenological anthropology, Jackson (1996) writes: “the task for anthropology is to recover the sense in which experience is situated within relationships and between persons if the lifeworld is to be explored as a field of intersubjectivity and not reduced to objective structures or subjective intentions” (p. 26). Such an approach complements interpretative methodologies in that practices are examined as a main analytical category, thus situating them as not only sociohistorical constructs but also as embodied subjectivities – that is, the association between places,
bodies and mobilities that shape temporal and spatial dimensions. For the present study I have opted for a method called interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) (Smith, Jarman & Osbourne, 1999). The foundations of IPA are theoretically rooted in hermeneutic phenomenology. IPA has its foundation in phenomenology because it maintains that one can probe experiences and how they are given value through informants’ lifeworld. IPA states that efforts at understanding the informant’s perception entails interpretative attempts on the part of the researcher (Smith, 2004). As a result, its strength lies in how informants describe their experiences and identify meaning (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). Since IPA recognizes that there are shared perspectives and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon, the analysis comprises collectively shared meanings, while being mindful of the unique experience of a single individual and/or subgroup (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). Such an approach grants explorations beyond what Bloch (1998) has called “taken-for-granted” knowledge (p. 45). IPA advances the means by which researchers interpret social phenomena within embedded contexts and how meaning is constructed around everyday life practices.

The IPA methodology is especially applicable in this study because its emphasis is on the construction of meaning, context, and various aspects of everyday life practices within social phenomena. The supporting literature used to analyze the qualitative data collected are Clark Moustakas’ Phenomenological Research Methods (1994), John Creswell and Cheryl N. Poth’s Qualitative inquiry and research design (2017) and H. R. Bernard, Amber Y. Wutich and Gery W. Ryan’s Analyzing qualitative data: systematic approaches (2017). IPA is particularly well suited in this research as it enables a contextual and condensed analyses of the phenomenon under investigation. I am
interested in what would be revealed from a population whose annual lifestyle mobility is from their home-spaces in Quebec to their RV-spaces in Broward County. I will examine the experiences of the Québécois who fit the following description: French Canadians from Quebec who self-identify as being part of the “Floribécois” community, and who annually migrate and live in RVs during the winter months in Broward County, southeast Florida. This mode of inquiry allows the lived experiences of participants to be revealed naturally via their perceptions, this method limits one from taking over as a researcher (Moustakas, 1994; Jackson, 1996; Lucius-Hoene, 2000; Giorgi, 2009; Martin, 2012; Creswell & Poth, 2017).

In addition, in order to place human experiences within the context of lived experiences, I have chosen a phenomenological approach that aligns with experiential properties of space (Seamon, 1980; Pred, 1984; Featherstone, 1987; Massey, 1997; Thrift, 1999; Crouch, 2001; Thrift, 2004a, 2004b; Cresswell, 2010; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Anderson & Harrison, 2010). The qualitative approach that I will use is a central open-ended question. In this way, the subjectivity of the participants and their own personal interpretation of experiences is at the forefront (Creswell & Poth, 2017). At the same time, a system that codifies and describes (Giorgi, 2009; Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009; Martin, 2012) these lived experiences will be used as the main procedure and are presented in the chapter overview of the chapters below follows.

Chapter two provides an overview of the terms “seasonal lifestyle mobilities”, “place”, “space” and “spatial”, by drawing on scholarship from lifestyle migration literature, mobilities and tourism theories, and place/space-specific scholarship. Chapter three presents a literature review outline of phenomenology and its use in social sciences.
Chapter four begins with a short history of how Florida as a space was “inhabited”. It then presents the structures and processes that were needed in order for the French-Canadian community (the Québécois) to arrive in significant numbers. This study is heavily inspired by the phenomenological tradition of describing shared meanings and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon. As a result, the fifth chapter comprises of the research procedures and the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) (Smith, Jarman & Osbourne, 1999). The final sixth chapter contextualizes the subjective perspective of the interviewees and presents the results and findings.
CHAPTER 2
LIFESTYLE MIGRATION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the terms “seasonal lifestyle mobilities”, “place”, “space” and “spatial”, by drawing on scholarship from lifestyle migration literature, mobilities and tourism theories, and place/space-specific scholarship. This overview provides not only a critical literature review, but also presents evaluation of existing theory and research.

The chapter begins by providing an overview of lifestyle and migration theories. It then situates those terms within the context of the “mobility turn” (Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006) and experience or the phenomenology of place and space. Next, key debates within the field of lifestyle migration are examined in order to demonstrate how the issues of “quality of life” and “tourism” have been studied in relation to people who move from the Global North to both Global South and other Global North countries with warmer climates. Finally, after quickly reviewing the history of place/space-specific scholarship, the chapter highlights the key notions of place attachment, sense of place and experiential properties of space.

Reviewing these conceptual frameworks will focus on the main goals of the research:

1. How do translocal spaces condition everyday practices and the sense of place of bi-local residences?
2. What is the role of mobility in restructuring the modes of living of the Floribécois?
3. How are class identities and language negotiated within new, adaptable and flexible translocal spaces?

More specifically, this literature review aims to bring together existing approaches to seasonal lifestyle mobilities in order to examine how seasonal movements disrupt concepts of fixed territorially and how place/space can be used as a useful tool of analysis to understand how translocal spaces can be identified through meaning, time and occurrences.

Moreover, my work on the seasonal movements and unique settlements such as RVs in Broward County, Southeast Florida aims to broaden current understandings of how mobility is grounded in temporal and spatial dimensions where locations become sites of multi-perspective arrangements, role reclassifications, socio-economic differentiations and other socially stratifying factors. In so doing, this project will contribute to existing scholarship on mobilities, where they are re-imagined as flexible and comprised of multifaceted interactions (Hannam, Sheller & Ully, 2006) on the one hand and “embedded [in] daily routines and practices, and emergent social structures” (O’Reilly, 2007, p. 139) on the other.

Defining Lifestyle Migration

When Ulrika Åkerlund wrote in 2013 that “contemporary mobilities can in many ways be claimed to be ‘in-between’, and of a fluid and flexible nature” (p. 23), this meant that terms such as “lifestyle migration” or “seasonal lifestyle mobilities” were also fluid and flexible. This phenomenon located in the indeterminate state between migration and tourism has been variously labelled as “second home tourism” (Hall & Müller, 2004;
Hiltunen, 2007), “residential tourism” (Rodriguez, Fernández-Mayoralas & Rojo, 1998; Tomas, 2006; O’Reilly, 2007; McWatters, 2009), “amenity migration” (Gosnell & Abrams, 2009), and “lifestyle migration” (Sato, 2001; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Benson, 2011a, 2011b). Furthermore, annual seasonal migrations have been referred to as “repeat visitation”, “holiday repeats”, “destination attachment”, “revisit intention”, and “destination loyalty” by those who have studied such phenomena (Gitelson & Compton, 1984; Oppermann, 1998, 2000; Lehto, O’Leary & Morrison, 2004; Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Li, Cai, Lehto & Huang, 2010; Morais & Lin, 2010).

The idea that lifestyle could represent something beyond basic economic and physical security was part of what sociologists have called the “postmodern turn” (Lyotard, 1984; Hassan, 1987; Vattimo, 1988; Kearney, 1988; Best & Kellner, 1997). Initially, lifestyle was theorized (Weber, 1968; Sobel, 1981; Rojek, 1985) in relation to ongoing conducts that formed the “basis for a separate, common social identity” (Stebbins, 1997, p. 350). Such conducts included individual’s “choices” that conveyed a distinct sense of personal identity that simultaneously belong to a recognizable “collective” (Bauman, 2000; Cohen, 2010, 2011). Consequently, lifestyle was mainly understood as having a quality of life, that is, daily acts or patterns of recognizable behavior (Sobel, 1981) within the realm of certain attitudes and values (Stebbins, 1997). Accordingly, lifestyle has been examined generally in relation to aesthetic consumption practices (Shields, 1992), associated with post-Fordism and late modernity (Giddens, 1991), and the loosening of class distinctions (Bell & Hollows, 2006). In recent years, the dominant theories of consumption practices and choices (Bourdieu, 1984; Giddens, 1991), use-value vs. sign-value (Baudrillard, 1998), or self-concept (Turner, 1985) have
been gauged for their utility in understanding how “our choice of lifestyle affects our sense of self and how our sense of self affects our (mobility) consumption choices” (Cohen, Duncan & Thulemark, 2015, p. 157).

The term “migration” was defined in 1966 by Everett S. Lee as a “permanent or semi-permanent change of residence” (p. 49), which remains a working definition among many scholars even a half century later. Similarly, in 1992, Curtis C. Roseman defined migration as the “relatively permanent change of address or abode” (p. 33). But, while the definition of migration has stayed stable, studies on migration now encompass a much more extensive scope of phenomenon that have been shaped by globalization and neoliberal economic policies (Castles & Miller, 2003; Kull, Ibrahim & Meredith, 2007). Indeed, earlier migration research had typically focused on causality, directionality (South-North movements), and legality and duration (Lee, 1966; King & Connell, 1999, Castles & Miller, 2003). However, such studies often overlook complex subjective histories, background and personal desires, at times overlooking the social, economic and environmental importance of cyclical and temporary migrations – ideas to which many, more recent studies attend (Halfacree & Boyle, 1993; McHugh, Hogan & Happel, 1995; Bell & Ward, 2000; McHugh, 2000; Williams & Hall, 2002).

The emerging trends of second homes and an increase in vacation time in the 1970s led scholars to predict the looming lifestyle migrations (Williams & Hall 2002). The value shift that was tied to post-modernism influenced lifestyle migration, especially in the ways that lifestyle migrations tend to objectify nature and summon “a nostalgia for real or imagined past lifestyles and landscapes, and the growth of environmentalism.” It was a process that constituted “one of the main counter-urbanisation flows [and] the
search for valued rural environments” (Williams & Hall, 2002, p. 19), something which
many scholars have picked up on (King, Warnes & Williams, 2000; MPI 2006; Hoye,
2006; Hiltunen, 2007; Sunil, Rojas & Bradley, 2007; McCarthy, 2008; Benson, 2011a).

Additionally, the concept of migration in conjunction with lifestyle trends and a
rise in travel to the Global South has been studied by tourism scholars since the 1980s
(O’Reilly, 2000; Sato, 2001; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Benson, 2010, 2011a,
2011b; Bell, 2014; Cohen, Duncan & Thulemark, 2015). This trend is distinct in that the
movements are reverse – from North to South (Williams & Hall, 2002; MPI, 2006; Sunil,
Rojas & Bradley, 2007; McCarthy, 2008; Miyazaki, 2008; Åkerlund & Sandberg, 2015;
Weiske, Petzold & Schad, 2015).

Indeed, the common narrative of lifestyle migration research from North to South
has been primarily about relatively affluent and resourceful Movers who move to rural
and environmentally delicate places throughout the Global South (Gosnell & Abrams,
2009; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Benson, 2010, 2011a, 2011b). In reviewing the
international literature on “lifestyle migration” it is important to recognize that the phrase
suggests an assortment of migration practices in diverse social, political, economic, and
spatial settings. Besides the inconsistencies in terminology associated within diverse
contexts, there is hardly any academic consensus as to the types of features the term
ought to include. Lifestyle migration always involves an “extended stay” in the new
destination, nevertheless, it has at times been misconstrued as tourism, second
homeownership or full-time residency. The terms “travel”, “tourism”, “leisure”, and
“migration” are bounded terms that do not sufficiently cover the more “complex forms of
corporeal mobility that may involve multiple ‘homes’, ‘belongings’ and sustained mobility throughout the life course” (Cohen, Duncan & Thulemark, 2015, p. 158).

Following on the work of sociologist John Urry (1999) and Laurence Moss (2006), Norman McIntyre (2009) established the term “lifestyle mobilities” which he characterized as “the movements of people, capital, information and objects associated with the process of voluntary relocation to places that are perceived as providing an enhanced or, at least, different lifestyle” (p. 4). The term “seasonal lifestyle mobilities” (Åkerlund, 2013; Cohen, Duncan & Thulemark, 2015) was conceptualized as a lifestyle value and practice based on individuals’ freedom of choice, who may or may not have a home base, and whose desire to increase their “quality of life” can be temporary or permanent. (Sagaza, 1999; Sato, 2001; D’Andrea, 2006, 2010; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009a, 2009b; Janoschka, 2009; Korpela, 2009). The term came into being because the Movers did not belong to categories of tourists, labor migrants, refugees, nor business elites. Instead, the term highlights indicators and effects of lifestyle mobilities facilitated by an ever more globalized society mostly from a Western perspective (Ohnmacht, Maksim & Bergman, 2009). Also, it usually designates a somewhat recent trend of reverse movement of older people who move from the Global North to other countries with warmer climates. However, not all can be designated as part of the movement of older persons to southern Europe (known as International Retirement Migration (IRM) - research that emerged in the mid-1980s), since many of them may not be of retirement age (King, Warnes & Williams, 2000; Williams, King, Warnes & Patterson, 2000).

In a wider sense, the term covers a gamut of movements, whether tourism, short-term mobility, cyclical movements on an annual basis, or long-term mobility. Michaela
Benson and Karen O’Reilly (2009a) argue that these diverse movements should be regarded as a phenomenon of lifestyle migration as long as they fall within this definition: “relatively affluent individuals of all ages, moving either part-time or full-time to places that, for various reasons, signify, for the migrant, a better quality of life” (p. 609) or lifestyle enhancement. Edward Jackiewicz (2010) makes a case for the term “lifestyle” rather than “residential tourism” or “retirement migration” since it is a “more encompassing term and therefore more pragmatic in describing the heterogeneity of this group” (p. 2). This wide variation of terminologies and designations other than “immigrants” that has been used to designate Movers of privilege, according to Sheila Croucher (2012), “not only reveal elements of privilege, but also contribute to perpetuating it [by the scholars who use it]” (p. 4). The emphasis in lifestyle migration is mostly on privileged mobility but, according to Croucher, “in actuality, all migrants are aiming to enhance their quality of life” (p. 4).

Although this trend under analysis can be employed using the overall term “lifestyle mobilities” (McIntyre, 2009; Åkerlund, 2013; Cohen, Duncan & Thulemark, 2015), there are some exceptions. Raquel Huete, Alejandro Mantecón and Jesús Estévez (2013) challenge the designation of “lifestyle migration” in cases of British nationals who live on the Spanish coast, as their state of affairs is simply too “imprecise, since it does not determine clearly which variables characterise the lifestyle migrants” (p. 331). Furthermore, their “situations [are] as heterogeneous as those among the group of non-lifestyle migrants” (p. 332). In a similar vein, Nina G. Schiller (2008) critiques migration scholars’ reliance on using “ethnic groups as units of analysis” because it is a “logical but unacceptable consequence of the methodological nationalism of mainstream social
science” (p. 3) advocating instead the use of non-ethnic forms of incorporation and transnational connections.

Therefore, the exact designation, temporal distinctions, and benefits of these migration practices must inevitably be contextualized. In addition, the particular degree of affluence amongst Movers is relative both to those back home who do not have the same privileges and also the local populations of destination areas. Some research has been conducted on migration trajectories of Movers who do not necessarily belong to the “super-rich” (Paris, 2010; O’Reilly, 2000). Therefore, wealth is not the only indicator of capital here. There are also human, social, and symbolic capital (Benson, 2011a) at play in conjunction with socio-political privileges that facilitate their migration (Benson, 2013). These benefits are grounded on not only relative capital and wealth but also largely in a privileged national belonging (political and/or symbolic capital). Although social identities and positions may change, it is capital, structures, systems, and privileged national belonging or “symbolic capital” that facilitate mobility decisions and how “new lifestyles” are performed.

Mobility

In a sub-section of chapter one of their book Tourism and migration - new relations between production and consumption, aptly named “Definitions: The Chaotic Conceptualisation Trap”, Allan Williams and Colin M. Hall (2002) make a praiseworthy effort to provide an overview of the attempts that have been made at defining human
mobility: “The nub of the definitional problem lies in differentiating temporary mobility from tourism” (p. 5).

In the past, the term “migration” had directed debate towards the mobility of people without necessarily including the wider arrangements of other types of mobilities or flows (Appadurai, 1996; Urry, 1999; Castells, 2000; Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006). Important recent scholarship in mobilities has drawn on John Urry’s (1990, 1998, 1999, 2007) work, which helped set in motion a path towards the concept of mobility. In *The tourist gaze* (Urry, 1990), Urry explored the sociology of tourism in conjunction with a way of seeing and the visual practice both through actual travel and the consumption of places. As early as 1998, Urry examined this phenomenon (whether corporeal, symbolic or virtual) in connection with people who could easily travel and live anywhere, and were increasingly becoming part of a shrinking and homogenized world (Urry, 1998).

In *Mobilities* (2007), Urry formed a theoretical lens (five “mobilities” or “mobility systems”) through which distance could be arranged vis a vis economic, social, and cultural circumstances. Together with Doreen Massey’s (1994) “politics of mobility”, which inspired an entire practice of research dedicated to the politics and imbalances and of movement and mobility (Miles & Thranhardt, 1995; Anthias & Lazarido, 1998; Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Weiss, 2005; Amit, 2007; Whyte, 2008) they have been instrumental for the way geographers have approached mobility.

The recent taxonomies of a “new mobilities paradigm” (Sheller & Uly, 2006) and a “mobility turn” notably, mobility (or “new mobilities”) literature has helped organize incongruent bodies of scholarship around the topic of mobility (Cresswell & Merriman, 2011). The influence of these approaches has advanced “diverse sets of research interests
and disciplinary agendas, and ‘mobility’ as a concept into the general parlance of social scientific research” (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011). The developing arena of mobilities research is exemplified by the 2006 publication of the new journal *Mobilities*. The journal encompasses disciplines that covers “studies of corporeal movement, transportation and communications infrastructures, capitalist spatial restructuring, migration and immigration, citizenship and transnationalism, and tourism and travel” (Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006, pp. 9-10). This broad range not only encompasses mobility through an extensive span of locations (De Souza e Silva & Frith, 2010; Torkington 2012; Anderson & Erskine, 2014; Elixhauser, 2015; Grundström, 2018), forms (Bissell, 2013; Stehlin 2014; Licoppe, 2016; Davidson, 2017), scales (Philo, 2014; McMorran, 2015; Murray, Sawchuk & Jirón, 2016), practices and technologies (Redshaw & Nicoll, 2010; Birtchnell & Urry, 2013; Nilsson & Salazar, 2017; Clayton, Jain, Ladkin & Marouda, 2018), but also examines the politics of mobility (Adey, 2006; Parviainen, 2010; Doughty & Murray, 2016; Rickly, 2016; Sheller, 2016; Chan, 2018; Handel, 2018; Suliman, 2018), their representational and non-representational dynamics, and the relevant frameworks within which they are embedded (Jensen, 2011; Gössling & Stavrinidi, 2016; Boyer, Mayes & Pini, 2017; Holton & Finn, 2018; Saltes, 2018).

Nevertheless, mobility is not a constant and well-defined phenomenon. It is a common precept of modernity (Bauman, 2000) and, as such, there is an array of systems, methods, and interchanges which bring it into social and geographical relevance. Mobility does not have a one-dimensional materiality, rather, it is as Cresswell (2001) proposes “movement (when it becomes mobility) is socially produced, is variable across
space and time and has visible effects in people, places, things and the relationships between them” (p. 20).

In “Motility: Mobility as capital”, Vincent Kaufmann, Manfred Max Bergman and Dominique Joye (2004) define “motility” as the “capacity of entities (e.g. goods, information or persons) to be mobile in social and geographic space, or as the way in which entities access and appropriate the capacity for socio-spatial mobility according to their circumstances” (p. 750). In other words, the set of skills and capabilities Movers have to reach their goals and endeavors is considered their “mobility potential” (Kaufmann, Bergman & Joye, 2004). Wolfgang Bonß, Sven Kesselring and Gerlinde Vogl (2004) view “mobility” with respect to a “match between movement and motility which allows people to realize their certain projects and plans” (p.14). They assert that the demarcation between “movement and motility is necessary because in the age of the internet people can be mobile without physical movement” (p. 12) (emphasis in the original). And so their concept of mobility is that it is the combination of the two dimensions - movement and motility.

Using Bonß, Kesselring, and Vogl’s (2004) concept of mobility, my intention here is to identify how and why people’s mobility relate to both dimensions: mobility and motility. Self-determination and autonomy are defining factors for mobility (Bonß, Kesselring & Vogl, 2004) and so participants’ narrations about their flexibility and/or constraints will be examined with regard to their social, physical and virtual movements. The choices and “mobility potential” by which the study’s participants organize everyday life are divulged through conversations about everyday routines. The interview schedule (Appendix D) covers eight topics: spatial and temporal relations over time, lifestyle and
daily activities, routine (habits, habitus, and life-space), independence and security, mobility, satisfaction, social connections, and future. The aim here is to extract responses in relation to physical, social, and virtual networks, scapes, and flows (Urry, 1999; De Souze e Silva & Frith, 2011). An analysis of the relationship between lifestyle migration, mobility, space and place necessitates capturing subjectivities about mobility and how participants imagine themselves as having “mobility potential” (Kaufmann, Bergman & Joye, 2004).

These various layers of interactivity with spaces, whether physical, social or virtual is relevant to this research because concepts of space, place and place attachment can be better traced using both motility and mobility as part of the term “lifestyle mobility”. This allows a more nuanced analysis through a lens of networks, geographies, economic and social conditions (Cresswell, 2001). In “The New Mobilities Paradigm”, Urry (2004) writes:

Places themselves are seen as travelling, slow or fast, greater or shorter distances, within networks of human and non-human agents. Places are about relationships, about the placing of peoples, materials, images and the systems of difference that they perform. But at the same time as places are dynamic, they are also about proximities, about the bodily co-presence of people who happen to be in that place at that time, doing activities together, moments of physical proximity between people that make travel desirable or even obligatory (p. 28).

Hence an analysis of the relationship between lifestyle migration, mobility, space and place is needed. Such non-positivistic considerations suggest qualitative rather than quantitative approaches to inquiry. What better way to capture subjectivities of mobility and how participants imagine themselves as having “mobility potential” than through discourse and phenomenological methods.
Place and Place Attachment

Since the goal of this chapter is to examine seasonal lifestyle perspectives in order to investigate the role of mobilities and sense of place within them, it is only fitting to review existing theory and research on place and place attachment. The terms “place,” “space” and “spatial” are such common words one might assume that they do not require definition. However, there are an array of definitions and multiple interpretations as researchers continue to theorize and conceptualize the idea of a sense of place (Shamai, 1991; DeMiglio & Williams, 2008). At an objective level, place conveys the simple naturalistic qualities of a location. The concepts shift depending on the conceptualization or the physical location which, in turn, make them difficult to quantify. Concepts of places are permeated with meanings that go beyond just a locality or territory. Conceptual confusions may arise because place is not only a formal concept with physical characteristics but also an “expression of geographical experience,” (Relph, 1976, p. 4). The first movement of place-centered scholarship began in the late 1960s and lasted into the 1970’s with Jackson & Zube (1970), Lefebvre (1974), Relph (1976), Tuan (1974, 1977) Buttimer (1976) and Seamon (1979). In particular, drawing from Clifford Geertz’s (1973) concept of ethnography as “thick description” consisting of “webs of significance woven by human beings, in which we are all suspended” (p. 5), Edward Relph (1976) furthered the debate in that places “occur where these webs touch the earth and connect people to the world” (p. 24). Around the same time, anthropologist Edward T. Hall’s The hidden dimension (1966) was regarded as the foundational scholarship on space and place in that discipline.
By the time the second trend of place-specific scholarship appeared in the 1990s, it had become multi-disciplinary (Tuan, 1991), increasingly refined and multifaceted, drawing on multiple strands of theory emerging not just from geography, but from scholars throughout the academy (see, for example: Agnew, 1987; Soja, 1989, 1996, 2000; Harvey, 1990, 2001; Entriekin 1991; Rodman, 1992; Seamon, 1993; Bachelard, 1994; Massey 1994; Malpas, 1999, 2012; Cresswell, 2004). By 2008, Relph’s categorical view on place was clear: that place is “not a bit of space, nor another word for landscape or environment, it is not a figment of individual experience, nor a social construct,” but is “instead, the foundation of being both human and non-human; experience, actions, and life itself begin and end with place” (2008a, p. 36).

Similarly, numerous scholars have approached the topic of subjective attachment of meaning to place (Heidegger, 1962; Lefebvre, 1974; Tuan, 1974; de Certeau, 1984; Massey, 1994) and biophysical experiences and human consciousness as foundations for personal meanings (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977). One of the more prominent strands of these explorations holds that these connections are individualistic meanings manifested at the representational level of objects, experiences, and movements to and from places (Malpas, 1999; Cresswell, 2004; Hague 2005). John A. Agnew’s (1987) characterization of place is that it is “discrete if ‘elastic’ areas in which settings for the constitution of social relations are located and with which people can identify” (p. 263). Lawrence Buell (2005) outlines place as influencing three directions at once: “toward environmental materiality, toward social perception or construction, and toward individual affect or bond” (p. 63). Buell’s places are spaces “to which meaning has been ascribed,” are “inseparable from the concrete region in which it is found” and are circumscribed by
tangible indicators and societal concurrence (p. 63). Buell provides a binary exploration of place as a physical, sensual experience; and space as having an ambiguous “out there” quality. It is in this duality that geographers have tried to negotiate the tension between physical activities in place and the disjuncture of identity and culture. The site where objective reality meets subjective meanings is what Entrikin (1991) has called the “betweenness of place”.

A sense of place is also deemed to be the emotional connection between people and place, which at its core signifies for a specific person or community their sense of wellbeing and quality of life (DeMiglio & Williams, 2008; Bushell, 2009). John Eyles’ *Senses of place* (1985) identified ten major themes around the sense of place. All themes indicate that people-placed connections are dynamic depending on how individuals or communities assign different values or meanings to places. Robyn Bushell’s (2009) inquiry further connects the sense of place to social, physical, and functional qualities of a place together with accessible resources. The overlapping definitions of place and space therefore refer to both the corporeal and emotional relationships of geographical locations to locale, structure, and meanings. The intersection of places and meaning are “centers” of meaning:

Places are neither totally material nor completely mental; they are combinations of the material and mental and cannot be reduced to either. A church, for instance, is a place. It is neither just a particular material artifact, nor just a set of religious ideas; it is always both. Places are duplicitous in that they cannot be reduced to the concrete or the “merely ideological”; rather they display an uneasy and fluid tension between them. (Cresswell, 1996, p. 13).

By conferring meaning to place, humans personalize their experience and initiate what Tim Cresswell has called “place-making activities” (2004, p. 5). These activities can be
anything from the visual, for example, home renovations, yard care, city ordinances to commodifying places, such as, tourist brochures, postage stamps or parliament buildings.

Relatedly, the concept of “place attachment” or “place-bonding” (Low & Altman, 1992, Buell, 2005) represents an “affective bond that people establish with specific areas where they prefer to remain and where they feel comfortable and safe” (Hernandez, Hidalgo, Salazar-Laplace & Hess, 2007 p. 310). In other words, the bond involves individuals who have positive feelings about their community and locality (Vanclay, 2008) or sense of place (Relph, 1976; Shamai, 1991; Low & Altman, 1992; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Hillier & Rooksby, 2002; Farnum, Hall & Kruger, 2005; Relph, 2008b; Vanclay, 2008). In recent years, “place attachment” has been applied to ideas about human interaction and the environment, and the ways in which they create a sense of community and cultural identity that can be useful in times of change and friction (Meisel, 2007; Sampson & Goodrich, 2009).

Additionally, postmodernist scholars have broadened the discourse of place as spaces of “flows” that are socially produced, diluted, fluid and diffused (Lefebvre, 1974; Castells, 1989; Arefi, 1999; Amin & Thrift, 2002; Crouch, 2002). Worthy of note is the recent scholarship on relational and phenomenological geographies by scholars such as James Ash (2019), whose post-phenomenological account of space analyzes space in terms of the comprehension and form of entities. In much of this work, place is situated in the physical experience and space is identified through language, meaning, time and occurrences (Cresswell, 2004; Buell, 2005). In light of this trajectory of scholarship, the vast arena of taxonomies around place identity within the context of a sense of place (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Buell, 2005; Davenport & Anderson, 2005; Kianicka,
Buchecker, Hunziker & Muller-Boker, 2006; Carter, Dyer & Sharma, 2007; Relph, 2008a, 2008b; Vanclay, 2008; Goodrich & Sampson, 2008; Kerstetter & Bricker, 2009; Schofield & Szymanski, 2011; Vedru, 2011) requires an examination for its applicability to this study.

Experiential Properties of Space

“Experiential properties of space” or a “sense” of place, whether they are values, experiences or activities function at the intersection of the concrete/physical world and the ideological/mental idea of place. These connections have been broadly explored in both the social sciences and life sciences. There have been quantitative studies (Shamai, 1991; Hay, 1998; Stedman, 2003; Shamai & Ilatov, 2005; Carter et al., 2007) and numerous qualitative approaches (for example: Williams & Stewart, 1998; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Jiven & Larkham, 2003; Farnum, Hall & Kruger, 2005; Kianicka et al., 2006; Harrington, 2007; Kerstetter & Bricker, 2009; Townend & Whittaker, 2011). Experiential properties of space are concerned with various facets that are vague, hard to identify and quantify (Relph, 1976; Shamai, 1991). They are concepts that deal with emotional attachment, familiar, belonging, rootedness, symbols, meaning and values within historical, cultural, and spatial contexts (Williams & Stewart, 1998; Gustafson, 2009; Schofield & Szymanski, 2011). Similarly, constructs of a sense of place as related to experiences means that they will vary between people. Subjective, personal and relational experiences are not just mundane daily activities, but include all the senses (Steele, 1981; Vanclay, 2008) which are experienced viscerally.
The humanistic geographer Yi-Fu Tuan helped set in motion a path towards the subjective and individualistic dimension of space, that is, the concept of “experiential properties of space” where people move about or inhabit not just locations or geometric spaces but a world of meaning and values (Tuan, 1974). Tuan used the term “topophilia” to describe the affective, aesthetic, and sensual attachments to places. He presents place as an authentic and complex cultural construction than the spaces of “scientific” geography. He further contends that it is the presence of the body that gives places their makeup and direction (Tuan, 1974) and that there are no “scales” associated with place. Rather place is created and sustained via individuals’ emotional attachments or “fields of care” (Tuan, 1977). He writes that “place is a pause in movement. Animals, including human beings, pause at a locality because it satisfies certain biological needs. The pause makes it possible for a locality to become a center of felt value” (Tuan, 1977, p. 138).

Tuan, among other theorists, assert that space is also communal in that meanings, despite being understood differently by individuals, have a shared cultural, economic, or historical dimension (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977; Steele, 1981; Hummon, 1992; Moore & Graefe, 1994; Brandenburg & Carroll, 1995; MacNaghten & Urry, 1995). Through time, these meanings can be expressed and changed through symbolic representations, stories, objects, structures, or physical landscapes (Tuan, 1977; Hummon, 1992; Greider & Garkovich, 1994; Williams & Stewart, 1998). Meanings and symbols that create landscapes are also manifestations of people’s self–definitions (Sampson & Goodrich, 2009). Place then is not just a physical setting; rather representations of places must be interpreted as a complex structure and the people who are engaged with it (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977; Stedman, 2003).
Alternatively, other scholars such as geographers Neil Smith and Cindi Katz (1993) differentiated between “metaphorical” space and “material” space in that it is the representation of space that ascribes the unknown to one that is familiar in order to “reinscribe the unfamiliar event, experience or social relation as utterly known” (p. 69). Doreen Massey’s influence on the broader political and social debate on place/space/time was also considerable. According to Massey (1994), the spatial is socially constituted: “‘Space’ is created out of the vast intricacies, the incredible complexities, of the interlocking and the non-interlocking, and the networks of relations at every scale from local to global” (p. 265). Within this context, Linda McDowell (1996) fittingly condensed the denotation of the space/place predicament in that we now have a “coincidence between material, symbolic and discursive constructions of space, in situated theory, in imagined communities, in the social construction of different visions of space and in the performative and fictive nature of subjectivities and social relations” (p. 41). More recently, the terms “space,” and “performative” were used discursively in Kevin Grove and Jonathan Pugh’s (2015) work on using assemblage thinking when it comes to identifying “a politics of life enacted through participatory activities” (p. 1). They state that:

Key here are the status of “things” and “space” in participatory activities. Both of these reflect the impact of seeing participation as performative: if participation is a performance, then interaction will be mediated not only through communication, following Habermas, but also through affective encounters with the bodies – human and non-human – that make up the space of participation. (p. 7)

Consistent with earlier humanistic views of place, contemporary scholars endorse the idea that place is not just a geographical location independent of human interaction
but have personal meanings (Hillier & Rooksby, 2002; Jiven & Larkham, 2003; Stedman, 2003; Farnum, Hall & Kruger, 2005; Vanclay, 2008; Manzo & Devine-Wright, 2014). In “Being accounted for: Qualitative data analysis in assessing ‘place’ and ‘value’”, Stephen Townend and Ken Whittaker (2011) define what “place” is:

First, a place is not akin to a box that contains things and within which things happen. Second, a place, in the sense intended, does not exist independently of those who have an involvement with it. So, there are no physical boundaries, objects, structures, or buildings that are necessarily implicated; rather a place is borne of an interpreted engagement with time, stories, associations, people, buildings, structures, objects, “natural” features etc. and expressed as an understanding. (p. 66)

Specifically, a “sense of place” is not inherent to the material location, but exists in individuals’ understandings of the site, which are formed through encounters with it.

Over the years, the terms “place” and “space” have been used interchangeably. In the glossary of terms of Key thinkers on space and place, Phil Hubbard and Rob Kitchin (2011, p. 499) characterize “sense of place” as a dominant model in humanistic geography suggesting “particular ways in which people invest their surroundings with meaning”. Kent C. Ryden (1993) claims that a place “takes in the meanings which people assign to that landscape through the process of living in it” (pp. 37-38). For Foote & Azaryahu (2009) a sense of place is:

The emotive bonds and attachments, both positive and negative that people develop or experience in particular locations and environments. It is also used to describe the distinctiveness or unique character of particular localities and regions. (p. 96)

Tuan (1977) offers a more concise yet intricate description arguing that space and place are necessary for each other and that:
“Space” is more abstract than “place”. What begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value [...] Furthermore, if we think of space as that which allows movement, then place is pause; each pause in a movement makes it possible for location to be transformed into place. (p. 6)

Consequently, the physical locations and fixed coordinates of spaces are converted into places through the corporeal presence of humans and everyday life. Michel de Certeau (1984) characterizes space as “composed of intersections of mobile elements [...] actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it” and the “labor that constantly transforms places into spaces and spaces into places” (pp. 117-18). In these analyses, space and place are socially constructed through actions, movements, performances, experiences, and consumption of sites (Low, 2000; Bærenholdt, Haldrup, Larsen & Urry, 2004). It is in human practice and its complementing narratives that create place meanings.

In terms of phenomenology of space and place, meaning making has been described as a performative progression of “mobilizing and reconfiguring spaces and places” via the social and fragmented circulation of memories that are created and performed (Coleman & Crang, 2002, p. 10). In this context, spatial reality is viewed and interpreted by the individual and experienced personally rather than imposed from outside. This suggests that definitions of sense of place are subjective and arbitrary (Relph, 1976). Some researchers adopt the multi-layered views of a sense of place, whereby emphasis is placed on human interactions with space in their daily lives – in that “landscapes are the reflections of these cultural identities, which are about us, rather than the natural environment” (Greider & Garkovich, 1994, p. 2). The claim is that all tangible places have the capacity to encompass various layers of geographies, which in
turn reflect the shared meanings of those who experience that place. Even such cultural practices as film, music, and literature influence place creation. Others claim that if places are produced through daily practices and replication of activities by some, it only follows that “the construction of place is more often than not achieved through the exclusion of some ‘other’ – a constitutive outside” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 96). In the same vein, Margaret C. Rodman (1992) accurately summarizes these assorted views - that places are “not inert containers” but are “politicized, culturally relative, historically specific, local and multiple constructions” (640).

What has furthered discourse on space and place has been Marc Augé’s (1992) idea of “non-places” in that Augé takes into consideration hotel rooms, cruise ship staterooms, airports, freeways, and train stations (vs. “anthropological places”). Augé’s non-places are those of transience, anonymity, and interchangeability rather than places to live or build a community. The increasingly globalized economy and income (at least from a Western perspective) has made distance from place to place shorter, cheaper, and easier to travel (Lash & Urry, 1994; Ohnmacht, Maksim & Bergman, 2009). The frequently mobile are perceived to hold a sense of dislocation (Garsten, 2008; Pellegrino, 2011; Costas, 2013) and attempt to offset what Lucy Lippard (1997) has called “alienated displacement” (p.10) by seeking homogeneous and comforting communities which they routinely visit. Lippard writes that “sometimes a spontaneous attraction to place is really an emotional response to the landscape, which is a place at a distance, visual rather than sensual, seen rather than felt in all its affective power” (7-8) – this is what Buell (2005) has called the “imagined world” (73). According to Buell, place is formed out of space in a cyclical endeavor – place is created and re-created recurrently until a sense of place is
formed and defined. This cycle of formation and definition institutes a “self” that is re-created intermittently.

In the last few decades, scholars have distinguished place as a type of cultural knowledge and practice (Olwig & Hastrup, 1997; Relph, 2008a, 2008b), analyzed place through the lens of place satisfaction (Guest & Lee, 1983; Brown, 1993; Mensch & Manor, 1998; Stedman, 2003), explored place from the economic perspective of value (Cawley, 2010), observed place attachment through environmental psychology (Feimer & Geller, 1983; Low & Altman, 1992; Hay, 1998; Lewicka, 2008; DeMiglio & Williams, 2008; Vanclay, 2008), studied spatial analysis from the viewpoint of legal theory (Blank & Rosen-Zvi, 2010), identified place from the perspective of urban planning, landscape architecture and design (Arefi, 1999; Hayllar, Griffin & Edwards, 2008), examined how places shape humans’ actions, awareness and moral concerns (Sack, 1997), and recognized local heritage and spaces (Schofield & Szymanski, 2011). These debates have been invigorated and enabled under changing, accelerating, and dynamic restructuring of global capital, deindustrialization, and other facets of neoliberal economic and political life, and have slowly come to gain increasing significance among a growing scholarship on place and space. Topics such as digital technologies (Coleman & Crang, 2002; Ash, 2019), places as evolving processes that are not inherently stable (Hultman & Hall, 2011), and social media and cyberspace (Meyrowitz, 1985; Wellman, 2001; Wellman & Haythornthwaite, 2002) have captured the tone and trends of contemporary place scholarship.

On the whole, there has been a theoretical shift from the notion of place as a physical environment that contributes to human behavior to the idea that it is humans
who bestow meaning on their environment “in ways that reflect their social and cultural experiences” (Eisenhauer, Krannich & Blahna, 2000, p. 422). In fact, some authors claim that the production of everyday practice is not imposed on individuals by the state, rather “the reality of everyday life—the sum total of all our relations—is built on the ground, in daily activities and transactions” (Burkitt, 2004). These somewhat compelling non-positivistic and “social construction” views not only prevail in current discourse, but also suggest qualitative and phenomenological rather than quantitative approaches to inquiry.

Ironically, it is not the lack of conceptual clarity, but an an over-abundance of delineations and theories in place-specific scholarship that has led to a definitional problem (Williams & Hall, 2002). Place is too extensive a concept to channel into a single direction and discipline, because it is physical, perceptual, and ubiquitous. While I argue that place is constructed out of multi-layered views of a sense of place, I do not claim that place is purely a creation of the mind – it is a physical location and corporeal.

In this research, the emphasis is on the Movers’ human interactions with place and spaces in their daily lives, social relations across spatial scales, and narratives. It is in the intricate and individual expressions of places that place, and space theories are formed and debated. Attempts at simplistic definitions or fixed standards of measurement will inevitably detract from the sophisticated and singular manifestations of place and their meanings.

In relation to space and mobility, there is a change in the contemporary notion and theory of mobility that combines social locality in time and space to information, connectivity, and knowledge (Tomlinson, 1999; Taylor, 2004). My research will take into consideration Urry (1999) and Kaufmann’s (2002) recommendations that the future of
mobility ought to incorporate network perspectives, transdisciplinary practices and multi-mobility examples and further research mobility research as a whole. To advance this framework, there is a need to better understand how adaptable and flexible mobility processes are involved in translocal spaces. This presents another way to consider, imagine and relate to “seasonal lifestyle mobilities”, “place”, “space” and “spatial”. Although the value of examining the concept of lifestyle mobilities has come to gain increasing significance among a growing scholarship on lifestyle migration, it has not been subject to a deeper and more sustained investigation. The shortcomings of current understanding around the grey zone between tourism and migration can be assumed through the lens of seasonal lifestyle mobilities.

Attention on lifestyle mobility situates conjectures around conventional concepts of home/away or work and leisure, challenging distinct concepts of leisure, social life, travel, and migration (Ong, 1999; Fitzgerald, 2000; Truly, 2002; Ahmed et al., 2003; Fechter, 2007; Croucher, 2009; Bantam-Masum, 2011). Themes of techno-social contexts (Crang & Graham, 2007; Amoore & Hall, 2009; Budd & Adey, 2009; Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009; De Souze e Silva & Frith, 2010; De Souza e Silva & Sheller, 2014), changing economy (Kaufmann, Bergman & Joye, 2004; Bærenholdt, 2013; Cresswell, 2010), and environmental matters (Büscher, 2006; Bergman & Sager 2008; Urry, 2011) have always emerged vis a vis mobility studies. However, the broader impact here is the potential disruption of the “fluidity” of forms of lifestyle mobility and how evolving everyday practices in modes of living are created in the rise of populaces and increasing number of locations (Bauman, 2000; Conradson & McKay, 2007; Kaufmann & Montulet, 2008; Torkington, 2012; Bell, 2014). Additionally, arrangements of lifestyle mobilities
normally accessible to the somewhat privileged or “power asymmetries” (Pred & Watts, 1992; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Smith, 1991; Massey, 1993; Blomley, 1994; Cresswell, 2001; Harvey, 2001) will show transformations whereby seasonal lifestyle mobility may become more accessible to wider populations.

Since seasonal lifestyle mobilities destabilize notions of “home”, this project also challenges binary ideas of spontaneity/familiarity, transience/rootedness, freedom/unfreedom, excitement/routine, and living an untethered and/or conventional lifestyle (Foley & Hayllar, 2007; Hardy, Hanson & Gretzel, 2012; Brooker & Joppe, 2014; Pearce & Wu, 2018). Such issues resonate in society as seasonal lifestyles, location clustering and the concept of rootedness become more commonplace. This study is urgent as seasonal lifestyle mobilities have not been studied in relation to experiential properties of space, raising questions about how mobile lifestyles are formed between the grey zone of tourism and migration, in affective, embodied ways (Pile, 2005, 2010). In addition, this research will contribute significantly to studies about translocal spaces and evolving forms of lifestyle mobilities, more specifically, about how the Floribécois conceptualize and experience space through the lens of social relationships and identities.
CHAPTER 3
PHENOMENOLOGY IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline a methodological framework and research plan for investigating seasonal lifestyle perspectives, experiential properties of space, the lived experiences of multi-locational actors and the production of unique forms of socialization and community using the seasonal movements and settlements of the Québécois population in Broward County, Florida. At the heart of the research strategy is an interest in the personal narratives of the Floribécois some of whom come to Broward County Florida every month, stay for a short period, then return and come back again the following month during the winter season on an annual basis (between November to April). Specifically, I am curious about English-speaking residents of Quebec who come to Broward County and stay at Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) RV park. This methodology is heavily inspired by the phenomenological tradition of describing shared meanings and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon. In this chapter, the aim is to provide an overview of phenomenology, its use in social sciences, the reasoning behind the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) (Smith, Jarman & Osbourne, 1999) and the research procedures used for this study. This overview provides not only a critical literature review, but also presents evaluation of existing theory and research.
Phenomena of Interest

In general, phenomenological research describes the shared meaning and the experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon. The main aim of this research is to find the “meaning” of the lifestyle mobility and the lived experiences of place and space of the Floribécois through interviews in order to understand their perceptions and motivations. The phenomena of interest in this dissertation are the geography of mobility, place and space built upon a concept that has been described by Husserl (1970 - first published in 1936 in German) as Lebenswelt or “lifeworld” generally used by phenomenologists to describe the intersubjective and personal nature of individuals’ dynamic relationship with places (Heidegger, 1962). The often habitual or taken-for-granted aspects of routines and lived practices that “acts and reacts on us” (Graumann, 2002, p.102) may not easily be recognized or examined. Therefore, it is essential to examine contextual, objects, bodily and spatial conditions that make up the ever-changing nature of the lifeworld. (Buttimer, 1976; Seamon, 1979; Buttimer & Seamon, 1980; Seamon, 1987).

Rationale Behind the Use of Phenomenology

Phenomena have and will continue to form the foundation of positivist science and practice. Both positivists and interpretivists seek to advance shared understanding of the world, but they use different research methods to report their research (Weber, 2004). Phenomenology arose in the 18th century in clear acknowledgement that the phenomena we experience is through our consciousness, the body, and the senses (Gutland, 2018).
The way the world is lived, perceived, and experienced are central to phenomenological research. The key to accomplishing this is not merely to explain or analyze but to describe using hermeneutics, via description and interpretation or “the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon” (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). Phenomenological studies use descriptions as a basis from which to identify shared connections that uncover the fundamental traits of the phenomenon that embody everyday experiences. The focus is typically on participants’ common experiences of a phenomenon, thereby condensing individual experiences toward a description of a meaning or a “grasp of the very nature of the thing” (van Manen, 1990, p. 177). To this end, the description consists of “what” they experienced (Ontological - what things exist in the world) and “how” they experienced it (metaphysical - describes how the world is) (Moustakas, 1994). It is in this sense that I will be using the term “phenomenology”, that is “the science of describing what one perceives, senses, and knows in one’s immediate awareness and experience” (Moustakas, 1994, p.26). There are several elements that comprise a phenomenological study. I apply features from Moustakas (1994) and van Manen (1990). In both these works, the emphasis is on a phenomenon to be examined, articulated in respect to a concept or idea, such as “mobility” or “place”, using a heterogeneous group of individuals who may experience the same phenomenon.

Since physical locations and fixed coordinates of spaces are the medium for corporeal presence of humans and everyday life (Heidegger, 1962; Tuan, 1974; Relph, 1976; Buttimer & Seamon, 1980; Casey, 1997), it would make sense that a phenomenological interpretation of place-making through individuals’ emotions, thoughts, and embodied practices be applied to the study of places and spaces. This
position diverged from the Western inclination to deem the rational mind as being superior to bodily knowledge (Pickles, 1985), which had the tendency to trivialize “the extent to which the body is the obvious point of departure for any process of knowing, especially participant observation” (Sokolowski, 2000, p.104).

Phenomenology’s non-positivistic views also suggest qualitative rather than quantitative approaches to inquiry (Groenewald, 2004), since it can accommodate multiple methods and can capture subjectivities of place meanings. These views also provide an effective platform for a study interested in exploring mobility since the physical movement itself is attendant to space, temporality, language, and motility among others (Smith, 2018). The qualitative method can be “interpretive” and “naturalistic” (Belgrave, Zablotsky & Guadagno, 2002, p. 1428) when it is concerned with human agency because “humans, and human behavior, cannot be understood or studied outside of the context of a person’s daily life” (Low, 1987, p. 280). For this reason, my study includes field work and participant data in order to convey the context in which they live.

As noted above, I explore personal narratives of a group of ‘Floribécois’ (Floribec in English) by way of a phenomenological approach (Low, 1987). Since the focus is on mobility and experiential properties of space, outcomes may involve various facets that are vague, hard to identify and quantify (Relph, 1976; Shamai, 1991). Within this field, scholars have underscored themes of emotional attachment, familiarity, belonging, rootedness, symbols, and meaning and values within historical, cultural, and spatial contexts (Williams & Stewart, 1998; Gustafson, 2009; Schofield & Szymanski, 2011). Other themes under examination in this field have been repetitive spatial practices or what Anne-Marie Fortier (1999) has called “appartenance” (translated from the French,
to mean “membership”) - these are acquired routines and practices of group identity that manufacture “cultural and historical belongings which mark out terrains of commonality that delineate the politics and social dynamics of ‘fitting in’” (P. 42). Another significant area that is related to mobility and space is that of embodiment and “idiolocalism” (Casey, 2001b) where the experience of the body is the “bearer of idiolocality [and] the proper subject of place” (p. 688). Entrenched in material everyday practices, it is the “lived body” that contributes to individuals’ subjective experiences (Casey, 2001a). In other words, the body is not a motionless entity, rather it has a shifting nature which interacts with spaces and places. The relevance of phenomenology to this study is to describe the experience of the person telling a story, not just the structure of the story itself. Therefore, the dominant research paradigm for this study must be phenomenology.

Defining Phenomenology

It is useful to mention at the onset that phenomenology is not a single thing, even though it is sometimes defined as “a movement” within twentieth-century philosophy (Spiegelberg, 1982; Smith, 2018). The concept of phenomenology was introduced in the early 1800s in what is today known as Germany. From the outset, it was adopted by various disciplines such as philosophy and descriptive psychology and was marked by a variety of analysis such as psychoanalysis and analytic philosophy (Pickles, 1985). It also had its share of critics from critical theorists and structural Marxists, among others (for an overview of phenomenology see Pickles, 1985; Stewart & Mickunas, 1990; Moustakas, 1994; Casey, 1996; Sokolowski, 2000). There are at least three successions in
philosophical history that are exemplified in the works of G. W. F. Hegel, Edmund Husserl, and Martin Heidegger (Husserl’s former research assistant).

Hegel’s “Dialectical Phenomenology” (1751) was an approach that was contingent on processes and subject matters that were in contrast to one another and were positioned on opposing sides. Influenced by George Berkeley and David Hume, Hegel, created a philosophy of consciousness (Harman, 2007) that accredited a conscious sense of being, becoming, existence, and reality present behind any phenomenon.

By the 1900s, Hegel’s view was that philosophy was a kind of pure science that had to be as objective and universally true as other sciences. His metaphysical and ontological principles were further developed by the German mathematician Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), who used the term “phenomenology” in his *Logical Investigations* (Harman, 2007). Considered the founding father of phenomenology, Husserl was unsatisfied with how science concerned itself only with “objects” and “sense data” and neglected human thought and action. The data that both researcher and participants acquire are, in fact, through the senses which are components of consciousness. Per Husserl, the appropriate way for discerning how individuals experience the world are through “phenomena” – that is, everything we are conscious of - then “without consciousness there are no sense data” (Couper, 2015, p. 88). Husserl deemed human experience as ever-changing and consciousness as a constant structure. This pure “area” of consciousness was above and beyond the flux of experiences and so became known as “transcendental phenomenology” and began entering the social sciences.

Phenomenology is now considered one of the major narrative analyses in social sciences with sociolinguistics and hermeneutics being the other two (Bernard, Wutich &
Ryan, 2017). Inspired by Franz Brentano’s “intentionality of consciousness” (Brentano, 1995 [1874]), Husserl challenged both Cartesian thinking and Immanuel Kant’s views of the unknowable thing-in-itself by exploring the idea of a set of intuitive essential features that together formed a consciousness that represented the fundamental make-up of an experience - its “intentionality” or “the way it is directed through its content or meaning toward a certain object in the world” (Smith, 2018). For Husserl, intentionality is always present, and one cannot separate phenomena from consciousness. These “truths” or generalized views of the human experience are deemed as “knowledge based on intuition and essence [that] precedes empirical knowledge” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 26). The implication here is that one can extract the essence of phenomena (Seamon, 1979) through transcendental phenomenology - that is, associating knowledge with subjectivity (or being with consciousness), whereby subjective human consciousness is the vehicle through which “everything is perceived freshly, as if for the first time” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 34). In other words, phenomenology is the study of “things as they present themselves to and are perceived in consciousness” (Allen-Collinson, 2011, p. 300).

There are multiple phenomenological schools, applications, and styles but primarily they have been operating on two tracks (Spiegelberg, 1982). One has been directed at the level of acquisition of knowledge within the scientific community, and the other has been aimed at assessment of everyday human activities and experiences. Descriptive phenomenology stems from Husserl’s (Husserl, 1913/1983) concept of Epoché, which is suspending presuppositions or putting aside assumptions, where “any existence of things outside consciousness is secondary” (Harman, 2007, p.22). Husserl’s Epoché (or bracketing) is an attempt to lay aside (or bracket) researchers’ biases,
assumptions, and the tendency to use past principles to describe or analyze participants’ narratives - more exactly, it focuses on the notion that “consciousness actualizes presences” (Giorgi, 2009, p. 105). For Husserl, experiences ranging from emotion, perception, memory, thought, imagination, and any social, linguistic, and embodied actions are phenomena that occur in human consciousness and “make up the meaning or content of a given experience and are distinct from the things they present or mean” (Smith, 2018). They ought to be interpreted not through past scientific theory but through hermeneutics (Harman, 2007) so as to avoid filtering participants’ experiences through researchers’ own cultural lens and attempt to experience phenomena as participants experience them (Giorgi, 1986; Moustakas, 1994; McNamara, 2005; Creswell 2007).

Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) and Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) critiqued the idea that perception presents things around us and asserted that intellectual consciousness was part of the world and human existence and that the approach to phenomenology must lead with a presupposed starting point. In *Being and Time* (1962 - first published in 1927 in German) Heidegger expanded his interpretation of phenomenology in that one should not bracket the world, rather individuals’ activities ought to be interpreted within the context of the world (Smith, 2018). Heidegger’s approach was to let “that which shows itself be seen from itself in the very way in which it shows itself from itself” (Heidegger, 1962, p. 58), which can be interpreted that Dasein is a balance of both inner and outer world, that is, between the individual and the world. An “existentialist” approach then considers contextual everyday practices as knowledge, which is comprised of participants’ perspectives, contextual
factors, system of relations as well as the author’s preconceived notions about the phenomenon under study.

In addition, Merleau-Ponty’s (1962) “being-in-the-world” or “embodiment” means that “[t]he body is our general medium for having a world” (P. 146), and that one should consider the body as a “third genre of being between the pure subject and the object” (P. 366). Here, the body is central to one’s understanding and consciousness of the world and intentionality resides in an individual’s power to act, which implies that “every act of consciousness we perform, every experience that we have, is intentional” (Sokolowski, 2000, p. 8). Consequently, these “existential” phenomenologists (Schmidt, 1985) shifted Husserl’s domain of untainted cerebral perception “into the realm of the contingencies of history and embodiment” (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 205). Environmental psychologists and feminist geographers have since embraced the significance of the body to the contextual and physical relation with space (Longhurst, 2001; Graumann, 2002).

Phenomenology in the Social Sciences

In the last several years, emergent scholarship in phenomenology appeared in areas such as environmental design (Vesely, 1988; Corner, 1990; Condon, 1991; Berleant, 1992; Mugerauer, 1994; Carmona & Tiesdell, 2007; Larice & Macdonald, 2007), place-making, identity, urbanism, and neighborhoods (Chase, Kaliski & Crawford, 1999; Kallus, 2001; Mehrotra, 2005; Staeheli & Mitchell, 2005; Cuthbert, 2006). Currently, the areas where phenomenology is widespread are in psychology (Giorgi, 1985, 2009; Polkinghorne, 1989), health sciences (Oiler, 1986; Nieswiadomy, 1993),
sociology (Jackson & Smith, 1984; Swingewood, 1991; Borgatta & Borgatta, 1992; Wahl & Lang, 2003; Ash, 2019), and education (Tesch, 1990; van Manen, 1990). The common thread across all of these viewpoints is that in studies of lived experiences of participants, the main objective of the researcher is to develop descriptions (Moustakas, 1994). Among them, real-world examples drove phenomenological and qualitative approaches to arrive at an “environmental understanding and design more in tune with our experiences and lives as human beings in the everyday world” (Seamon, 1993, p. 2). What these discourses produced was the beginning of a new discipline “whose substantive focus is environment and place, whose methodological thrust is openness and fairness, and whose ontological vision is togetherness, belonging, and wholeness” (Seamon, 1993, p.16) (emphasis in the original). Currently, such deliberations have become part of humanistic geographical discourse and have worked their way into the mainstream collective “common sense” (Curry, 1996).

Humanistic geographical discourse has seen a shift from the Cartesian dualist ontology of perception to works by Yi Fu Tuan, Edward Relph, J. Nicholas Entrikin, David Mercer, Joseph M. Powell, Anne Buttimer, David Ley, Tim Cresswell, Paul Cloke, Chris Philo, David Sadler, John Pickles, Tim Unwin and David Seamon who have challenged positivist “spatial science” data analysis and geographic theory and have subscribed to ideas present in phenomenology (Larice & Macdonald, 2007, p.125). Their geographic focus was “not on reason but on human creativity, not on the universal but on the specifics of people’s lives” (Longhurst, 2001, P. 15). Rather than relying upon impersonal and hypothetically “objective” positivist geography, humanist geographers considered phenomenology’s emphasis on everyday human experience to be both a more
realistic and embodied approach relating to space (Smith, 1979). Tuan, Relph and Mercer & Powell’s works were of particular significant in their critique of logical positivism and the conjectures of objectivity. Tuan proposed entirely new paths of research for geographers in *Topophilia* (1974) and *Space and Place* (1977). Drawing on psychology, anthropology, and geography, he explored the “affective bond between people and place or setting” (1974, p. 4) and further expanded his ideas in 1977 taking into account the social construction of places in relation to experiential, emotional, symbolic appeal and values. This includes paying attention to embodied subjectivities – that is, the association between places, bodies and mobilities of everyday life, where the “body implicates space; space co-exists with the sentient body” (Tuan, 1974, p. 218). Although Tuan does not refer to phenomenology in either of these works, his plea that “we should remember that feeling and its objects are often inseparable” falls into the domain of intentionality (1974, p. 92).

Parallel to Tuan, Edward Relph’s *Place and Placelessness* (1976) drew attention to affect and people’s connections to places, distinguishing between various types of “insideness” and “outsideness” (or a sense of placelessness that is “taken for granted”). According to Relph, by continually “recreating” our place we recreate ourselves and so our experiences of places create a sense of attachment and commitment to these places because the “fragments of human environments where meanings, activities and a specific landscape are all implicated and enfolded by each other” (p. 37). Anne Buttimer’s *Values in Geography* (1974) directed its focus on individuals’ experiences, “situated knowledge”, meaning and values, and the spatial operation of power (Ley, 1981). By the early 1990s, the refusal of the subject-object dichotomy had become apparent in works of
humanistic geographers such as David Ley (1983, 1988), Peter Jackson (1989) and Denis Cosgrove, Stephen Daniels, and Alan R. H. Baker (1988). In these analyses, space and place are not regarded as merely a “vessel” in the positivist tradition but are socially constructed through actions, movements, performances, experiences, and consumption of sites (Low, 2000; Bærenholdt, Haldrup, Larsen & Urry, 2004). In subject-centered qualitative research it is in human practice and its complementing narratives that analyses takes place because space is “something that is involved in action and cannot be divorced from it” (Tilley, 1994, p. 10). Humanized spaces create place meanings. A phenomenological exploration of place does not negate that places are socially constructed (Casey, 1997), rather “it is within the structure of place that the very possibility of the social arises” (Malpas, 1999, p. 35-36) and, according to Cresswell (2004), “place is primary to the construction of meaning and society” (P. 32). Here, the emphasis is not on the socially encoded core of the individual Habitus (Bourdieu, 1984) or merely on habitation, rather on what Casey (2001a) has called “idiolocalism” where the individual “can be subject to place in its idiosyncrasy; this subject alone can carry the peculiarities of place in its very flesh” (P. 689).

Similarly, authors such as Heidegger, Tuan, Relph and Buttimer, have argued that physical locations and fixed coordinates of spaces are converted into places through the corporeal presence of humans and everyday life through emotions, thoughts, and embodied practices. Consequently, they favor the term “place” over “space” because it offers a more concise yet intricate description of everyday experience. This stands in interesting contrast to geographer Doreen Massey’s (1993, 1994, 1997, 2005) interpretation of place/space which is broader in its political and social scope. According
to Massey, the spatial is “socially constructed” (1994) and space is made up of “a heterogeneity of practices and processes [where] everything is connected with everything else [and is] always unfinished and open” (Massey, 2005, p.107). Space for Massey is dynamic, politically charged, and global and “is just as concrete as is the local place” (Massey, 2005, p.184). In contrast to Massey’s view that the spatial is socially constituted, scholars such as Casey (1997), Felski (1999), Malpas (1999), Burkitt, (2004) and Dickinson et al. (2008) rejected a reductionist of concept of purely a socially constituted space. They proposed that the direction of societal impact must be studied in the reverse order – that is society does not construct space, rather space constructs society. For Malpas (1999), place “does not so much bring a certain politics with it, as [it] define[s] the very frame within which the political itself must be located” (P. 198). This is echoed by Dickinson et al. 2008 in that one must think through “how political subjectivities emerge out of taken-for-granted routines, rather than vice versa” (Dickinson et al. 2008, p.103).

Humanistic geographical discourse has not been without contention, because its emphasis is on knowledge gained from the direct study of subjectivities and human intentionality. In its attempt to understand how a phenomenon is perceived and lived by the subjects themselves, critics have maintained that such an approach may mask external forces and any analysis of social constructions of body and space. Phenomenology has at times been viewed as being highly abstract, lacking useful applications (Staeheli & Mitchell, 2005) and devoid of “any political philosophy” (Sokolowski 2000, p. 227).

Geographers’ engagement with phenomenology that began with humanistic geography has moved towards a compelling combination of theory and philosophical
views that together have formed what is now known as non-representational geographies (sometimes referred to as ‘more-than-representational’) (Couper, 2015). That is, experiences that are intrinsically composed, relational, embodied and entrenched in material everyday practices (traits that distinguish phenomenology) are also valid for non-representational geographies. Led by Nigel Thrift (2007) in the mid-1990s, non-representational theorists were involved with how the world is experienced before it is represented as “text”. Merleau-Ponty’s “being-in-the-world”, or how individuals know the world through emotional, embodied and affective exchanges with living and non-living phenomena, had already gained recognition amongst theoretical psychologists who were questioning mainstream ideas in academic psychology and the training of psychotherapists: “we are not seeking, as already developed individuals, to discover what something is, but different possible ways in which we might relate ourselves to our surroundings – how to be different in ourselves, how to live in different worlds” (Shotter, 1997, p. 13).

For John David Dewsbury, Paul Harrison, Mitch Rose and John Wylie (2002) “Non-representational” indicates a variety of approaches with “tactical suggestions” where the researcher works on “presenting the world, not on representing it, or explaining it. Our understanding of non-representational theory is that it is characterised by a firm belief in the actuality of representation” (438). In this sense then, any situation, object, incident, state of being or experience that an individual knows and understands via the senses is a legitimate theme for phenomenological exploration. Of course, Derrida, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s work on Actor Network Theory and the concept of assemblage also influenced non-representational theory in their emphasis on multiple
potentialities of relations and compositions of material everyday practices (Davies, 2013). Other significant texts on the spatial experience of bodies includes works by Michel Foucault, Edward Soja and Judith Butler.

The phenomenological tradition has shifted considerably since its creation by Husserl, changing from consciousness (transcendental) to lived experiences (existential). In the 1960s Marxist geographers examined the creation and use of spaces and their influences on and through individuals’ materiality (Peet, 1985; Claval, 1993). Some years later, feminist geographers broadened the limits of geographic discourse by exposing the patriarchal nature of discourse, the absence of gender and sexual embodiment in research, as well as outcomes of societal powers on spaces (Rose, 1993; Coddington, 2015). Such innovative and more socially aware perceptions of spatial relationships paved the way for a variety of epistemologies to investigate subjectivities and bodies in place and space.

The links between phenomenology, experiential properties of space and subjectivity (Holt-Jensen, 1999) have been developing since the 1970s. These connections have been broadly explored in both the social sciences and life sciences. Although a variety in depictions of phenomenon is important, the fundamental purpose of phenomenological research is to use descriptions as a groundwork from which to detect core commonalities that reveal the essential substance and key qualities of the phenomenon that accurately embody everyday experiences. What this means for geographical discourse is, according to Derek Gregory (1978), that “geography will have to dismantle the oppositions between subject and object, actor and observer, and emphasize the mediations between different frames of reference” (p. 146).
This study works towards descriptions of phenomena that are intrinsically relational, composed, embodied, and entrenched in a sociocultural world. Similarly significant for this research is Merleau-Ponty’s concept of shifting the prevalence of a Cartesian dualist ontology of perception to placing an emphasis of experience. “Experiential properties of space” or a “sense” of place, whether they are values, experiences, or activities function at the intersection of the concrete/physical world and the ideological/mental idea of place. They are concepts that not only deal with emotional attachment, familiar, belonging, rootedness, symbols, meaning and values within cultural, and spatial contexts (Williams & Stewart, 1998; Schofield & Szymanski, 2011), but also with historical contexts. The significance of historical context requires further clarification on the arrangements and practices that were needed in order for the Québécois to make the southward journey to Florida. The following chapter offers a short history of French Canadians in Florida.
CHAPTER 4
HISTORY OF FRENCH CANADIANS IN FLORIDA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a history of the French-Canadian communities in Florida. This chapter begins with a short history of how Florida as a space was “inhabited”. It then presents the structures and processes that were needed in order for the Québécois to arrive in significant numbers. This includes the creation of “amenity entrepreneurs” (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011, p. 5), policies, and legislations that were put in place to attract communities from the North. By drawing on scholarship from mostly French-Canadian historians and geographers, the last part of this chapter sheds light on the Québécois community whose presence has led to the formation of the term “Le Petit Québec” (Tremblay, 2009; Gilbert, Langlois & Tremblay, 2011).

In the fall of 1982, geographers Louis Dupont and Marie Dussault presented a portrait of the French-speaking presence in Florida and reported that the history of the first presence of French speakers in Florida remains to be written (Dupont & Dussault, 1982). Thirty years later, Godefroy Desrosiers-Lauzon emphasizes the absence of scholarship on the Québécois in Florida (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011). Over the years, the communities that the Québécois established have been dynamic, but their temporary presence did not lead to the establishment of a “French Florida” or a “French Quarter”. The institutional networks they created were marked by the short duration of their stay and by their ethnicity, which has led to the formation of geographical and community clustering.
Francophones in the United States are descendants of migrants and undoubtedly have great ease of movement. In southern Florida, the presence of French Canadians has grown in the Palm Beach area and, of course, Hollywood. Every March, Hollywood’s year-round population doubles with visitors. Naturally, a good number of these Québécois started to work for the already established Snowbirds in the field of tourism, catering, and hotels. Unlike previous generations, cultural and linguistic stability is necessary among Québécois expatriated here. The arrival in Florida of other French-speaking communities (from France and Haiti in particular) has also strengthened their continuance. In considering the history of Floribécois mobility, a short treatment of North America within the context of “expeditions of discovery” is in order.

When conceiving of space within the background of voyages of discovery, one has to acknowledge that space is not neutral – it has always been something to be traversed and occupied (Schulten, 2012). Doreen Massey’s (1994) “politics of mobility” has been instrumental for the way geographers have approached space and mobility within the context of power relations. The politics and imbalances of movement and mobility (Miles & Thranhardt, 1995; Anthias & Lazarido, 1998; Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Weiss, 2005; Amit, 2007; Whyte, 2008) are accurately summarized by Rodman (1992); places are “not inert containers” but are “politicized, culturally relative, historically specific, local and multiple constructions” (p. 640). If places are produced through daily practices and replication of activities by some, it only follows that “the construction of place is more often than not achieved through the exclusion of some ‘other’ – a constitutive outside” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 96). Framed as an unchanging picture, geographies of places have often been reduced to the “perceptions” of white
Europeans privileging “the sense of sight in systems of knowledge constructed around the ideal of Cartesian perspectivalism” (Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 24). In the explanation and elaboration of knowledge of spaces then, reports of discoveries and maps have never been “inert records of landscape or passive reflections, or mere instructional aids, they are assertive articulations of national geography that legitimate territorial claims, national identities, and narratives of western colonization and empire” (Snow, 2012, p. 38). Early American geographic imagination saw such spaces as if they are, as Massey (2005) has noted “a surface; continuous and given” that “carries with it social and political effects” (p. 4).

How the French Arrived

The history of colonial North America of the sixteenth century is marked by rivalries over space and natural resources between the Spanish, French, and British. By measuring and remapping the globe in their own image, cartography was transforming seized spaces into “legible, ordered imperial territory” (Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 4) and discursive spaces in which to articulate and circulate reports of the New World.

By 1763, Great Britain had already instituted its control in North America and defeated France and Spain in the French and Indian War (Taylor, 2001). The first French colonies in North America were “traversed spaces” (Innis, 1999) that were transformed into trading posts in Newfoundland, followed by settlements in the St. Lawrence valley, the Mississippi River, and some areas of what we now know as “Canada”. The French colonies included Quebec (1608), Montreal (1642) and Louisiana (1682) (Havard &
Vidal, 2006). This land of trading posts and passages produced what Jody Berland (1997) refers to as spaces that have been “mapped and shaped by specific imperial forms of knowledge and administration” (P. 60). Trapping and trade routes shaped a necessity for colonially imposed boundaries through which “imperial peripheries” (Innis, 1999) could be constructed and changed into the “First Nations of Canada”.

Colonial space has never been empty landscapes or wilderness. As far back as late antiquity there were roughly ten indigenous tribes living in Florida (Wallis & Randall, 2014; OCLS, 2020). Here, they cultivated “seeds of corn, beans, squash, and pumpkin” (Gannon, 2003, p. 1). The Spaniards, who already had colonies in Cuba and Puerto Rico (Harris, 2003), had little interest in Florida and only stopped for a basic exploration of its coasts. The Prince of Spain, Charles V, even called the peninsula “useless” (Fonteneau, 2008, p. 40). If the Spanish were the first Europeans to set foot in Florida, it was the French who tried to establish a colony in the territory of Florida between 1562 and 1565. According to historians Gilles Havard and Cecile Vidal (2006):

[Unlike] the Spanish, the French did not get their hands on the other side of the Atlantic, the fabulous treasures, whether Aztec or Inca, or on gold and silver mines. They also failed, despite some attempts, to establish settlements in the long term. However, they still seem to be active. (p. 31) [Translated from French by Tara Kai].

In 1562, the French admiral Gaspard de Coligny had attempted to establish a colony in Florida (Starr, 2016). Having converted to the reformed religion in 1557, Coligny’s ambition was to foster religious coexistence and advocate the establishment of

---

4 Florida was recognized as a territory on March 30, 1822 and admitted as a State on March 3, 1845 (United States Census Bureau, 1880 v-08, p. 54).
France in the Americas (Havard & Vidal, 2006). In 1562, Coligny sent an expedition to North America led by one of his naval officers Juan Ribault. Ribault was one of the first Europeans to lay claim to Florida. He was a French Calvinist\(^5\) (also known as a “Huguenot”). Ribault established the outpost of Charlesfort (current-day Parris Island, SC). Two years later, he took over Fort Caroline [current-day Jacksonville] - the first European settlement of land now known as Florida.

Ribault\(^6\) is astonished at the flat land “covered with an infinite number of high and Fayrc trees, we being not past 7 or 8 leagues from the shore, the countrye seming unto us playn, withowt any shewe of hilles” and a climate that is “a good clymate, helthfull, of good temperaunce, marvelous pleaasunt, the people gentill and of a good and amyable loving nature” (Ribault, 1974).

The Huguenots were regarded as heretics and illegal trespassers “on their [Spanish] land”. As Spencer Snow affirms in Maps and Myths: Consuming Lewis and Clark in the Early Republic (2013) such colonized spaces are not just locations but “assertive articulations of national geography” (P. 701). The Spanish crown regarded the New World spaces as “exclusively Christian places, occupied only by Christians and using only goods produced in Christian Spain” (Rice, 2013, p. 93). Spain’s territorial claims consequently led to the murder of Ribault and many of his followers near St.

\(^5\) French Protestants who followed theologian John Calvin’s teachings were known as “Huguenots”. Following their persecution by the French Catholic government during the 17th century, they fled France and settled all over Europe, Africa, and North America (Treasure, 2013).

\(^6\) Published texts by Jean Ribault are rare. After his death, his account was found in 1563. The first publication of his account was released in 1875 with the title Histoire de l’Expedition Francaise en Florida. In 1875 The Whole and True Account [a reprint of the 1563 The whole & true discoverye of terra Florida] London edition was published in New York.
Augustine in 1565 (Havard & Vidal, 2006). A second civil expedition of 180 Huguenots who went to Florida in April 1568 was also unsuccessful. By 1574, Sainte-Augustine was declared the capital of the Spain’s Floridian colony (Lussagnet, 1958). The state remained under Spanish rule until the United States officially took control of Florida on July 17, 1821. Within a year, after Florida was recognized as a territory on March 30, 1822, and the first map of Florida as an American Territory was drawn by Charles Vignoles in 1823 (Figure 1).

This was the first map to show Florida as an American territory and the first map to use the term “the everglades” (Vignoles, 1823). Despite two centuries of Spanish rule, only a
few thousand Spaniards lived in Florida. As European Americans arrived bringing black slaves with them, actual relationships through which spaces were made were positioned via “articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings” (Massey, 1994, p. 154). The demographics changed and “statehood led to rapid economic growth in Florida during the antebellum years. The population grew from 70,000 persons in 1845 to 140,424 in 1860, of whom 40 percent were slaves” (Gannon, 2003, p. 40). Episodes of violence were common in Florida. The arrival of landowners and their slaves marginalized the Hispanic population and provoked confrontations between migrants and Seminoles who had settled on the internal concessions that the Spaniards recognized for them. In 1823, the United States refused to honor the promise made to the Seminoles to create for them a dream of four million acres in central Florida. The Seminoles engaged in combat with the conquerors, which led to their deportation to an Arkansas reserve in 1834 (Gannon, 2003). After a second conflict in 1857, there were only a few hundred Seminoles left in the Everglades.

As Florida’s infrastructure was growing, its low taxation and the idea of individual freedom brought new settlers and migrants (Gannon, 2003). By 1880, the state’s population amounted to 269,493 people, an increase of 90% over two decades (U.S. Census Bureau, 1880 v-07, p. 4). It was not until the first railroad was completed before the territory was elevated to the status of an “American State” in 1845 (Grunwald, 2006).

As French settlers established themselves in the Laurentian valley, the rapid saturation of these lands led to some communities scattering across factories in Montreal, Quebec, and New England (Lamarre, 2000; Louder & Waddell, *Franco-Amérique*, 2008;

According to the geographer, Rémy Tremblay (2006; 2009), Florida attracted French Canadian workers to the mills of the Florida Panhandle in the winter. Between 1840 and 1930, “about 900,000 French-speaking Canadians left Québec to work in New England’s factories, mills, potato fields and logging camps,” whose region acquired the name “Little Canadas” (*The Little Canadas of New England*, 2019). Yves Roby’s *The Franco-Americans of New England: Dreams and realities* (2004) identifies the first wave of immigrants who settled in the New England region. While some returned after a lucrative stay, most eventually uprooted permanently. The movement South to the Atlantic beaches widened its appeal in 1853 after the opening of the Grand Trunk railway connecting the Canadian metropolis to Portland, Maine (Chodos & Hamovitch, 1991). With the advent of the automobile and the major paved roads in the 1910s, the journey from Quebec to coastal cities in Maine was reduced to five or six hours. Gradually, the French language was instituted in New England (Roby, 2004; 2007), and as a result, the degree of integration was particularly high among the first migrants into the U.S.

Two colonization projects helped increase the French-Canadian numbers during the 1920s and 1930s. In January 1924, the enthusiasm for Florida was such that a group of farmers from New Brunswick and Maine bought a 1000-acre concession with a view to installing 50 to 75 families there (Connors sells 1,000 acres to Florida colony of French Canadians, 1924). *The Palm Beach Post* reports that these prospectors visited Iowa, North Carolina, and Georgia before deciding on Florida, which offered affordable
land to any settler who had the resources to clear it. According to the group, Canadian potato exports were collapsing in the face of the rise in the tariff barriers imposed by the United States, the recipient of most of Canada’s agricultural production (Dick & Taylor, 2015). They then opted to grow and sell agricultural products within American borders. It is likely that a few thousand Acadians, Cajuns, French Canadians, and Franco-Americans resided in Florida permanently. However, the census categories of the time do not allow estimating their importance with exactitude. In addition, the fragility of the first colonies meant that the French-Canadian institutions had almost all disappeared (Dupuis, 2016).

French and French-Canadian settlers took over Florida in a manner comparable to the other colonists who participated in the development of the peninsula. There were even “attempts at French Canadian colonization, including the Acadian colony of Lake Okeechobee (1924) and the Franco-American colony of Bélandville (1930-1936)” (Dupuis, 2010, p. 466) [Translated from French by Tara Kai]. Both colonies evaporated almost without a trace, perhaps due to a storm that left hundreds of people dead in 1928.

Without the expansion of railways and the drying up of marshes, it would have been impossible to undertake extensive settlements of Florida (Bramson, 2018). In 1861, the railroad crossed the Everglades and the railway expansions gained momentum at the beginning of the American period, especially in the 20th century (Sammons, 2010). Inspired by a notion of progress, this “useless” land of swamps was slowly transformed into land suitable for agriculture, urbanization, and tourism. In 1849, the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act (Dovell, 1947) allowed states to transform estuaries that were located in cultivable land and rivers and were considered too narrow or too shallow as canals conducive to navigation. By draining important swampy areas of the southern
third of Florida, this region was considered suitable for urbanization and agriculture. The 1855 Internal Improvement Fund (Minutes of the trustees of the internal improvement fund, 1855) financed the sale of formerly unusable public land, the draining and burying of marshes, as well as the widening and deepening of watercourses. By this time, Floridian farmers had moved away from cotton growing, which became less profitable after the abolition of slavery, and turned to cattle breeding and the cultivation of winter vegetables (Gannon, 2003).

The first cases of French Canadians who moved to Florida were those who could contribute to farming and forest harvest. Missionaries and settlers soon followed (History of Our Parish 1566-1850). Whether it was to take care of French-speaking communities or to evangelize the local populations, the bishop of Montreal sent three missionary priests to Florida between 1836 and 1876 (Beaudin, 1968). In 1910, there were 151 French-Canadian permanent residents in Florida, to which were added at least 36 Floridians whose parents were born in French-speaking Canada (U.S. Census Bureau, 1910, v-2, p. 315). The southern shore of Lake Okeechobee had become an agricultural destination. The length of the journey, however, prevented most French Canadians from getting there. If the peninsula only had a few hundred kilometers of road in 1900, by the 1930s the road network had spanned 5600 kilometers (FL State Road Department, 1930). In 1915, the Dixie Highway Tampa already connected the Midwest, while the Atlantic Highway connected New England to Miami. Nevertheless, Florida was still not that accessible from those who wanted to come on short vacations from the North.

Despite the inauguration of “national roads”, the road networks were made up of an amalgam of local and regional roads that crossed cities and villages. These roads, in
conjunction with traffic jams and slow automobiles contributed to a slow and long journey – on average one-week to make the journey from Montreal to Miami. With the advent of the automobile, the Sunshine State began attracting more than a million tourists a year, an impressive figure at the time (Gannon, 2003). With the completion of the first private toll road, called the “Conners Highway”, through the Everglades in 1924 (Grunwald, 2006) and the expansion of the rail system, Florida saw an increase in mobility tourism. Henry Ford’s first Model T vehicles could now drive in the newly built east to west and north to south national roads. The U.S. government standardized the national roads and created a new network of 66,000 kilometers of federal dual carriageways due to the aftermath of the Second World War. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 - a project whose enormity recalls the Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of Europe – inaugurated a project, which took 30 years to complete (Highway - History, 2020). The Interstate Highways provided relief to the decongested single-carriageway roads and ran connections between major American cities. These highways allowed movement from Vancouver, Montreal, and Toronto to U.S. cities. Major road improvements and interstate networks in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to the reduction of travel time from North to South (Cox & Love, 1998). By 1967, it would only take two to three days to travel from Quebec, Ottawa, Montreal, or Toronto to Miami. The transition from winter to summer, that is driving from cold Quebec to Florida, sometimes in a single day, made it more affordable for groups of families to drive to Florida.

According to the geographer, Louis Dupont (1991), there have been two waves of Canadian migration to Florida. The first beginning in the 1930s and the second after the
Second World War (Dupuis, 2016). Between 1845 and 1860, Florida’s population doubled due to the progress in railway construction (Gannon, 2003). In the wake of these demographic changes, the American census recorded the presence of Canadian permanent residents. In 1870, the U.S. Census Bureau counted 174 residents born in “British America” (the Canadian colonies) and 126 residents born in France (U.S. Census Bureau, 1870, Table VII, p. 338). Historians Eric Jarvis and Robert Harney identify the 1870s as the start of a seasonal migratory flow of Canadians to the mills in the Gulf (Harney, 1989; Jarvis, 2002). In addition, Florida’s first law to limit the work of foreigners was enacted in 1874. It was designed to keep Canadian seasonal workers from competing for jobs on the Pensacola docks. The Workingmen’s Association, a union of African American workers, reportedly lobbied members of Florida congress to pass a 6-month residency requirement in order to obtain a stevedore’s license (Shofner, 1972; Lincove, 2000). By the end of the century, the timber industry in Florida began to decline when the densest forests of cedars and pines had been razed, and a hurricane destroyed several mills on the coast in 1896 (Gannon, 2003). After Reconstruction (1865-1877), the establishment of segregationist laws, as elsewhere in the South, accentuated the impoverishment and the political marginalization of African Americans (Gannon, 2003).

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, French Canadians began taking advantage of Florida’s subtropical warm weather and its economy. The trend of moving to a warmer climate “for health reasons” had already been present among the wealthy. The peninsula also attracted winterers, retirees and semi-retirees who moved towards the winter warmth. This place of leisure and relaxation was luring an increasing number of tourists, who considered a Florida vacation “a democratic right and a republican virtue”
(Mormino, 2005, p. 77). If climatic considerations motivated this migration, the economic factor was essential to its “democratization”.

When World War I broke out, some of the first French Canadians living in Florida temporarily left agriculture to enlist in the U.S. army. These examples of military engagement highlight the fact that many French Canadians undertook individual migrations and quickly integrated into American life.

The 1926 and 1928 devastating hurricanes severely affected the Floridian population and caused a significant fall in prices on the real estate market. In 1926, 5000 houses were destroyed, and 9000 others were damaged in the Southeast (Gannon, 2003). The village of Belle Glade, hastily built in 1925 and home to some French Canadians, was practically wiped out by a second tropical storm (Gorman, 2001). The 1928 hurricane drowned more than 2,500 residents, the majority of the inhabitants of the region (Grunwald, 2006). The bodies buried in the deep mud of the Everglades were never found (Gannon, 2003). In response, the State built a levee on the southern shore of the lake (Mormino, 2005). Despite the 1924 National Origins Quota Act limiting the number of immigrants, Canadian migration to New England did not decrease because they were exempt from this law (Eckerson, 1966).

The 1929 New York stock market crash forced Franco-Americans, who had been laid off by factories in New England to look elsewhere for work (Frenette, 1998). In Florida, the unemployment rate had reached a level such that President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal created 40,000 jobs in Florida (Gannon, 2003). In response to the Economic Crisis, the Quebecker Albertino Béland, went on a tour of New England in 1929 and recruited 103 families who promised to move to Florida and lend him a hand to form
a colony. Laura Lee Scott’s *Belandville: A French Canadian colony in West* (2005) follows Béland’s attempt to establish a village in the northeast region of Pensacola, near the Alabama border. However, after a first migratory flow, the population languished and within six years, most of the settlers had moved away. Once again, French-Canadian colonization left only a small footprint on the territory. What remains are clearings and old foundations, the Camp Paquette campground, the Belandville roads near Milton and Beland in Pensacola (*Belandville Road*, Google Maps, 2020).

As the peninsula became more accessible in the twentieth century, it quickly became a tourist destination for people from the North. Still the French-Canadian presence in Florida was rather low - a few thousand at most. The population only began increasing after World War II.

Altogether, mobility from Québec to Florida has been sporadic and only in the beginning of the twentieth century did migrant workers, who were Québécois, Acadian or Franco-American, come to the Gulf of Mexico because of its forest and orchard industry (Dupont, 1991). It was through word of mouth, advertising, and the creation of advantageous conditions that most of them would henceforth become acquainted with the “Etat du soleil”.

The subtropical climate, the strength of the labor market and purchasing power were key to these movements. It also explains how it was easier to pick Florida over Louisiana or Haiti - two places that were of historically of French descent. Florida’s infrastructure, familiarity, affordability, and its social liberalism made the destination accessible to the middle class and to segments of the post-war French Canadian working class (Harney, 1989).
At the turn of the 20th century, English Canadian investors who went to Florida decided to take part in agricultural colonization. The tiny local business class invited English-Canadian bankers and industrialists to visit the Southeast of the state, in the hope that they would contribute to its agricultural and tourism development (HSPBCA, 1924). Consequently, in April 1916, TM McCormick, director of the family company of crackers and candies, obtained 160 acres of land in Moorehaven, on the banks of Lake Okeechobee, to sow the wheat and potatoes necessary for making his cookies. The transaction did not go unnoticed in the media (Canadian Merchant Believes in Glades, 1916). It is also during this period (1913) that the first English Canadian club in Saint Petersburg, brought together investors and successful vacationers (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011). Their presence, however, is reminiscent of the economic inequity between English and French Canadians; the nearly 200 permanent French-Canadian residents working there at the time were workers and farmers.

By mid-twentieth century, the southern third of the state included only a few thousand Americans and Seminoles, a factor that allowed the authorities to conduct a vigorous policy of colonization and “improvement” (Grunwald, 2006). Absorption of the strike force of hurricanes that periodically fell on the peninsula, revealed the importance of preserving these natural habitats (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011). About 30 percent of the estuaries surrounding Miami, Orlando and Fort Myers had already been drained in order to promote urban sprawl of cities. Whatever the case, rave stories fostered by an array of visual culture – including photographs, advertising, and post cards, probably mark the entourage of visitors.
Word of mouth stories, such as the first advertisements exalting the attractions of the peninsula during the 1920s, helped build the mirage of a Florida dream (Hollis, 1999). No matter how warm or inherently beautiful Florida’s beaches and environment were, “the Florida Dream had to be constructed by the state’s promoters and boosters and advertised to potential tourists and migrants. Tourist Florida was, after all, made not begotten” (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011, p. 26). This was a variant of the American awakening, marked by the subtropical climate and hedonism, which seduced many Americans and Canadians from the northeast (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011; Malone, 2012). To escape the monotony of work and the exhausting cold weather, Florida offered heat, a festive environment, and young women in swimsuits. After successfully attracting the American elite, the state set out to seduce ordinary people.

The 1940 census offers few details on the ethnic origin of residents of Florida and does not record the presence of Franco-Americans or Cajuns; there are still 1153 French, 877 French Canadians and 298 Belgians (by birth) who reside there permanently (U.S. Census Bureau. 1940 Volume 2. v-02, p. 32). Already in 1940, 36% of French-Canadian residents of the State lived in Dade County, which includes the city of Miami, which became the main destination for French Canadian immigrants after the Second World War. From 1945, the Florida Advertising Commission broadcast advertisements in magazines and on television, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars. Tallahassee then established the Florida Citrus Commission (1935), a public organization dedicated to promoting orange as the emblem of the state (Rogers, 1960). As early as the 1890s, Florida citrus crates had labels featuring lush tropical landscapes and beautiful women
beckoning visitors from the North to come for the warmth and possibly “romance”

(Figures 2, 3 & 4).
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The State Agricultural Marketing Board whose 1935 legislature mandated the Florida Citrus Commission to promote the state’s iconic citrus crop reinforced this visual culture (LaGodna, 1968; 1974). Local and state government agencies adopted the citrus emblems in their tourism and real estate material. Such iconography was so entrenched in North American imagination that in 1945, the Florida Advertising Commission was incorporated into the Department of Agriculture (Florida Department of Citrus, 2017; Florida Department of State, 2020). In 1945, thanks to the invention of frozen concentrated orange and advertising targeting families in the North, exports of oranges from the Florida quadrupled between 1940 and 1950 (Gannon, 2003; Mormino, 2005). In 1953, the New York Times reported that the three Florida/Georgia (Yulle & Hilliard) and Florida/Alabama (Campbellton) border welcome stations offered visitors “a free glass of orange juice [...] the staff of each station consists of three young women, all college graduates, who are required to know just about all there is to know about Florida”
(Wright, 1953). A frequent request from tourists at these stations being “where can we go and take pictures of ourselves picking oranges?” (Wright, 1953).

As the journey became routine for Nordic travelers, a culture of particular consumption leads to the integration of specific appetizing symbols: third-party fruit stands, pecans, fried chicken, among other southern “culinary specialties” (Breslauer, 2000; Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011). Several chains of gas stations, motels and restaurants offer travelers familiar standards, as these become landmarks discussed by migrants and even cause nostalgia among those who repeat the journey. That said, some back home see this as the work of the American “Manifest Destiny”, which encourages over development, mass consumption, gun ownership and undermines the diversity of tastes and cultures (Slinger, 1989; Pelletier, 1990; Vennat, 1990; Berland, 1999; 2009).

In addition to beaches and hotels, Florida offered tours by glass bottom boat, hovercrafts in the marshes, exotic wildlife and forest parks, landing strips, and reconstituted Seminole villages (Mechling, 1996; Ammidown, 1998; Eck, 2001; Mormino G., 2002). This spectacular increase started in the 1960s from 70,000 French Canadians with disposable incomes and paid holidays drove down the highways towards a warmer climate and attractions. The opening of Cypress Gardens at Winter Haven in 1936 (Branch, 2002) and the National Aeronautics and Space rocket launch platform Administration (NASA) at Titusville in 1962 made it a hub of attractions unique in the world (Kennedy Space Center, 2013).

In Quebec, the second wave of industrialization accelerated the rural exodus and urbanization, while the advent of the telephone, radio and television introduced American hedonistic culture into popular French-Canadian culture (Frenette, 1998). Although the
average incomes of French Canadians were lower than those of English Canadians, they began to practice tourism, starting from the Second World War, in the same way as Americans and other Canadians. By the second half of the 20th century, the increase in incomes of French Canadians allowed them to follow their penchant for the mobility they would have had since colonial times (Morissonneau, 1978; 1983).

It is estimated that about 60,000 French Canadian tourists settled in Florida permanently during the period of 1945-1970 (Dupont, 1993; Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011). Despite the establishment of clubs and the creation of weekly newspapers, the level of institutional development of this contingent remained relatively low. The destination was popular even with French Canadians who spoke little or no English. Already, in a few cities located between Miami and Fort Lauderdale, there were motels, restaurants and shops which, belonging to Franco-Americans and French Canadians, offered services in French.

It was not until the 1960s and the arrival of Walt Disney that Florida became the main tourist destination on the planet. The arrival of Walt Disney World (WDW) irreparably transformed Florida; the fall of tourism in nature parks, the presence of tens of thousands of underpaid workers, the displacement of the heart of South Florida tourism in Orlando and the development of an exacerbated representation of consumerism are generally considered to have resulted from this arrival. This process of radical commodification of societies will come to bear the name “disneyfication” (Mormino, 2005). Other parks such as Sea World (1973) and Universal Studios (1990) opened their doors to compete with Disney. WDW welcomed 100 million visitors during its first decade (Walt Disney World History, 2009). If one estimates that French Canadian
tourists constitute about 2% of visitors to Florida at the time, we can extrapolate that two million French Canadians would have visited Cinderella Castle from 1971 to 1981 alone (McGoun, 1987; Mormino, 2005). The success of the first park is such that Disney World opened the Epcot Center (1982) which highlights the 10 countries from which the majority of its visitors come, including Canada (Canada Far and Wide in Circle-Vision 360). The descendants of the Québécois factory workers, miners, lumberjacks and farmers now have enough presence in Florida to prompt historian Eric Jarvis to call Florida “Canada’s 11th province, an extension of their society into a foreign country” (Jarvis, 2002, p. 186). According to The Canadian Snowbird Association, about 350,000 Canadians (10 percent of the Canadian population) stay three to six months in Florida. About 100,000 stay between one to three months in the state (Swisher, 2019).

The concentration of French-Canadian immigrants in the Southeast probably attracted visitors to certain cities more than others. This organic process of community gathering is not, however, exclusive to French Canadians. According to Michael Gannon and Gary Mormino, the Germans were already converging on Fort Myers, while British and English Canadians went mainly to St. Petersburg. On the Atlantic coast, Jews, French and French Canadians were concentrated around, Miami, the Finns converged on Lake Worth, and the Italians settled in Key West (Mormino, 2002; 2005; Gannon, 2003). To illustrate the migration of ethnic groups to specific destinations, Godefroy Desrosiers-Lauzon writes that in 1960, there were so many Canadians wintering in Miami Beach that “the manager of the posh Sans Souci hotel calculated that half of his winter clients were Canadians. A critical mass had been reached for fission: in 1964 a Miami newspaper [Miami News] found that most English Canadians preferred Fort Lauderdale and
Pompano Beach, while the French chose Sunny Isles and Surfside” (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011, p. 175).

The semi-permanent Québécois community in and around Hollywood, Florida had reached about 80,000 by the early 1980s. During the harsh Northern winters, this number increased by another 60,000 snowbirds and an additional 435,000 tourists from Quebec (Dupont & Dussault, 1982). The permanent Florida residents from Quebec worked or owned businesses that catered to the French-Canadian population. Under these conditions, the number of tourists grew rapidly and, since most of them praised the destination upon their return, they had a ripple effect on their loved ones. In addition to family stories, high profile personalities told their stories to the press and may have struck the imagination of their compatriots and sowed at home the desire to visit Florida one day (Lamonde, 1996). For Dupont, it was the Floribécois community who contributed to the possibility of the Québécois mobility – assuming the same function once possessed by New England’s mill towns (Dupont & Dussault, 1982; Dupont, 1993).

Tremblay found that most of the French speaking community who came to Florida between 1946 and 1960 settled in and around Miami Beach (Tremblay, 2001, 2006). South Florida became progressively more Québécois owing to improved rail and motorways and economic growth due to Québec’s “Quiet Revolution.” With the influx of the Latin American migrants and urban growth during the 1970s and early 1980s, the French-speaking population moved further north. The language limitations of French-

---

7 In 1960, the liberal government of Jean Lesage and later Robert Bourassa (elected in 1970) came to be known as the “Quiet Revolution” (Révolution tranquille). The provincial government took direct control from the Roman Catholic Church and implemented major changes. Such efforts allowed healthcare and education to become secularized and proved to be a period of uninhibited social and economic enhancement in Québec and Canada (Behiels, 1985; 2005; Cuccioletta & Lubin, 2003).
speaking visitors and snowbirds fostered what Dupont has branded as “captive tourism.” (Dupont, 1985) that is, a temporal and spatial hub of businesses owned or operated by Québécois community. Understandably, merchants started offering goods and services to welcome their French-Canadian neighbors and put forward services in French. Frenchie’s Café, La Gaspésienne, QuéFla, Chez Bébère and La Brochette all form a strip of ten kilometers along the beach between Sheridan Street and Hollywood Boulevard nicknamed “Le Petit Québec” (Tremblay, 2009). The French-language newspaper Le Courrier des Amériques (Letters from America) references the few miles from Hallandale Beach to Hollywood Beach as a neighborhood where there are not only the Québécois but “suddenly, other French speakers (French, Belgian, Swiss) are also settling there more and more. This is the case of Sunny Isles, Hallandale and Hollywood (Broward County), and of course Lake Worth (Palm Beach County)” (Le Courrier des Amériques, 2014). [Translated from French by Tara Kai]

Many shops display “Bienvenue –Welcome”, “nous parlons français” or “TV en français”, alongside a Quebec flag or a list of Canadian products (Tremblay, 2006; 2009; Gilbert, Langlois & Tremblay, 2011), and they are busiest during the winter months. Tremblay writes that such common culture sociability creates “structuring places” that are perfectly exemplified in and around the Hollywood Boardwalk. These merchants display Canadian products in their windows, including whiskey, but also “cognac and big gin” the most popular among French Canadians, according to a French merchant interviewed. You can also get the newspaper La Presse at 30 sous (triple its price in Montreal) (Séguin, 2015). During the weekend, “Salute to Canada” from March 10-12, 1967, the maple leaf and the Fleurdelisé (the flag of Quebec) fly side by side all over
Surfside (Paquette, 1967). In addition to occasional activities at the beach, there is a Sunday mass in French during the winter.

From Montreal, visitors can reach Florida in 19 hours and Miami in 25 hours, and round-trip air tickets between the two cities sell for an average of $185. Airlines offer more than one connection a day between major Canadian cities and Florida. The city of Sunny Isles offers services in French in 27% of its motels, 2 out of 5 tourists are of French-Canadian origin and a third of the municipality’s tourism promotion budget is spent in Canada. Nevertheless, there is still a schism between wealthy tourists at Surfside and young tourists from working classes, who stay in cheaper hotels in Hollywood (Dupont & Dussault, 1982).

It would only be a matter of time until the Québécois media was established to cover French-speaking cultural and social activities. In the 1990s not only could one buy *La Presse, Le Devoir, Le Journal de Montreal* but also *Le Droit d’Ottawa-Hull*. Mostly Québécois law firms, clinics, and real estate agencies, display their ads in such publications offering their services in French. Branches of Desjardins Bank and the National Bank began their operations in Broward County in 1992 and 1994, respectively. They provide services mainly in French and facilitate transfers and withdrawals from Canadian bank accounts (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011).

Despite the devaluation of the Canadian currency against the American dollar between 1978 and 2002, the Canadian Dollar was at 1.62 in January of 2002 (Canadian Dollar, 2020). During this period, free trade with the United States intensified and Canadians thus became more and more familiar with U.S. goods and services (Hillmer & Granatstein, 2005). Since the 1970s, Canadians have increasingly travelled to sunshine
destinations in the United States. They crossed the million mark in 1970 and exceeded two million in 1989 (Desrosiers-Lauzon, 2011). Quebec tourists visiting Southeast Florida went from 350,000 in the 1981-1982 season to 550,000 seven years later (Dupont & Dussault, 1982).

The biggest event that is held every winter since 1994 is CanadaFest (see figure 5). According to Tremblay, CanadaFest,

Embody what Floribec is; a community made up of people of French-Canadian origin belonging to the working class who idealize the Miami lifestyle. They frequent the same retail and service spots where French is spoken and whose survival depends in all respects on mass seaside tourism in its image. (Tremblay R., 2001, p. 11) [Translated from French by Tara Kai]

![Figure 5](https://images.cornell.edu/...)

**Figure 5** (University of Florida Digital Collections, 2007)
Florida has increased its capacity to welcome French Canadians over the years, particularly in the coastal suburbs north of Miami. The French-Canadian presence continues to be significant (Léger, 2014) in the 21st century. The enthusiasm for the warmth and lifestyle that Florida offers attracted in 2012 alone 3.7 million Canadian tourists and more than 500,000 Canadian winter visitors, among whom there are about one million tourists (Dupuis, 2016). Following on from this increase in presence, RV tourism, a subcategory of “drive tourism” (Pearce & Wu, 2018), has allowed the Movers to travel South, bringing with them a microcosm of their home. Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) park\(^8\) is now home to an ever increasingly number of RVs from Quebec during the winter months.

It is inevitable that some of them became immigrants (Rosental, 1990); they establish businesses that display their services in French, offer Canadian products, set up associations and establish newspapers. From 1945, the proliferation of retirement plans, the increase in life expectancy and the accessibility of transport over long distances favored the emergence of those who “winter” in Florida. Some have bought residences or have shared a routine community life. To use Joseph Yvon Thériault’s expression, it is the winter visitors who most clearly demonstrate the will to make society - through their concentration in certain geographical areas in the Southeast, the associations, and the services they have endowed, their use of the French language and their multi-year roots in Florida (Thériault, 1995). In other words, they animate, during the winter, a temporary

\(^8\) “Topeekeegee Yugnee” in Seminole means gathering place.
CHAPTER 5
METHODS

Phenomenology as Method

From a contextual and subjective perspective, the challenges in any phenomenological description and interpretation are: what the researcher experiences, what the participants are experiencing and how participants articulate their experiences (Hubbard et al., 2002) because these perceptions are “constituted by differential densities of human experience, attachment, and involvement. […] What space is depends on who is experiencing it and how” (Tilley, 1994, p. 11). If communication is fundamentally representational, then the qualitative methods used must strike a balance between description and analysis (Couper, 2015).

An analysis of the relationship between lifestyle migration, mobility, space, and place necessitates capturing subjectivities about mobility and how participants imagine themselves as having “mobility potential” (Kaufmann, Bergman & Joye, 2004). Given the subjective nature of lived experiences of Movers who change their mobility practices - expected and known mobility changes and subtle mobility changes through time, it is appropriate to use qualitative research to interpret a thorough understandings of phenomena, because it has “the power to take the investigator into the minds and lives of the respondents, to capture them warts and all” (McCracken, 1988, p.10).

The current study employs an interpretive research approach and is inductive in nature. Phenomenology is an appropriate method to use since its focus is on the basic experience or essence of phenomena and will provide individual insights and a framework for things that make them what they are. Although social constructions acting
upon the Floribécois are important, they are beyond the scope of a phenomenological description since the focus here is to understand relationships between selves and places after the social construction has already taken place. It is in the lived body where “there is only one subject of place, one body-subject, one embodied self who experiences, expresses, and deals with place by means of habitus, habitation, and idiolocalization” (Casey, 2001a, p.689).

Although a variety in depictions of phenomenon are important, the fundamental purpose of phenomenological research is to treat narratives as a groundwork from which to detect shared connections that uncover the fundamental traits and key qualities of the phenomenon that accurately embody everyday experiences. This study works towards descriptions of phenomena that are intrinsically relational, composed, embodied, and entrenched in a sociocultural world. What this means for geographical discourse is, according to Derek Gregory (1978), that “geography will have to dismantle the oppositions between subject and object, actor and observer, and emphasize the mediations between different frames of reference” (p. 146). The idea that consciousness is affiliated with an object (the intentionality of consciousness) sustains that the actual object is intricately linked to one’s consciousness of it. At its core, what this means is that participants have subjective experiences of a phenomenon and at the same time, can have objective experiences that they share in common with others. Similarly significant for this research is Merleau-Ponty’s concept of shifting the prevalence of a Cartesian dualist ontology of perception to placing an emphasis of experience.
IPA - Overview & Context

For the present study I have opted for a method called interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) (Smith, Jarman & Osbourne, 1999). The foundations of IPA are theoretically rooted in hermeneutic phenomenology. As a result, its strength lies in how informants describe their experiences, identify meaning and the researcher’s interpretation of subjective experiences (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). Since IPA recognizes that there are shared perspectives and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon, the analysis comprises of collections of conversations and shared meanings, while being mindful of the unique experience of a single individual and/or subgroup (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). When compared to broad quantitative data, qualitative data is at times viewed as limited but deep. IPA facilitates the probe in participants’ experiences, perceptions, and phenomenon within a specific milieu by specific informant sets (Reid et al., 2005; Brocki & Wearden, 2006). The interpretivist can determine meanings and subjective experiences that fall within a certain timeframe, and within particular contexts by focusing on the “particular” or “thick description” (Geertz, 1973). The practice of IPA provides thick description and is an important technique by which a researcher can provide context and the meanings placed on places, words, actions, and objects; it offers “understanding [of] an area of interest through a deeper, more personal, individualized analysis” (Kay & Kingston, 2002, p. 180). It is within this depth of understanding that empathetic identification with individuals is more likely. Qualitative data involves informants’ perception and therefore need not necessarily be expected to be “reducible”. In fact, Lucy Yardley (2000)
contends that in qualitative research “reliability and replicability may also be inappropriate criteria, if the purpose of the researcher is to offer just one of many possible interpretations of a phenomenon” (p. 218). Nevertheless, it must be credible, dependable, convincing, transferable, and confirmable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Giorgi, 2002).

The IPA methodology is especially applicable in this study because its emphasis is on the construction of meaning, context, and various aspects of everyday life practices within social phenomena. The supporting literature used to analyze the qualitative data collected are Clark Moustakas’ *Phenomenological Research Methods* (1994), John Creswell and Cheryl N. Poth’s *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (2017) and H. Russell Bernard, Amber Y. Wutich and Gery W. Ryan’s *Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches* (2017).

IPA is particularly well suited in this research as it enables a contextual and condensed analyses of the phenomenon under investigation. IPA has its foundation in phenomenology because it maintains that one can probe experiences and how they are given value through informants’ lifeworld. IPA states that efforts at understanding the informant’s perception entails interpretative attempts on the part of the researcher (Smith, 2004).

Research Procedures

The purpose of this section is to explore the personal narratives of the Floribécois and to better identify their meaning. It seeks to discover the meaning of these subjective
experiences using interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) (Smith, Jarman & Osbourne, 1999). This is necessary because an IPA approach helps translate stories and explore the possible subjective meanings articulated in narratives. Such an approach does not presuppose that life experiences are quantifiable and can be reduced to an objective or inadequate binary analysis. Rather, it attempts to shift the lens from established predetermined hypothesis to viewing phenomena differently.

The participants in this study are English-speaking residents of Quebec who come to Broward County and stay at Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) RV-park. Although this study is not concerned about creating definitions, its goal is to search for common elements as described in shared meanings and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon. While I expect that the outcomes might corroborate prevailing themes present in current research in lifestyle mobilities and experiential properties of space, I am interested in what the common phenomena would expose from a more exclusive population of the Floribécois using IPA. The spatial experiences of the Floribécois in my study are not only significantly related to mobility and places, but also to individual physical space in an RV. The way the body adjusts and moves in space is another case given in phenomenology and wholly relevant to the scope of this dissertation. Using Seamon’s (1979) three different but connected concepts of rest (sense of place), encounter (observation) and movement (intentional/motility) in conjunction with his concept of “purposive sensibility” (p. 40), it is noteworthy to examine the habitual spatial movements of the participants. Spatial analyses also necessitate examination of “the material and representational aspects of body space” (Low, 2003, P. 10) as a function of individual and local experiences. According to Low (2003) embodied
practices underscore “the importance of the body as a physical and biological entity, lived experience, and a center of agency, a location for speaking and acting on the world” (P. 10). My research will enhance the concept of spatial consumption via routines, lived practices and interactions using processes and analysis of the socio-physical context in which these experiences occur. It is during this phase that perceptual experience, subjective consciousness, and social flows become an “embodied space” and take on material/spatial form (Low, 2003).

Specifically, I will be using Bernard, Wutich & Ryan’s (2017) six steps listed below that are involved in a phenomenological study:

(1) identifying a thing, a phenomenon, whose essence you want to understand.

(2) identifying your biases and bracketing them— doing as much as you can to put them aside.

(3) collecting narratives about the phenomenon from people who are experiencing it by asking them a really good, open-ended question, grand-tour question and then probing to let them run with it.

(4) using your now fresh (after bracketing) intuition to identify the essentials of the phenomenon.

(5) laying out those essentials in writing with exemplary quotes from the narratives.

(6) and repeating steps 4 and 5 until you are sure that there is no more to learn about the lived experience of the person you are studying. (P. 297)
Research Method

In April 2019, the author contacted Broward County Parks & Recreation Division to acquire a research permit. The intention of the permit process is that once the permit has been issued, the researcher will then provide a one-page research intent flyer (Appendix A) to the administrative office to begin recruitment. The office specifically requested that their administrative staff distribute the flyer to the RV-park guests. If the guests are interested, they can contact the researcher who then begins the informed consent process. The researcher was awarded the research permit in July 2019. After the IRB approval, the researcher began the recruitment process with Ms. Deborah Battista, the office manager at the T.Y. Park office. Given that the T.Y. Park RV spaces can be reserved by non-Floribécois, the participants in this study were first identified by Ms. Battista based on the population she and the staff knew would fit the description of the flyer. The staff placed flyers in the welcome package of those guests they knew were driving South annually from Quebec. Since the participant group was predefined, it was only reasonable not to use random sampling or other available sampling methods.

If the RV-park guests were interested, they could contact the researcher directly via phone, text, or email. This process respects potential participants’ privacy because the communication would be directly with the researcher and not through the administration office. Furthermore, although the Broward County Parks and Recreation division can request the researcher to submit a project summary, data collected, reports and/or future publications to the Planning and Development Group, these documents do not contain any identifiable private information of the subjects.
Semi-Structured Interviews

In line with the phenomenological study and interpretative research design or IPA, qualitative interviewing was applied in this research as its aim is to describe the shared meaning and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon (Smith, Jarman & Osbourne, 1999). Given the subjective nature of the research focus and the IPA approach used, it was appropriate to employ semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions to gain a thorough understandings of phenomena. Such questions are typically framed within the conventions of a flexible research design approach, which include “fundamental characteristics such as an evolving design, the presentation of multiple realities, the researcher as an instrument of data collection, and a focus on the participants’ views” (Robson, 2002, p. 166). An “interview schedule” (Smith, Flowers & Larkin 2009) (Appendix D) was used as a starting point instead of structured questions. Open questions encourage participants to elaborate on their experience on a specific topic, thus keeping in line with the IPA approach. Smith, Flowers & Larkin (2009) assert that IPA approaches must tackle the research questions “sideways” (p.58), that is, allow the conversation to flow, while the researcher listens, and extracts detailed first-person accounts of their experiences.

All participants read and signed the consent form and their responses to the preliminary participant questionnaire (Appendix C) were recorded. The researcher generally clarified the aims of the study to the participants and emphasized that she is interested in their personal accounts of events and experiences. When interesting ideas, processes or responses arose, the interviewer took notes before, during and after each
interview. Based on the preference of the participants, the location of the interview was either outside or inside their RV. The researcher made sure the space was private and quiet.

To begin, the researcher followed the Smith, Flowers & Larkin (2009) interview parameters which propose starting with a question that enables participants to describe their experience. Therefore, the following single open-ended question was used: “Can you please describe your specific experiences of moving from your home in Quebec to TY Park RV-park every year, and your experiences of space and place in both places?” Having an open-ended question allows for a degree of openness so that stories can be further probed during the interview process (Kvale, 1996). When needed, the interviewer used the sub-questions in the interview schedule (Appendix D). An IPA study’s strength lies in how informants describe their experiences, identify meaning and the presentation of the researcher’s interpretation of those subjective experiences (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). It was important that the researcher approach the participants’ experiences through their descriptions, and for her to lay aside (or bracket) her biases, assumptions, and the tendency to use past principles to describe or analyze participants’ narratives (Giorgi 2009). Participants were prompted with questions such as “how did it feel to …” or “can you describe …” in order to fine-tune the interview schedule.

From the first interview, it was obvious that a structured “sequence” of questions was not necessary and that follow-up questions had to be shaped based on the responses given. Although some questions were straight-forward such as “What brought you to Broward County the first time?” or “What brought you to the RV-park the first time?”
they set the scene for the main research question of seasonal lifestyle perspectives and experiential properties of space.

Participants

The IPA approach has been mostly favored by psychologists who are interested in the individual and focus on personal experience by using unstructured interviews and thematic analysis. This manner of in-depth insight into individual behavior is called the “idiographic” approach because it does not seek to formulate laws or generalize theories in advance.

The IPA approach was used to relate shared perspectives and the lived experiences of a group of people about a concept or a phenomenon which entails the use of a fairly homogeneous group. The method is to collectively look at shared meanings, while being mindful of the unique experience of a single individual and/or subgroup (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009).

Since the researcher is not fluent in French, it was critical that the interviewees were fluent in English. One of the screener script (Appendix B) questions was “would you say you speak English well enough to conduct an interview in English?” It was assumed that those who did not fit the description on the flyer - French Canadians from Quebec who self-identify as being part of the “Floribécois” community, who annually migrate and live in RVs during the winter months in Broward County would not apply.

On November 4, 2019, the first participant left a voice message on the researcher’s cell phone. From here on, no one else contacted the researcher. A follow-up
meeting with the T.Y. Park administrative office in December 2029 proved useful in that they introduced the researcher to the onsite “Campground Host”. This role is currently filled by an 88-year-old man from Quebec who has been driving to the RV-park with his wife since 2008. In exchange for rent-free space, the host’s responsibilities are to welcome the RV guests, help them set-up, and be available to their questions via text and cellphone.

On January 24, 2020, the researcher met with the host, drove around the RV-park, and was introduced to 10 couples⁹ who the host identified as “English speaking” Floribécois and who fulfilled the other parameters of the study. During introductions, the researcher confirmed dates with each RV guest/couple from January 27 until February 5, 2020. The reason the interviews were spread out over a period of ten days was to give the researcher enough time to listen and transcribe each conversation with an eye on modifying questions and their sequence in accordance with IPA guidelines (Smith, Flowers & Larkin 2009, p.66).

The researcher followed up with texts/calls on the day of the interview to confirm the time and location. Only one participant did not respond to the follow-up text/call. The campground host was able to quickly provide a back-up contact, and an interview date was scheduled for the tenth couple. This process led the researcher to recruit ten “couples”. According to the practices of IPA, approximately four to ten participants are needed to collect “detailed accounts of individual experiences” (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009, p.51). Ten participant accounts can be deemed a robust study that allows

---

⁹ Although the researcher refers to “couples” throughout, responses from each couple depended on who spoke the most (contingent on who felt more comfortable speaking English). This is reflected in the column titled “Sex” in table 1 of the appendices: Female (F), Male (M) or both spoke equally (F/M).
for an in-depth analysis of a homogenous group within a specific context (Smith, Flowers & Larkin 2009, 2009) where the emphasis is placed on “quality rather than quantity and the objective [is] not to maximize numbers but rather to become ‘saturated’ with information on the topic” (Padgett, 1998 cited in Bowen, 2008, p.142). The nuanced exploration of a small group’s experiences may transfer to future studies whereby new phenomena can be placed in similar contexts or similar phenomena can be placed in different contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Once consent forms were signed by participants, the researcher allocated a predetermined subject identification (ID) letter (A-J) to ensure that subjects are only identifiable by letters. All interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder. The couple’s ID letters that cross-referenced the subjects’ names were kept in a separate location. The couple’s ID letters and demographics of the ten interviewees who participated in this study are in Table 1.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process adhered to the IPA guidelines by Smith, Flowers & Larkin (2009) and Bernard, Wutich & Ryan’s (2017) six steps (see section Research Procedures). The six steps involved in a phenomenological study are not bound to prior theories and hence can be applied to any theoretical methods. Moreover, this study took into consideration Smith’s (1995) work on semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis with regards to the early stages of interviewing. According to Smith (1995), qualitative research requires the iterative and cross-referencing process of consulting the
recordings as well as transcripts in order to simultaneously generate and interpret data. Before any analysis or interpretation is initiated, recordings were first listened to, transcribed, and then the transcripts were read and re-read repeatedly so as to collect the full essence of participants’ account. Should any significant or interesting phenomena, concepts or themes emerge, they were noted and later clustered under themes and sub-themes. According to Smith (1995), upon examination, the researcher’s interpretations must be internally consistent. In this study, the researcher’s interest was not to formulate laws or generalize results, instead its aim was to reveal phenomena and participants’ experiences and meanings given by the informants. The analytic process was cyclical and involved drawing associations between source material and interpretation.

Participant observation, the least structured data collection technique (Bernard, 2006) provides complimentary perspectives on lived practices captured through site visits and interviews. The space-sensitive method socio-spatial network games (modified from Schröder, Picot & Andresen, 2010) is a network activity within a framework whereby subjects are asked to describe the people that they most interact with and are important for them and tell stories based on these (Table 3). This activity is in addition to performative methodologies (embodied gestures, movements, and actions) that allow interviewees to present their own stories, through “relation rather than just representation” (Thrift, 2000). A short questionnaire that was completed by the informants captured, age, dates, living situation and other socio-demographic data. While some outcomes might corroborate prevailing themes present in current research present in lifestyle mobilities and experiential properties of space, the interest here is in what the common phenomena would expose from a more exclusive population of the Floribécois.
All interviews were transcribed for interpretation and analysis. During the transcription process, any significant or interesting phenomena, concepts or themes that emerged “across data sets to find repeated patterns of meaning” (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009, p. 86) were noted and later clustered under themes and sub-themes. The researcher transcribed each interview and took notes before the next interview was conducted. Since this study involves the awareness and interpretation of certain phenomena, and not “language use”, the transcripts were modified as needed to accommodate French/English language issues. However, the researcher left most of the grammar irregularities intact in the transcriptions.

As data was transcribed, patterns were initially identified case by case. By listening, reading, and re-reading the transcript, the aim was “to understand the participants and their subjective world” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 43). A three-columned analysis table (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009), was created with the interview topic to the left, emerging themes in the middle, and subthemes to the right column (Table 2). As each new interview was transcribed, the revision and clustering activity helped determine associations between common themes and subthemes across all interviews. This quasi “dialogue” between the researcher and coded data, led to the “development of a more interpretative account [...] the development of a structure, frame or gestalt which illustrates the relationships between themes” (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009, p. 79). The individual experiences of the ten couples, a pre-determined and homogenous group, helped the researcher develop an understanding of the particulars within the context of space, place and lifestyle mobilities.
CHAPTER 6
RESULTS

Contextualizing Extracts

The aim of this chapter is to discover the seasonal lifestyle mobility experiences of the Floribécois population in TY Park’s RV-park in relation to experiential properties of space via “expression[s] of geographical experience,” (Relph, 1976, p. 4). Their stories build the framework towards an analysis of the justifications and motivations behind participants’ everyday life choices whilst in Florida during the winter months. Although references to space and place are used interchangeably in these extracts, the guideline I am using is Tuan’s (1977) concise yet intricate description arguing that space and place are necessary for each other and that “‘Space’ is more abstract than ‘place’” (p. 6). Physical locations and fixed coordinates of spaces are converted into places through the corporeal presence of humans and everyday life. In these analyses, it is in human practice and its complementing narratives that create place meanings. The choices by which people organize their daily movements and activities can be discovered through discussions about daily routines. This enables researchers to identify the way in which the lived experiences are described and verbalized. Kvale (1996) defines the semi-structured interview as one “whose purpose is to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewees with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena” (pp. 5–6). This approach helps clarify what mobilities means for individuals within the context of space in everyday life, and how they are articulated in stories and narratives.

What follows is a longer chapter that both reveals my findings and concludes the dissertation. The chapter begins by providing an overview of participants’ origin stories:
how participants first came to Florida. It then situates those stories within discourses of choice and freedom. Next, key narratives about home are examined, followed by reports of consumption, familiar places, faces and old friends. Finally, the last two sections address themes of being active in nature and safety and security.

Origin Stories: How Participants First Came to Florida

In the present study, it is observed that all participants first came to various towns in Florida with their family when they were younger – in some cases, the annual journey South during the winter months goes back generations. Likewise, decisions made about their choice of locations, places and spaces are often mentioned in conjunction with referrals received from other couples from Quebec. Social scientists, who have studied mobility flows, social networks, and sociability, have touched on similar assumptions (Pankhurst, 1966; Brox, 1983, Mueller, 1999). Motivations on the repeat vacation phenomenon - also known as “repeat visitation”, “holiday repeats”, “destination attachment”, “revisit intention”, and “destination loyalty” have also been studied by multiple scholars (Gitelson & Compton, 1984; Oppermann, 1998, 2000; Lehto, O’Leary & Morrison, 2004; Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Li, Cai, Lehto & Huang, 2010; Morais & Lin, 2010). For example, as early as 1954, George Calvin Hoyt surveyed Bradenton Trailer Park residents (north of Sarasota) as to what first brought them to Bradenton, Florida. Like other migrants, lifestyle migrants draw from their experience of previous travels, are influenced by Florida publicity, and follow suggestions from their family and social networks to choose their destination.
Couple “D”, a young(er) couple in their 60s first visited Florida in 1986. They explain that they discovered TY Park because a friend of theirs from Quebec was staying at the park. They have been coming here for the past 4 years. They reflect on the number of times that friends or co-workers made them aware of the various places in Florida:

**Couple “D” – Extract 1**

“We came here for the first time in 1986 and went to Daytona for the races. And then we came down South here because at that time my husband was working for a guy who had a condo here. So, we went to see him here. So, you know, we look around. And then a friend was living here, I mean not living but he was staying here for a while. So, we came here and said ‘oh that’s nice’ you know. I never liked the cold. Back in the day, our goal was to come to Florida when we retire. Now we are here even though we are not retired yet.”

Having been “aware” (Milman & Pizam, 1995) of Florida since they had been going there with friends and family since they were in their 20s was significant to them as it solidified the repetitive nature of established practices. These findings are in line with those reported by Richard Gitelson and John Crompton whose 1984 study indicated that there is a “shift to visit a familiar destination [which] occurs most noticeably around the age of 40” (Gitelson & Compton, 1984).

Another couple in their early 70s have been coming to FL since 1989 (since they were in their mid-30s) and driving with a “fifth wheel”. They used to stay in Juno Beach for 15 years, then Naples, and then Fort Meyers. When the wife became sick and had to have a kidney transplant, they stopped for a while. Now they have been coming to TY park since 2012:
Couple “H” – Extract 2

“It’s a friend. He said that ‘we are there’. We come back on the airplane. The first time we came, we stay in the hotel over there - the Holiday Inn. And we come see. And we said yes, and we reserve for the next two years. We like Juno Beach, but now it’s too expensive. It is $99 per day because it’s a private place but close to the beach.”

In the same way, Couple “E” (a couple in their mid-70s) who have been coming to TY Park for 9 years, heard about Florida when they were younger and experienced the journey South with their friends and family.

Couple “E” – Extract 3

“Like everybody else, we were younger, we all heard about Florida and we all wanted to go. And then we started going down here in the late 60s. And then when we first married in the early 70s, every now and then we used to come down a couple of weeks. And then in late 70s, we bought a condo on Collins in Miami Beach. Right now, all the bluegrass is destroyed. We weren’t retired then, so it was not a good time. We couldn’t really come as much as we wanted to. After we pay all the expenses of owning it and not using it, after maybe a year or two and then we sold it.”

The pattern emerges that the justifications and motivations for the annual southward journey is based on memories taking the trip when they were younger. According to Relph (1976), by continually “recreating” our place we recreate ourselves and so our experiences of places create a sense of attachment and commitment to these places because the “fragments of human environments where meanings, activities and a specific landscape are all implicated and enfolded by each other” (p. 37).
Owing a condo in Miami and not using it enough led couple “E” to try renting a trailer home before finally settling on buying an RV. Upon seeing a friend’s RV, the couple purchased one too:

**Couple “E” - Extract 4**

“The first time we came here [after retirement]\(^\text{10}\), we rented a trailer home without visiting it, and when we got there, it took us a week to clean up the place. Every time we walked by here and I seen the motor homes, that’s when we decided, well, we’d like to have one and start doing this. We bought the RV in 2004 and came here until 2006. Then we went to Arizona.”

Here, the lifestyle mobility decisions of couples relies on prior repeat experiences in Broward County. Back home, a positive word-of-mouth from friends and relatives about Florida often represents one of the top sources of information for them.

For couple “F” (in their early 70s), places, locations and spaces are preferred when friends recommend them:

**Couple “F” - Extract 5**

“Let’s recall the first winter we came here, we were at Trinity tower, OK? And over there my friend talked about this place. Then the first month we were at Trinity Tower and the second month we moved here. There was no space here in the campground - they put us in the overflow over there by Pavilion 12. We spent the rest of the winter day here. Then the next year, we got a space here.”

\(^{10}\) Text in square brackets within extracts is inserted by the author for clarification purposes.
Decisions made about familiar spaces, places and locations are often mentioned in conjunction with referrals received from other couples from Quebec. There are a number of likely interpretations. On the one hand, emulating others’ choices would normally be viewed as being a “follower” and lacking self-determination and spontaneity. On the other hand, since the interviewees are mostly older individuals, they probably experienced other places in their youth. Therefore, one could argue that they are now returning to a place that is easy and familiar to them. Here, the findings by Yoesting and Burkehead are relevant in that “the security provided, and the memories kept of those activities participated in during childhood have an influence on the kinds and extent of leisure involvement during adult life” (Yoesting & Burkhead 1973, p. 31). Thus, it is in the everyday practices, the sense of familiarity of places, meeting up with French-speaking people from one’s own state, and frequenting the same restaurants with friends and family where participants find comfort and safety. Such range of motivations obliges us to shift our perspective and rethink how lifestyle mobilities can be lived; that is away from the binary framework of spontaneity vs. familiarity and allowing the participants to share their story, memories, and needs. In this sense there is a freedom within the context of comfort and ease, where expressions around “freedom” begin to emerge.

The Discourse of Choice and Freedom

Freedom is a prevailing topic and compelling influence when individuals reflect and consider their choice of mobility (Enevold, 2000). John Urry (2007) describes freedom as the right to movement and the facility to “engage in co-present conversations
with those in one’s various networks” (p. 207). In *Globalization* (1998) Zygmunt Bauman argues that “mobility climbs to the rank of the uppermost among coveted values – and the freedom to move, perpetually a scarce and unequally distributed commodity, fast becomes the main stratifying factor of our late-modern or postmodern time” (p. 2).

Amid memories about past trips to Florida, discourse revolving around the ability to choose a different setting (i.e., a “warmer climate”) emerges. Here, the term “seasonal lifestyle mobilities” (Åkerlund, 2013; Cohen, Duncan & Thulemark, 2015) applies to all couples. This term was conceptualized as a lifestyle value and practice based on individuals’ freedom of choice, who may or may not have a home base, and whose desire to increase their “quality of life” can be temporary or permanent. In response to the question “What made you want to come here every year?” all couples expressed that “darkness” and “the cold” triggered their move. Couple “A” (64-year-old female and 65-year-old male) have been coming to Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) RV-park for the past 15 years every winter:

**Couple “A” - Extract 6**

“For probably 15 years that we’ve been doing this. We leave our house when it’s dark. Well, when it starts to get cold, but we plan on how we’re going to do our winter. We’re still working. So, we come down with the motorhome and we reserve the two weeks. We go back to Montreal, and we go to work and we come back here after.”

Couple “A”’s two-week rotation from Montreal to TY park during the winter months signifies having the means and flexibility for this mobile lifestyle. Couple “C” (a semi-
retired 76-year-old male and 76-year-old female) specifically chose South Florida because it is warmer and conducive to their lifestyle now that they are getting older:

**Couple “C” - Extract 7**

“We prefer to be in the South of Florida. If we move in the middle of Florida, it is not the same climate. Winter in Quebec is very cold. My wife is allergic to the cold temperature. When we are here, we are not stuck in the motorhome. She can go out and walk. Also, there in winter it is very slippery. Three years ago, I fell, and I was lucky not to be injured. Winter here is softer, and we are lucky to have found a place here. In Quebec is different in the summer we do the same activity - siesta there and here.”

The desire for sunshine (and for some couples in this study, the beach), is a characteristic of what has been termed “Old tourism”, that is, repeat visitations by travelers “with limited travel motivations, one of which is a desire for sunshine and beaches” (Alegre & Cladera, 2006). Even couple “D” who are younger (in their 60s) chose South Florida because of the warmth. As most couples in this study talk about their experiences, they report that Broward County is really the only place that they come to over and over again. In fact, they report that they must reserve a spot one year in advance as they have no choice in choosing which week to come or the exact location of their parking spot.

The freedom to enjoy their lifestyle mobility at TY Park pre- or post-retirement is a source of joy for all participants. What is of significance here is that participants equate their RV lifestyle and ability to move to a warmer climate with “freedom”.
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Couple “A” - Extract 8

“Because I mean I’m in my own home, it is my own towel that I choose and it’s my own pillow. I know if I open this door, I have a screwdriver that I can fix my bicycle. It’s more personal – it’s FREEDOM 11 – rather than staying at a hotel. At a hotel, it’s not the same. You don’t have everything. You know. All your stuff. It’s if I eat with that particular plate is because I choose it. I like the square plates.”

The ability to move at will in one’s RV once the weather changes in Quebec, is akin to having the freedom of choosing one’s own towels or square plates described above. Most couples reported that they do not mind having less space than they do back home because in their RV they “have everything” they need. The reference in the extract to “freedom” and “I choose”, signifies how this couple see themselves. They highlight the benefits of being surrounded by familiar objects and having a level of control over their own choices and possessions rather than being obligated to follow the rules of a hotel or an Airbnb host. The issues of choice, one’s belongings, control, and freedom are repeated again and again by the participants; in this way, they construct an understanding of their sojourn at TY Park which gives them meaning and validity. Tuan, among other theorists, asserts that space is also communal in that meanings, despite being understood differently by individuals, have a shared cultural, economic, or historical dimension, (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977; Steele, 1981; Hummon, 1992; Moore & Graefe, 1994; Brandenburg & Carroll, 1995; MacNaghten & Urry, 1995). Through time, these meanings can be expressed and changed through symbolic representations, stories, objects, structures, or physical landscapes (Tuan, 1977; Hummon, 1992; Greider & Garkovich, 1994; Williams

11 Words or phrases that are loudly expressed by participants are in all caps.
& Stewart, 1998). Meanings and symbols that create landscapes are also manifestations of people’s self–definitions (Sampson & Goodrich, 2009). Place then is not just a physical setting; rather representations of places must be interpreted as a complex structure and the people who are engaged with it (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977; Stedman, 2003). This externalized narrative of being surrounded by their own possessions and not following an Airbnb host’s rules also parallels Giddens’ (1991) structuration theory whereby individual actions are structured by society, and simultaneously society is structured by individuals’ actions.

All participants report that the freedom they have comes from the ability to choose their own schedule and not being tethered to any deadlines. The implication here is that those who travel by plane are controlled by airline schedules. Travelling by RV gives one control and power since through the participants’ own choice, they decide when they want to drive South.

**Couple “A” - Extract 9**

“We are under the impression that we are free, free to move, free to go wherever we go and the time to come here - sometimes we take three days to come down, sometimes we take two weeks to come down – we’re free of our time. We feel so attached in town [Montreal] with the work. When we come here you know, you’re free here, you feel free – freedom.”

By denying various forms of social control when travelling, participants are expressing to the outside world that if one aspires to be mobile and free, one cannot rely on hotels, holiday packages, or Airbnb hosts. The opportunities and unrestricted forms of mobility
offered to couple “A” override their decision to go to vacation destinations that are more restrictive or as they call it “all-inclusive” holidays.

**Couple “A” - Extract 10**

“It’s easy because you just take the airplane, you come here - it takes three hours with direct flight from Montreal. We fly with Air Canada. Spirit Airlines is cheaper but I don’t like the hours of the airline – you have to travel by night […] this is what I call freedom. Let’s say I have an emergency at work. There’s like 20 planes that leave every day for Montreal. It is almost unlimited, so really, I could leave like this afternoon. You just buy your ticket on the Internet and jump in the car and go to the airport and I’ll be home for lunch. It’s going to be more expensive. But I am able to do this. If let’s say you are in Cuba for an all-inclusive holiday - sorry, but there is no plane before Saturday, right? So, you have to wait. Let’s say I feel sick here – I can just jump in the plane and be home. At least I know that I could jump in a plane and go home.”

The couple describe how significant and fulfilling it is to control one’s own schedule – a sentiment they call “freedom”. This experience exceeds a mere unhampered mobile lifestyle – the verb “jump” suggests agility and swiftness and jumping “on a plane and go home” is a mark of unrestricted and privileged travel.

Freedom as the “fundamental” viewpoint of living functions at various intensities in narratives of everyday life. Whether it was Adam and Eve freeing themselves from the Garden of Eden, or Marx’s notion of “freedom” as a façade in capitalist society, to Foucault’s notion of freedom in terms of power-knowledge relations, or capitalism’s messages of freedom, ideas of freedom are embedded in our everyday stories. These narratives appear to closely link mobility to freedom. The perception of freedom thus
prevails as a core belief when people reflect on movement and mobility. Thereby what has historically been considered “freedom” - that is, no intrusion or coercion by the rule of a tyrannical law, the right to security and freedom (Hylland Eriksen, 2005; Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009) has shifted and in this context, signifies the “good life” - the ability to jump on a plane that has conveniently set schedules, is efficient, and provides frequent departures. The advantages that come with having one’s own business and a Canadian passport gives the couple the opportunity to just “jump” on a plane at a moment’s notice. In this sense, what is referred to as “freedom” is in actuality the social and economic benefits of a Quebecan lifestyle – that is access, socio-spatial inclusion, and “mobility rights” (Soysal, 1994; Urry, 1999). Doreen Massey’s (1994) “politics of mobility” is significant here in terms of the inequalities and politics of mobility and movement (Miles & Thranhardt, 1995; Anthias & Lazarido, 1998; Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Weiss, 2005; Amit, 2007; Whyte, 2008).

For one couple, freedom is represented by having less possessions and objects which they consider impediments to independence and mobility:

**Couple “D” - Extract 11**

“So when we left our apartment I did a good cleaning and everything, you know, we have too much stuff. So, I cleaned everything and then I put the extra stuff somewhere in our building or I bring with us. We brought with us the necessary stuff. We did this because we like the mobility and freedom […] Here, I feel more free for sure. Less complicated, you know than when you have a house. So now it’s less complicated. It’s like home.”
A simple and “less complicated” life has increased the couple’s lifestyle satisfaction as well as their use of outside physical spaces. Whilst living in their condo, couple “D” used to take their RV to the racetrack for work. Now that they are “full-timers”, as they are called in RV communities; their space represents freedom and the feeling of being on vacation depending on where they are parked:

**Couple “D” - Extract 12**

“[when we are parked] on the racetrack, I’m in charge of the ticket booth and so I do have some more work to do than here. The only thing is when I work, I’m not free. But, you know, I feel comfortable here. Since it’s my home, I feel good everywhere I go, you know, because it’s [the RV] my home. I don’t care - I’m here or in Quebec or in Africa.”

One could argue that on the one hand, being untethered to a physical home and having all-year mobility affords this couple a sense of freedom, contentment, and comfort. On the other, whilst working “on the racetrack” they do not feel “free”, and the RV space becomes a space where they sleep and then go back to the ticket booth to work.

Nonetheless, their mobile lifestyle and better budgeting has allowed them to be more “relaxed”, thereby highlighting the benefits of their decision to become fully mobile and free on a personal and an emotional level. Couple “D” developed their own sense of freedom and lifestyle according to their own needs and budget – they have created their own rules by which to live the good life.

Despite the self-reported perceptions of “freedom”, nine of ten couples interviewed stated that once they purchased an RV, they did not travel internationally. A particularly interesting aspect of these narratives is the perception that with more mobility
the choice to drive to Florida with an RV, comes more freedom and adventure.

According to Ole B. Jensen “the free choice of mobility modality not only is a claim to freedom, but also a way of relating to the socio-spatial environment and thus ultimately also to notions about self and other” (Jensen, 2008, p. 5). The ambivalence in these narratives is the actual mobility and freedom versus the possibility of adventure and freedom that comes with thinking that one is mobile. These are “expressions” of freedom that Vincent Kaufmann (2002) has included in his definition of “motility”. Whereas self-determination and autonomy are defining factors for mobility (Bonß, Kesselring & Vogl, 2004), participants’ self-reporting about the possibility of mobility and freedom are examples of motility which in turn are important elements of mobility choices. Although one could identify a paradox in the participants’ imagined freedom through mobility that may not be substantiated by their actions, what is important are the many ways in which the possibility of freedom is experienced. Jörg Beckmann’s (2004) proposal on the ambivalent nature of motilities in that it has the “capacity to both paralyse and mobilize” (Beckmann, 2004, p. 86) is an apt evaluation because in this case, the participants define their own realities and possibilities. The ability to move at will and at one’s own schedule in an RV has, in fact, led them to become sedentary. Nonetheless, the routine, safe, comfortable, and a relaxed lifestyle are the ways in which participants establish subjectivity and declare their freedom.

Participants also connected the concept of freedom with the prospect of a having a level of control, choices, and opportunities. Even though these Movers must reserve a spot one year in advance and are beholden to the park’s schedule and availability of truck stops or state parks for over-night stays, their 2–3-day southward journey is how they
experience and understand freedom. It is a given that in today’s multifaceted and nonlinear existence, Marc Augé has noted, life cannot be lived in total freedom because the coded and ordered character of living in a community “cannot be transgressed without running the risk of sanction, either by authorities, or by the more or less effective disavowal of other users” (Augé 2002: 29).

An example of Movers creating new possibilities is Couple “G”’s flight plans which they have designed around the husband’s work routine. In their 80s, this couple has been coming to South Florida for 19 years. The husband is a superintendent at a construction company. This instance simply does not conform to the common standard of a 40-hour week at an office, and the notion of asking permission to go on vacation from a manager.

Couple “G” - Extract 13

“I fly back and forth multiple times for work and leave the RV and my wife stays here. My dates when I have to be back is scheduled – so now I fly on Sunday and I stay for 3 weeks, then I come back. Before 2001 we used to go to Europe during vacation. But after 2001, we come here and go on cruises too.”

Couple “D”’s freedom comes from their self-reporting that the day they purchased a bigger motorhome, downsized from a condo to living in an RV full-time, they do not want to go anywhere else.

Couple “D” - Extract 14

“Last time was in 2010 when we flew to Vegas. The farthest place in my life was Mexico. We have been to the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Puerto Rico and
then we bought our first motor home - it was smaller. After we rented our condo, and got the bigger motorhome, we don’t do vacation anywhere else.”

The RV for most of these couples has become the only way to travel. It appears that once participants experience the “home” amenities that owning an RV affords them, they do not revert to international travelling; in a sense, they have been freed to enjoy their relaxed lifestyle. Subjective and individualistic dimensions of space, where people move about or inhabit not just locations or geometric spaces but a world of meaning and values (Tuan, 1974) is reflected in participants’ “place-making activities” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 5). There are no authoritative blueprints that they follow. What the park has to offer is the ability to walk, relax but also do some needed maintenance for the RV:

Couple “I” - Extract 15

“What I love in the park - taking my walk every morning and the sights are nice and clean. First of all, the sites are nice and clean. Except the salt you know, you have to imagine that we come from Canada, right? We still have salt every morning beneath the RV. I have the right to wash it once when we arrive. After that, we have to go to a car wash. It’s a lot of money.”

By conferring meaning to place, participants personalize their experience and initiate place-making activities; these can be anything from the visual, for example, renovations and yard care to commodifying places, such as, tourist brochures, postage stamps or parliament buildings (Cresswell, 2004). Mobility linked to the RV takes on its full meaning of finding freedom in rootedness when considering that owners spend a considerable time “staying put” and maintaining their RV rather than go outside the park. From this perspective, the universal definition of being untethered and free to roam, no
longer applies. Here, the reality of owning one’s home, taking it to the same location for
5 months situates the participants within their own context and meaning of freedom.
These Movers have chosen a mobile lifestyle on their own terms; that is being rooted to
their local community at TY park.

Home: Here, There, Every Where

“Experiential properties of space” or a “sense” of place, whether they are values,
experiences, or activities function at the intersection of the concrete/physical world and
the ideological/mental idea of place. These connections have been broadly explored in
both the social sciences and life sciences. There have been quantitative studies (Shamai,
1991; Hay, 1998; Stedman, 2003; Shamai & Ilatov, 2005; Carter et al., 2007) and
qualitative approaches (Williams & Stewart, 1998; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Jiven &
Larkham, 2003; Farnum, Hall & Kruger, 2005; Kianicka et al., 2006; Harrington, 2007;
Kerstetter & Bricker, 2009; Townend & Whittaker, 2011). Experiential properties of
space are concerned with various facets that are vague, hard to identify and quantify
(Relph, 1976; Shamai, 1991). They are concepts that deal with emotional attachment,
familiar, belonging, rootedness, symbols, meaning and values within historical, cultural,
and spatial contexts (Williams & Stewart, 1998; Gustafson, 2009; Schofield &
Szymanski, 2011). Similarly, constructs of a sense of place as related to experiences
means that they will vary between people. Subjective, personal, and relational
experiences are not just mundane daily activities, but include all the senses (Steele, 1981;
Vanclay, 2008) which are experienced viscerally. The choices and imagined mobility by
which the study’s participants organize everyday life are discovered through discussions about daily routines. This makes it possible to identify the ways in which the lived experiences are described and verbalized. These can be pinned down through participants’ conversations about their journey South, their choice of locations and spaces in terms of “reliability of the familiar”. For example, narratives of familiarity, consistency, and reliability of having their belongings with them contributes to their sense of being at home:

**Couple “C” – Extract 16**

“*Main thing is that we are in our own elements. All is here. It is our second home. If you rent, it is not your home.*”

The simplicity and ease of the familiar in the phrase “all is here” can be decoded to mean being in one’s own element and feeling that the RV space is one’s “home” rather than having to live in a rental. Similarly, couple “E” explain that their experiences of space and place must be familiar:

**Couple “E” - Extract 17**

“*We prefer the RV than just flying from place to place. Well, this is our home second home, really. We spend five months a year in this, you know. We have the same comfort as at home.*”

The couple root themselves within routines and structures to mirror “home” even when they are away from it. Daily routines for some RV-park guests, like couple “F” include keeping up with their part-time work. Hence the need for access to good Wi-Fi (which was frequently mentioned by other couples as well) is critical to them:
Couple “F” – Extract 18

“To me, the only thing that they have not improved yet, to my knowledge, it is the Internet, Wi-Fi. I’m a municipal counselor back in Quebec and when I’m here, I work but here it’s impossible to get Wi-Fi with my laptop. So I have to go Starbucks or McDonalds. I’m a member of nine administration councils. And I chair five of them. So that’s a lot of time on the Skype.”

For couple “F”, the desire to feel at home in one’s own space, take short trips to stores and restaurants, and settling into a “home” routine inside the RV, makes up for not having good Wi-Fi connection. Upon arrival, all couples reintegrate into their everyday habits that they have held for the past 10-15 years since coming here.

Couple “B” (in their late 80s) who have been coming to South Florida for 15 years, want to feel they are the boss in their own space:

Couple “B” – Extract 19

“In a condo, you’re not the owner. You’re not the boss. Everybody tells you what to do in a condo. In an RV, if you don’t like your neighbor, you raise the jacks, put the sticker on and go away elsewhere. In the condo, you can’t do that. It’s absolutely not for me because of the rules. You can’t have the clothes washer in your apartment. You need to go by the elevator to wash your clothes. It’s either busy or very dirty. And my wife is very clean. She does like that. You can’t make any kind of noise sitting on the balcony. Somebody laughs too loudly, then they start banging on the ceiling - so that type of living that I don’t like.”

At stake for Couple “B” and other participants is the need to take control of their own life. Having experienced the restrictive culture of condo living, their freedom is defined
by having the choice to “raise the jacks, put the sticker on and go away elsewhere”.

Hence the Movers’ source of control and sense of self is on full display, despite existing systems and structures. Returning to the same place reduces the risk of the possibility of having an unsatisfactory experience and having to navigate and obey new rules. Participants do not have to waste time experimenting and searching for new experiences. The safety of the known is better than risking the unknown. The low-risk lifestyle phenomenon appears contrary to common definitions of freedom and adventure that one might associate with flying to an unfamiliar country and discovering where to go and where to eat for the first time. However, such modes of living show another way of experiencing place and space, opening up the possibility that freedom, in some cases, amounts to a quasi-liberation from the biting cold winter of Quebec, having more time to relax, read and create one’s own cocoon inside and around the RV. Li et al.’s comparison of first-time and repeat visitors showed there is indeed a need for “stability and continuity [that] may spur a number of individuals to become repeat tourists who enjoy familiarity with the destination” (Li et al.2008).

Upon close examination of the RV guests’ narratives, it is clear that the stories used to express daily experiences are located around the phenomenon of unchanging routines and finding comfort in sameness. The intersection of places and meaning are “centers” of meaning and a sense of place for these participants. Emotional connections between people and places at its core signify for a specific person or community their sense of wellbeing and quality of life (DeMiglio & Williams, 2008; Bushell, 2009). The participants’ stories align with John Eyles’ *Senses of place* (1985) in that people-placed connections are dynamic depending on how individuals or communities assign different
values or meanings to places. In particular, the overlapping definitions of place and space refer to both the corporeal and emotional relationships of geographical locations to locale, structure and meanings.; in these cases, the meanings conferred on these spaces is one of familiarity and comfort.

Familiar Places and Consumption

Shifts and intervals in daily routines, actions and rhythms “imprint on the way we construct meaning in our everyday life [and] knowledge of how meaning and apparent rationales become built into everyday life are fruitful in understanding how the individual masters everyday life mobility” (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009, p. 5). Having come to Florida from Quebec with their families since they were young and taking the same journey as adults, routine trips act as a comforting journey that help participants overcome difficulties that might have arisen should they have travelled to unfamiliar places. Their emotional encounters are one of familiarity, sameness, comfort, and safety. Current advertising and even some literature tend to promote RV travelling as having a lifestyle of wanderlust, freedom, excitement, and the unconventional (Foley & Hayllar, 2007; Hardy, Hanson & Gretzel, 2012; Brooker & Joppe, 2014; Pearce & Wu, 2018). On the one hand, multi-perspective arrangements, role reclassifications, socio-economic differentiations, and other socially stratifying factors, have contributed to existing scholarship on mobilities, where they are re-imagined as flexible and comprised of multifaceted interactions (Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006). On the other hand, however, lifestyle mobility lies in the “embedded daily routines and practices, and emergent social
structures” (O’Reilly, 2007, p. 139). Still, such research does not present enough on the experiences of individuals and their emotions. Indeed, by referring to their sense of mobility as familiar spaces and being around their belongings, the participants unknowingly highlight the seeming paradox in their experiences – that is, feeling secure in the everyday predictability of the familiar and the unmistakable sense of freedom (see Couple “A” - Extract 8). The notion of space as something familiar and reliable is evident in many of the participants’ accounts, often a stand-in for their essential need to have the simplicity of comforting routines and experiences during their stay. The topic of familiarity with the spaces, locations and “knowing where everything is” reemerges as a premise of “freedom” when asked why the couples chose to use an RV instead of staying at a hotel, renting an apartment or an Airbnb. For instance, couple “A” express a strong need for knowing where everything is. Early in the conversation, they describe what it means to “know” where everything is. They state:

**Couple “A” - Extract 20**

"Before, we went to a different place because like I said before, here for us is very central. Sometimes we camp at the airfield and when we need something at the store we come down here because up there we don’t know where the stores are. When we came down here, I know where the Home Depot is, I know where the grocery store is, I know where my favorite restaurants are. So, it’s very easy for me."

As the conversation develops, couple “A” stress their need for constancy: “If I change the place then I come back here because I know where my favorite spots are.” In addition to “knowing” their space, they frequently use the word “easy” as a stand-in to express their
need to apply the least effort during their sojourn. This demonstrates their inclination to favor spaces that provide a sense of dependability. Couple “E”, always spend two weeks in Jupiter State Park Dickinson (Maximum time allowed on state parks) before coming to TY Park. They speak about their favorite restaurants they go to every year, but also places they stopped going to:

Couple “E” – Extract 21

“We go to that restaurant there GG’s on Ocean Drive before Hollywood Boulevard on the canal. We went there for supper with our in-laws our sister-in-law it was her birthday. We also go to Aruba, George’s, Seasons 52, Lester’s Diner, Frenchie’s and Ale House. We don’t go to the beach here. We used to go more often in 2005. We used to go to church. Not anymore.”

The couple express the idea of the enjoyable experience that comes with visiting their favorite places with people they know. Listing local restaurants within a 5-mile radius suggests that familiar spaces correspond to recurring actions and short distances. For couple “C”, distance is equally important. They have been coming to TY Park for the past 6 years every winter:

Couple “C” - Extract 22

“We always take the car. I’m not very far when I go to the store. Normally we go to Walmart and the neighborhood, Publix and yesterday we found one on Pine Street - Broward Meat and Fish.”

Couples define their own spaces of consumption practices based on the limits they set for the distances they are willing to drive. The words often used in conjunction with
shopping, doing errands, and socializing is “close” and “central”. They get a sense of pleasure from customary meet and greets with the same people at the same place rather than entering an uninviting hotel room or Airbnb:

**Couple “H” - Extract 23**

*Here I feel like I am on vacation, all is fun, not too much cleaning. Everyone is on vacation, so not the same. The RV it’s always my home. I’m not afraid of nothing. Here you have somebody to talk. In the hotel, you go to the room, you go outside and is the same. Here, everyone is a friend. This one, I talk with him every day. I talk with that one and I talk with him over there. But not in the hotel or even a rented condo.*

When the destination is a place where “everyone is a friend”, the effort required to go from place to place, searching for and discovering new places and encounters is not required. The sense of well-being is derived from the ritual of driving down every year, settling down for 5 months in the same RV park, being surrounded with one’s own possessions, and seamlessly merging into a self-segregated community. In his analysis of Canadians in Florida from a historical perspective, Godefroy Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) asserts that this is a community emerging “through acts of consumption, through leisure pursuits, through lifestyle choices. In the very ‘modern’ acts of buying into the Good Life, of moving around the continent, through the medium of leisure, face-to-face interaction, breaking bread, and socializing, snowbirds have formed elective communities” (P. 200).

Not only does centrality, ease, and access to services matter, but also settling in a low economic and non-metropolitan area is significant since finances determine most
participants’ decisions about mobility. Since some participants are living on limited income, the ideal scenario for all interviewees is to make the trip South at a reasonable price and avoid hotel bills or eating out. Most of their stopovers comprise of sleeping in the RV parked at truck stops or big-box stores parking lots:

**Couple “E” - Extract 24**

“It’s more affordable here it’s about 1400 a month. If we drive down, we don’t stay at a hotel or eat in a restaurant and we are free and are in our home.”

Wealth and occupation of participants is an obvious marker of the type of RV they own and the “toys” that come with it. Eight of ten participant reported that they considered costs for all aspects of their Florida sojourn and tried to make their budget stretch. Cost was one reason that couple “D” became fully “mobile”. After reviewing their budget, they realized that they hardly spent any time at apartment in Quebec and that it was just wasted money:

**Couple “D” - Extract 25**

“In fact, we live in the mobile home [full-time] since last June 2018. We own a three- story apartment and we used to live upstairs and then were all the time in the motor home. So, we decided to rent our place and then live in the RV home full time. We were never home. My husband works for a racetrack, so every weekend we’re on the racetrack somewhere. We left on Wednesday, Thursday, and we came back home on Monday. So, when we go back, we stay at the racetrack until November and then come back here. They have RV facilities there and we don’t have to pay because it is part of his salary.”
The couple’s everyday life mobilities affords them a budget-friendly lifestyle and becomes the space where they can take a break. As such, the yearly drive to Florida for most participants fragments an otherwise organized life back in Quebec. Daily activities organized around work, home and weekend chores are replaced by slower patterns five months out of the year in Florida. This means that more time is available to relax, read and create their own cocoons inside and around the RV. Even if participants report that they have a certain routine in Florida, their “speed of life” is slower, and their daily choices are not as procedural as their routines back in Quebec.

**Couple “A” - Extract 26**

“I can walk the park every day, we go to get the groceries everyday together because we don’t do that in town [Montreal]. Because just the difference, because when are in Quebec, we work, so it’s not the same speed of life. Here we read. Here it’s never the same. The one at home is more routine because when we are at home we wake up, drink coffee, go to work. We never have breakfast at home. We never have lunch. We have breakfast at the garage. That’s it. And when you come on Friday night at home around 7 you see the daily paper and a cup of coffee, and that’s it. We never eat at home.”

References to words such as “routine” and “speed of life” underline the monotony of work/life for this couple in Montreal. The fact that they have daily walks in TY-park and do groceries together stands in stark contrast to their accounts of grueling work hours and draining experiences back home. Even couples who are retired view the RV park as a more relaxing space than back home:
Couple “E” - Extract 27

“Well, it’s our retirement life is what it is, you know, before I used to work. So now we do not work. This allows us to leave and spend the winter and that’s good for us, you know. Here we have less work because we don’t have to spend time doing a lot of work around our house in Quebec.”

The slow domains of life are found by staying put; here couples have more metaphorical space to settle down in TY Park. For these couples, a “mobile” lifestyle goes hand in hand with the freedom to relax, unwind, and become immobile for a while – even if they are already in retirement – as shown by the three extracts below:

Couple “E” - Extract 28

“We belong in Quebec. Here we relax and come for vacation. At home, there’s the upkeep of the property, the lake, the pontoon, and the fishing boat, you know, so that’s different.”

Couple “D” - Extract 29

“Since we have become more mobile we are more relaxed. When we moved from the 2 bedrooms to RV we didn’t feel the difference. Here we have everything.”

Couple “I” - Extract 30

Our lifestyle has changed - a lot more relaxed. You know, I have more time for myself. I read a lot. I now take my walks. It’s not the same thing. At home with the house, you know, it never stops. There’s always something to do around the house. For the man it did not change a bit because he works part-time.
Couples install “in-betweens” thus creating their own spaces, where they can disengage. Ironically, it is in the form of a vehicle, an object normally associated with speed and a recreational vehicle that allows one to drive and/or live from place to place and go anywhere one wants that has helped participants to “slow down”. By setting up in-betweens in mobility, they have nevertheless “stacked” new behaviors into daily life and are thereby unconstrained and can choose to do without the hectic life back home (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009). As such, everyday life mobilities at the RV park is a space where participants can take a break in “enclaves” (Shane, 2005) to achieve a sense of security and at the same time mingle with the neighbors and participate in weekly meetups.

The narrative of mobility as freedom in this case has converged to stories about having a place where the individual has her or his space and the possibility to construct personal choices about everyday routines. The “quieter” setting is in obvious contrast to how “camping” is done back home:

**Couple “A” - Extract 31**

“It’s not camping like in Quebec. When you go camping in Quebec for three days, you make a fire, people come and drink beer and sing songs. Here it is not like that - it is quiet at night. There are young people here on the campground but there is no noise. It is very quiet.”

It is this relaxed and simpler lifestyle to which participants return. The simplicity and ease of the familiar manifests itself in seeking services that cater to French-Canadians, such as, Des Jardins Bank, French-Canadian health clinics, restaurants, and veterinarians. These businesses are what Robert Harney has called “brokers” or “go-
between” (Harney, 1989, p. 23) catering to French speakers – from Québécois cuisine to French-language newspapers to social clubs. Even TY park’s staff who uses Google to translate reservation requests from French to English and who have had to “hire” a French-speaking campground host can be considered “brokers”:

**Admin Staff - Extract 32**

“We just simply can’t talk to them unless we get the campground host’s assistance. But typically, they’ll email if they can’t speak English, they usually won’t call us. And then we’ll use Google translate to write what we need and translate it to French. And we can work with it that way. Sometimes if they’re in the office and the campground host is not available and it is off season, we’ll do Google translate via the speakers and they’ll ask the question and then we can give them the answer.”

The Park has had to designate 5 out of the 61 spots as “short-term sites” because according to the staff member, the campground has come to be viewed as a “French-Canadian” site:

**Admin Staff - Extract 33**

“Because I guess we’ve had locals that complained that they can’t get in. So, we’ve created short-term sites where the locals can have those sites that don’t want to stay as long as six months. So, we haven’t found whether or not that’s going to drive people away.”

During off-season (May-September), the campground is not very busy. The office staff list the types of guests who reserve spots during the off-season: those who come
down from Disney World, those who have family members that have been admitted to Memorial hospital, people whose house is being renovated/tented, construction workers who have been hired to do work nearby, or people who just bought an RV and want to test it out.

Having a clinic, dentist or a veterinarian that caters to the Québécois is extremely important for the guests:

**Couple “C” – Extract 34**

“We have a Veterinarian for our dog - it is not far. We have a doctor in Hallandale, so I pay cash. We have a bank Des Jardins in Hallandale. We have an American account and an American credit card from Des Jardins. Publix accepts debit cards from Des Jardins.”

**Couple “F” - Extract 35**

“There is a clinic here for Quebecers called STAT where all services are in French.”

The clustering of French Canadians in Florida writes Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) was always a “consequence of language: francophones needed, more than anglophones, to congregate for mutual support and access to services in their mother tongue” (p. 175). It is this linguistic community that drives the geographical clustering and in turn, the community that drives the demand for French-language services.

**Couple “E” – Extract 36**

“We have unlimited plan and call our family a couple of times a week. I have a satellite TV here so I get Quebecan TV. We have Des Jardins, Royal Bank of Canada, and we live on our credit card and just pay at the end of the month.”
There is a plethora of French-language signs on Hollywood beach broadwalk, and in the winter months, Hallandale boulevard has a stream of traffic whose Quebecan license plates signal Quebec visitors. The Quebec microcosm or the “territorial appropriation of Florida by Quebecers” (p. 466) as Celia Forget (2010) has called it, is achieved through the very visible “registration of cars from Quebec bearing the inscription ‘Je me souviens’. At the sight of these plates, the newcomer wonders if he is still in American territory. These license plates strongly participate in the microcosmic constitution of Floribec since they refer to another territory” (Forget, 2010, p. 265). Each “guest rester” (Harney, 1989, p. 23) can recognize another by their license plates. Recognition corresponds with the familiarity of speaking and hearing one’s own language. Most interviewees highlight the fact that they do not have to speak English at all:

**Couple “A” - Extract 37**

“I know a lot of Quebecers that come here, they don’t have to speak English at all, they have French television. They can just not talk English and they can live the whole winter here. It’s the only place in the United States you can do that. But for me, it’s not a question of that. We come here; we have friends.”

Evidently, the concept of place as a location or environment that contributes to human behavior is manifested amongst the Québécois population - they are here first and foremost for the climate. However, once here, they bestow meaning on their environment “in ways that reflect their social and cultural experiences” (Eisenhauer, Krannich & Blahna, 2000, p. 422). In fact, the production of everyday practice is not necessarily
imposed on the Québécois; rather “the reality of everyday life—the sum total of all our relations—is built on the ground, in daily activities and transactions” (Burkitt, 2004) as apparent in these extracts. Mobility does not have a one-dimensional materiality, rather, movement (when it becomes mobility) is as Cresswell (2001) proposes “socially produced, is variable across space and time and has visible effects in people, places, things and the relationships between them” (p. 20). Each of these narratives stand alongside other stories that redefine how space, place, mobility, and freedom are experienced.

Familiar Faces and Old Friends

Social connections at the RV site itself are marginal – that is, they are limited only to reconnecting with other couples in the park once a year. All participants responded with a resounding “yes” when asked whether they would come back to the park if there were no other Québécois at the RV-park. It is the park, the lake, and its central location that the couple are drawn to. What is significant to all couples is being with their friends and acquaintances none of whom live in the RV-park. Their friends, family, and acquaintances also “come down” during the winter months. They are scattered around Broward County and Palm Beach County. None of the participants reported having their friends live at the TY park site. When asked if they have made friends who are not their long-term friends from Quebec, most said “no.”
Couple “A” - Extract 38

“We have a group of friends [who don’t live in the RV park] that we meet, we have a motorcycle and we do lunch at Key Largo once a week and then we visit each other. Sometimes we come here, we have lunch outside. It’s not people that we met here. It’s all people that we knew before [from Montreal]. And they are close. Some we don’t even see very much in Quebec, but we see them more here because everybody’s on holidays. Some are retired. Some are still working.”

For couple “A”, being with one’s friends in Florida enriches the feeling of “being on holiday” as it comes with a sense of familiarity, ease, and time to catch up as indicated by the phrase “we see them more here”. As a result, they may not reap the benefits of experiencing spaces in terms of socialization and community outside their known social group. Over the years, some couples do make friends with other residents of the RV-park, most of whom are from Quebec.

Couple “D” – Extract 39

“We have some friends who come here from Quebec in November and then they leave after maybe middle of January. And then his [husband’s] father came and live in the trailer. And then we met some good friends here too. Yeah. And then, you know, my husband is very sociable better than me, so he knows everybody.”

Couple “D”’s annual encounters with other Québécois led to making “some good friends here”. But when asked whether they socialize with these friends once they go back, most reported that they did not. In all instances, Broward County is a locum for meeting up with family and existing friends from Quebec. Such repetitive spatial practices or what Fortier (1999) has called “appartenance” are acquired routines and practices of group identity that manufacture “cultural and historical belongings which mark out terrains of
commonality that delineate the politics and social dynamics of ‘fitting in’” (P. 42).

Amongst these participants, place is where one preserves one’s existing connections with old friends and are key descriptors to this lifestyle. It is safe to say then that when a territorial mobility is fixed, it marks the enclosures of a lifestyle of mobility since, instead of including non-French Canadians, it remains centered on itself by situating its community within itself:

**Couple “E” - Extract 40**

“We are friends with five couples here who are from Quebec. When we come back every fall, we come back and meet our friends and enjoy it. But then in the summer we go back but cannot meet them in Quebec. The province of Quebec is quite widespread. Anywhere between, I’d say. 250 miles away, so we don’t really see them there.”

Such arrangements and systems support the “performance of lifestyle mobilities” amid specific groups of individuals. By seeking homogeneous and comforting communities to which participants return, place is formed out of space in what Buell (2005) has called “a cyclical endeavor” (p. 73); place is created and re-created recurrently until a sense of place is formed and defined. This cycle of formation and definition institutes a “self” that is re-created intermittently (p. 73). Bearing in mind that place identities are constructed and negotiated in everyday routines, these positions and representations affect both Movers’ decision and the ways in which the “new lifestyles” are performed. Thus, characterization of place becomes “discrete if ‘elastic’ areas in which settings for the constitution of social relations are located and with which people can identify” (Agnew, 1987, p. 263).
Living in close proximity to one another in an RV-park enables the participants to come together every year for the 4-5 months and experience community and friendships by means of neighborly and familiar contacts. In this way, reciprocal relations and social networks are constructed. Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) argues that such solidarity is not essentially a consequence of old age:

Many of the snowbirds’ community bonds have been justified by their need to re-root themselves in their new neighbourhoods, to rebuild networks of mutual help, and to regain a collective ethos of trust and comfort in a strange land. Snowbird communities are thereby much like big-city immigrant neighbourhoods. The necessities of community-building thus can explain why snowbirds have relied so much on sociability, participative leisure, expressive culture, and identity-signs. These bonding strategies are similar to those urban villages of big-city migrant communities that brought security, belongingness, and friendship to their members in North American metropolises, as shown by research on the Irish, Chinese, Italians, Jews, and South Asians, amongst others. (P. 244)

For the RV park guests, the circle of friends and acquaintances expand in Florida to include the couples they meet at the RV-park annually; once back home, the community retracts to its original “shape” based on who lives in close proximity to their home. This provides a window onto participants’ space, distance, and community inside the known social group. A habitual and everyday neighborly act is exemplified in Extract 41 by couple “E”, when the husband states “every morning my friend comes and knocks on the door and we go for a morning breakfast or coffee at McDonald’s”. By referring to “every morning” and “my friend” the sense of the everyday habits and relationships he is referring to sets the stage for the sense of familiarity and ease of life in the RV-park.

**Couple “E” - Extract 41**

“Here, every morning my friend comes and knocks on the door and we go for a morning breakfast or coffee at McDonald’s. That’s around ten o’clock and we
don’t come back till noon. So every morning doing this at that certain time is nice. But also it’s too much demanding. Sometimes he picks up two or three other guys. Then in the afternoon, he’ll give you a hand on working on your motor home and things like this. He’s good at that.”

On the one hand, the predictable “nice” daily get-togethers represent a feeling of contentment; on the other hand, at times it is “too demanding” referring to the obligation of daily meetups. During the weeks of interviews whilst the researcher drove around the RV-park to find the RV spaces of couples, there were often groups of 3-4 men standing around an RV engine bay talking or trying to repair a mechanical issue. The camaraderie and helpfulness were often cited as an item that interviewees liked at the RV-park. The Gitelson and Crompton (1984) study found that in cases of repeat visitations, respondents could be assured that they would find “their kind of people” at the destination. In some cases, they met with other people at the destination each year and did things together. This ritual excursion to the same destination every year is sometimes termed “boundedness.” A prominent example is the migration of a large number of mid-Westerners to the Rio Grande Valley area of Texas for a four- or five-month period each winter. They return to the same camp site, trailer park, or motel each year. This is the social system with which they are familiar, comfortable and which offers them pleasant memories of previous visits (P. 211).

At TY Park, the husband of couple “E” even created a separate outside space for his get-togethers with his friend from the space away from the RV itself.

**Couple “E” - Extract 42**

“The white tent [built outside of the RV] there I have two tables there and I have a TV in there because she doesn’t listen to the same program. I have hockey game and things like this. I got a friend who comes over and we were watching some French program that we love. So, and we put that ice machine is in there.”
This quasi “man-cave” is a space that separates the lived domestic space and the “entertainment” space. In these spaces, community is constructed around shared arrangements as informal practices actively support helping one another, visiting, organizing events, and schmoozing at various eateries. There are certain restaurants that are frequented by the Floribécois for weekly meetups – for example Fridays is “Spring Fish Fry” at the Knights of Columbus:

**Couple “F” - Extract 43**

“We go to Chinese restaurant or Knights of Columbus in Hollywood for Spring Fish Fry - All Quebecers go there every Friday. We love Hollywood. It is close to the beach. We would not change our place. We are very happy to be here. It is sure that our friends are close to us. But if they were not here, we would come back.”

Another place most participants meet weekly is the “Tuesday 5-7” meetups at Pavilion 12 of TY Park where RV-park guests can get together and socialize. The main organizer of this event is the husband of couple “F”:

**Couple “F” - Extract 44**

“Last week we started organizing this at 5-7 because I am the main organizer. We are also planning to go this winter to Key West. Yesterday, I met some friends to discuss the possibility to organize a sightseeing tour for the campground here to go to Key West. I’m going to present that tonight [Tuesday] to the people, going there one day and one day and coming back at maybe at nine.”
Couples explain why these experiences are so important to them. It is in the familiarity, predictability and reliability of spaces and the cluster of friends where couples can have a slower pace, a leisurely lifestyle and psychological well-being. Still, although connections and experiences in the RV-park recur every year, they do not lead to an extension of the friendship once couples are back in Quebec. Back home, there is no need for the familiarity of language or acquaintances since they are already “home”.

**Couple “A” - Extract 45**

“T.Y. Park is not a determinant of having friends. So, we don’t really have friends in TY Park, I mean we speak to people around - but then we don’t – there’s no friends around [...] in this neighborhood we don’t mix with the neighbors. We talk to them. It doesn’t have to be a friend that’s next to you. We don’t come to the TY because we know we’re going to meet people here [...] There’s a lot of older people. Are we considered older people?”

Instruments of their own clustering, what they share is the comfort and ease they find in the familiarity of spending vacation time with friends from back home. One couple does mention that they like to speak to their “American” neighbors:

**Couple “C” - Extract 46**

“There are many Quebecers, but we appreciate very much also the American people who are here. You know, this one is coming from Toronto, Ontario, the blue one. The other one’s from Quebec. This one, too. And the American people are very friendly.”
Although couple “C” mention that they socialize at the 5-7 Tuesday meet-up: “I go to meet the American people that I don’t know. And I begin to speak with them.” When asked who they spend time with, their response is:

**Couple “C” - Extract 47**

“Sometimes we find a couple of Quebecan campers that we meet every two weeks, and we do an activity. Also, sometimes with my cousin who lives by the beach. But the last activity that we did was a picnic at Biscayne State Park close to the Aquarium.”

Couple “C” does continue their relationship at least with one Quebecan couple they have met here when they return to Quebec. Although they have been coming annually to Broward County for the past 20 years, couples are not that interested in making “American” friends:

**Couple “G” - Extract 48**

“Here we have room and people are fond of each other. We know American people here, but we only say ‘hi’. We are not interested in meeting other people.”

**Couple “I” - Extract 49**

“Joe right here in front of us. And our neighbor there. We meet people here from all over Chicago, New York. We pretty much see the same people every year. We don’t keep in touch later, only when we are here.”

The younger couple, Couple “D” do socialize more with non-Québécois population:
Couple “D” - Extract 50

“We usually meet people at the races at Daytona. And we go to the beach and restaurants here. But I mostly cook. With the races, we meet a lot of people from everywhere. Some of them have become good friends. My English has improved a lot.”

When asked about their social life and what they do if they get bored or lonely the husband from couple “A” explains:

Couple “A” - Extract 51

“Well, we jump on the motorcycle, we jump in the jeep or we go somewhere. We never stay here more than three weeks. So, you don’t have time to get lonely - when I come here the first couple of days, I don’t want to talk to anybody because my work is public. I just want to sit here and read. And then if I want to go out, I can do anything here. We don’t go to a movie because I don’t want to lock myself in a building. The drive-in theater doesn’t exist anymore. That would be some place I would go with it.”

Florida signifies good climate, space to relax and enjoy one’s family and friends who also come down from Quebec. The good life does not necessarily denote a place to blend or socialize with Floridians. This shared meaning of place defines a unique version of lifestyle mobility in that one is mobile and yet cocooned, is untethered to hotels, finds freedom in using one’s personal possessions, and socializing with one’s small existing social groups. The geographic clustering by region is what Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) has called “ethnic regression”:

In the process of finding and joining snowbird communities through social networks and north-south roads, one is likely to seek and find kindred spirits, reinforcing ethnic traits in the process. Snowbirds, and the people catering to
them, are agents in their own clustering, by displaying signs of their regional and ethnic background. Hence the display and assertion of one’s mores and origins become a useful way to identify and join a group, thereby creating communitarian bonds and asserting inter-communitarian distinctions. (P. 184)

The RV guests’ attitude towards their space therefore is not only about relaxation and the climate, but also appears to be predicated on their relation with “home.” When asked if they think they will continue to come here in the future, outdoor spaces win every time. Couple G decided not to rent an apartment because they do not want to be alone:

**Couple “G” - Extract 52**

“Here we can walk around and, you know, we know everyone here, just about. You know, in a condo, you are in between the four walls. And my wife loves it here because she is very close with a woman down here.”

Despite the small square footage inside the RV, the majority of the participants in this study stated that they experienced more “space” in the TY RV-Park than anywhere else they had visited or stayed:

**Couple “A” - Extract 53**

“The configuration of the park is done in a way that you have your own privacy. You live on the other side of this Motorhome. And we live on this side. So when I come, I sit here, I don’t see all the neighbors. Let’s say she hung her clothes this morning, we go to the front. We talk to the neighbor. She’s right there. But if I want to keep my own privacy, I just stay here, and you have your own privacy.”

**Couple “G” - Extract 54**

“The space, first of all, because we have a lovely space. We had to stop and bring someone to another campground. That space was very nice near a lake, but Jesus
Christ, they don’t have any room, it is too close to each other. Here we have privacy.”

Privacy is central to the idea of “space”. At one point, couple “A” pointed out how great it is that they have so much space between the motorhomes, unlike some RV-parks where they pack them in like “sardines”. Similarly, couple “C” who own a ~80 sq. ft. Van Vista Cruiser and tow their small car behind the van, prefer TY park because it offers them more “space”:

Couple “C” - Extract 55
“Generally, we like very much our site. The main reason is we have space. You know what I mean? We have space between the campsite and RVs.”

The more space there is between the motorhomes, the more desirable an RV-park:

Couple “D” - Extract 56
“Then we came back in 1991 and then 1993, then the beginning of 2000 and then in 2016 we first stayed at the Trinity Tower RV park. But it was too tight. Here it is very spacy. And I know we don’t have a pool here, but, you know, we don’t swim too much. So, but we don’t care and it’s not that big. We don’t like big places like 200 or 300 sites. You know, this only has 62 spaces. So that’s why we love that, you know.”

The theme of a small and intimate community with plenty of space between the RV-spaces is echoed by couple “F”: 
Couple “F” - Extract 57

“The privacy here is better than the older campgrounds - there is a lot of space here compared to other campgrounds.”

In these examples, it is clear that the presence of other RV guests packed in like “sardines” would take away their enjoyment of their stay resulting in negative emotions. Familiarity, consistency, and reliability do play a large enough role in determining whether or not participants’ experiences are enjoyable. However, space to have privacy, space to walk and enjoy nature, space to relax are all reasons needed to construct a good lifestyle whilst in Florida. In addition, participants have the freedom of choice, that is the choice of not having to live in close proximity to others. Their awareness of their choices about their surroundings, their ability to move at will, and the emotions felt are part of place attachment. The concept of “place attachment” or “place-bonding” (Low & Altman, 1992, Buell, 2005) represent an “affective bond that people establish with specific areas where they prefer to remain and where they feel comfortable and safe” (Hernandez, Hidalgo, Salazar-Laplace & Hess, 2007 p. 310), that is, individuals who have positive feelings about their community and locality (Vanclay, 2008) or sense of place (Relph, 1976; Shamai, 1991; Low & Altman, 1992; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Hillier & Rooksby, 2002; Farnum, Hall & Kruger, 2005; Relph, 2008b; Vanclay, 2008). In fact, creating a sense of community and cultural identity can be useful in times of change and friction (Sampson & Goodrich, 2009; Meisel, 2007). Space is identified through language, meaning, time and occurrences and place is situated in the physical
experience (Cresswell, 2004; Buell, 2005). The physical experience of being active and in nature is a theme that emerged and is discussed in the following section.

Being Active and in Nature

Despite the privacy that participants report having at TY park, at some point, one has to have some kind of neighborly interaction with the RV guests 300 feet away. Through socializing and mutual help, the RV guests establish a community and a sense of placeness. A reduced number of square footage is bearable for the participants because they know it is only for a few months. For example, couple “A” does not seem to mind adapting to a smaller space because it is only for 4½ months.

Couple “A” - Extract 58

“Our house is 10 times bigger than this. 3 stories and 5-bedroom house. It’s a question of adaptation. I mean the space is used with compartments. We are living here for 4½ months.”

At some point, the lack of space in an RV cannot make up for one’s actual home back in Quebec:

Couple “I” - Extract 59

“After 3.5 months is enough to live in an RV after that, I cannot wait till I get to my big home. It is at least 10 times bigger than the RV.”
In other words, it is worth sacrificing space for the sake of a warmer climate, relaxation, and outdoor living during the winter months in order to enhance their overall experience. The central role of the couples’ experiences stem from a deep engagement with their friends, routine, personal belongings, and familiar spaces. Hoyt’s (1954) observations of trailer coach living is still relevant today:

To a certain extent, an increase in association may be expected because of certain physical aspects of trailer-coach living and trailer parks in general. In a favorable climate especially, the limited size of the dwelling unit may lead to increased time being spent out of doors, and this fact, when taken in conjunction with the close physical proximity of the dwelling units and the use of central laundry and lavatory facilities, gives rise to increased social contact and, in time, to informal associations of a more intimate nature. (P. 269)

In other words, it is inevitable that a leisurely lifestyle when combined with good climate, but small spaces will result in an upturn in outdoor activities. The preference for TY-park is expressed through the language of the love of “being in nature” as well as a connection with others through shared experiences.

**Couple “A” - Extract 60**

“I like it that we can walk the park every day, it’s clean. When you see early in the morning people start to walk around - it push you to do it. Yeah, it gives you the effect of - it pulls you to walk with motivation.”

The social aspect of these experiences in such a space is important as this couple report that it helps them get motivated when they see others who are walking early in the morning and so engenders a healthier lifestyle. Likewise, couple “C” immediately mention how they like the location because they can walk:
Couple “C” - Extract 61

“We can walk. You have paths along around the lake. So if you consider our age. The main thing that we do here is walking - walking with my dog with my wife. So it’s a question to be in shape with my wife. And to appreciate the space, the trees, the park, the lake.

The benefit of experiencing and appreciating the space is not only derived from being in good physical shape, but from the feeling of having a connection with the outdoors and nature.

Couple “C” - Extract 62

“After leaving from our house to the RV, you’re living a lot outside. I mean, at that time in October, November, December, you don’t live outside, I mean, you live in the house [in Quebec]. In the wintertime. I mean, you can still go out for different sports like skiing or things like that, but I mean minus 25 sometimes it’s not always you know, you don’t go out to take a walk, right?”

Couple “J” - Extract 63

“In the winter there is nothing much to do. The only thing we can do is ski, skate, and we don’t care anymore. We don’t ski anymore. So we’re walking on the roads and we can slip and hurt yourself.”

All participants reveled in the joy of their mobile lifestyle, vicinity to the beach, and being warm during the harsh winter in Quebec. Views of retirees or snowbirds may be construed as a population who are frail and not very tech savvy. In these examples, it is obviously not the case; the journey south, maintaining an RV and having to adjust to such drastic changes to one’s lifestyle and space is demanding and at times physically
exhausting. The fact that all participants complained about poor wi-fi connectivity at TY Park that hinders their ability to work or keep in touch with their friends and family, is a clear indication that host locations ought to reconsider their spaces and amenities with an eye on servicing a mobile population that is not frail and in need of staying connected.

**Couple “D” - Extract 64**

“We have space for our bikes, there is a bike trail and we can walk around the lake. We like the place of the park. You know, we are close to the beach, we are close to everything. I exercise in the morning, you know, around the lake by myself because he’s [pointing to her husband who is on his cellphone] always on the phone. So better to be by myself. I don’t do too much exercise when I’m in Canada. You know, I go walk with my niece or something like that, but not steady like here.”

For these participants, the combination of having to adjust to the smaller space in an RV, warm weather, and a park with walking and biking paths forcing them to live outdoors has heightened their awareness of their health and exercise routine and increased their physical and social activities.

**Couple “E” - Extract 65**

“Here we are more active. You cannot spend all day in a motor home. The motor home is for eating, watching TV and your bedroom and the activities are outside.”

**Couple “J” - Extract 66**

“Here we walk a lot around. We say hello to everybody that says hello to us. And after a while, they talk to us. We go to dinners with friends or we go to Costco. So
if they have a car they ask us sometimes they ask us for drinks and we go. Apart from these activities, we walk. Yeah. So, our lifestyle change is that we read most of the time. Yeah, we read a lot. And we walk a lot. Go to Publix, Aldi, Penn Dutch.”

For couple “G”, the lifestyle at the park is that of a leisurely and slow pace. Living mostly outside rather than inside the RV, encourages more interaction amongst their neighbors:

Couple “G” - Extract 67

“We like the nature here. It is also quiet here. We came here to relax so we do not mind not having activities. We cook here about 80% of the time. We walk around here or drive around, maybe fix this machine and do repair. We don’t go to Las Olas and we don’t go to the beach. You know, we get in the motorhome just for sleeping you know, and dinner and except that, every time we are outside.”

The implication here is that places motivate their lifestyle choices – but not just any place in Broward:

Couple “F” - Extract 68

“It was more interesting in TY because of the park. Trinity has no park. Here it is a very nice park. And as I play tennis, there is tennis court. I jog every morning. Then there is a path. I love to bike. There is a bike path. All we were looking for at that time was here. That’s the reason we move here. And that’s the reason why we come back every year, every winter.”

The same couple reflect on the emotive aspects of their encounters with nature:
Couple “F” - Extract 69

“I always preferred to come here with an RV because we are on the site outside, close to the lake, close to the nature. It is our preference. We love to go to the beach, OK. Not to swim only to sit close to the sea hearing the noise of the waves every day. We love everything we do that. Hollywood Beach we also love to bike. We go at 10 till 2 then we come back here and have lunch.”

The couple’s reference to the lake, nature and the “noise of the waves” refers to their level of engagement with nature and the benefits they receive from this lifestyle on an emotional level. Participants are nourishing their need to be outdoors whilst it is freezing back home. As the conversation develops, the couple continue to refer to their lifestyle as “paradise”:

Couple “F” - Extract 70

“The lifestyle here is paradise. As you know, in Quebec, it’s very cold. A lot of snow. We stay her almost three months, we have the lake, we have the palms, we have the beach, we have our house [RV]. And it is a completely different way of life. And we see that very often that we live much longer with this kind of winter spent here. When we go back, I go cross-country skiing for exercise. My wife makes these dish cloths using an embroidery machine back in Quebec and sells them here in Pavilion 12. We walk, bike and jog more here.”

Here place is created and sustained via individuals’ emotional attachments or what Yi-Fu Tuan as called “fields of care” (Tuan, 1977). Tuan employed the term “topophilia” to describe the affective, aesthetic, and sensual attachments to places. Place is viewed as an authentic and complex cultural construction than the spaces of
“scientific” geography. It is the presence of the body that gives places their makeup and direction (Tuan, 1974) - there are no “scales” associated with place. Tuan’s reference to “pause” is apt in this instance since “place is a pause in movement. Animals, including human beings, pause at a locality because it satisfies certain biological needs. The pause makes it possible for a locality to become a center of felt value” (Tuan, 1977, p. 138). In addition to their topophilia of Florida and its climate, safety in such familiar spaces also plays a role in their ontological experiences and coming to the same RV park for 20 years.

Safety and Security

Lifestyle mobilities rely on ontological security (Urry, 2007) which is necessary for establishing everyday routines. According to Giddens, “a lifestyle involves a cluster of habits and orientations, and hence has a certain unity – important to a continuing sense of ontological security – that connects options in a more or less ordered pattern” (Giddens, 1991, p. 82). Participants report that not only is it important to have amenities close by, but they must also be safe to get to:

**Couple “A” - Extract 71**

“We choose TY because we have friends very close to here [Broward County]. And this space for us is a central location for us because - like this morning we went to the grocery store by bicycle. It is very easy for us. And if we need to go to a restaurant, we go by bicycle if we want, because we find the place here very safe. It is safe - traffic speaking.”
Safety in roads and traffic as well as safety in having gates around the space is key. For instance, the couple express a strong similarity between the comfort of safety in Quebec and the safety they feel at the RV park. They describe in general what these experiences mean to them. Over the course of extract 72, the same couple reveal the sense of safety expressed via street traffic, fences, and gates:

Couple “A” - Extract 72

“Like yesterday night we went to lunch at Longhorn by bicycle – it is 20 minutes by bicycle. And it’s safe to do it. We don’t always drive on this side of the street. It’s a safe neighborhood. Because it’s all the fence around and the security is going in, the police car pass like 10 times a day. They leave the gate open on one side, but the security is always there. If you come in later because you are at a party. For example, if you have to come here at 1 o’clock in the morning, you call the security and he is just right there. If you drive up to the fence and you just go out and try to move the fence, he’s coming in with his truck. But he recognizes most of the - you know, when you come in he recognizes the car. There are just 60 campers here.”

Organized around a small cluster of RV spots, these spaces lend themselves to a sense of intimacy and guests being known and recognized. There is comfort in knowing that there is a police car who patrols the area after 6:00 P.M. Their presence makes couple “C” feel at home:

Couple “C” - Extract 73

“We appreciate the police car her. After 6, there is a guard and it is very dark to come here. So we feel like at home.”
Couple “I” - Extract 74

The Tuesday meeting made the difference - about 4 years ago, we can talk to anyone. We feel very much at home. Everybody is polite and everybody helps each other. I prefer the camper, it’s my home. Everything is here. I have a truck and pull the wheeler behind so it’s my own motel. It’s not the same air. Some people drive a box and sleep in the box.

Unlike a condo or a house, an RV is closer to the “outside” world and hence more vulnerable to security threats. Inevitably, the issue of safety has primacy.

Couple “D” - Extract 75

“I feel safe here. When I watch TV every day there is always something bad. But around here, you know, we don’t go out too much. But I never see something bad. There is a lot of cops and we hear the sirens a lot, but I don’t know what’s happening.”

The threat, whether real or imaginary, shown on local news stations is mitigated by gates, security guards and police patrols. Using Dean MacCannell’s (1999) axiom of “shared lack” (p. 125), Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) proposes that one of these lacks or “insecurities” originated in the very process of “moving away from a distant, northern home […] the shared experience of the southbound journey was a formative one for travellers: when they arrived in Florida, travellers easily recognized people with similar Northern roots” and hence the “need for security have always been a powerful glue for bringing and keeping a group together” (p. 154). Security is not only a social glue but what empowers participants to move at will and place and mode of choice. Since the advantage of mobility is seldom employed by the RV occupants, it is easy to assume that
they would consider TY park as their “home”. However, most couples (except for Couple “F”) did not see Hollywood or Broward County as their second “home”. Their emphasis and needs are about the centrality of the location but not the existing community in Broward County. The geographical and community clustering that exhibit participants’ feelings of what is known and is safe are manifested in meeting up with the same Québécois friends in Broward County.

Summary of Key Findings

As noted in chapter 1, the guiding framework for this dissertation revolved around three questions:

1. How do translocal spaces condition everyday practices and the sense of place of bi-local residences?
2. What is the role of mobility in restructuring the modes of living of the Floribécois?
3. How are class identities and language negotiated within new, adaptable, and flexible translocal spaces?

In keeping with my phenomenological method, I let my subjects guide me with their meanings. As such, I do not have answers to the questions individually – instead, most of what I learned from my informants answered all three at once. In tying meanings together from narratives, what emerged were themes of familiarity, consistency and reliability vis-a-vis space, and a relationship between spontaneity/adventure and
sameness, repetition, and routine in relation to the self-reported concept of “freedom”.

The tension between these representations is important in regards to notions of habitus, space, belongings, and freedom. Habitus (Bourdieu, 1984) pertains to the present discourse on “freedom” as participants’ practices and habits appropriate a space through the same routines and geographical and community clustering that exhibit participants’ feelings of the known and safety.

Three features became apparent from these interviews which contributed to people returning to a destination, freedom, and the known and familiar:

1. Origin Stories: How Participants First Came to Florida
2. The Discourse of Choice and Freedom
3. Familiar Faces and Old Friends

Origin Stories: How Participants First Came to Florida

The findings of this study underscored the context within which to place participants’ first southward journey to Florida. The analysis of their stories suggest that they were first exposed to the U.S. and Florida when they drove South with their family when they were younger – in some cases, the annual journey South during the winter months went back generations. Statements such as “Like everybody else, we were younger, we all heard about Florida, and we all wanted to go. And then we started going down here in the late 60s.” (Couple “E” – Extract 3) revealed that having become aware of Florida since they had been going there with friends and family since they were in their 20s solidified the repetitive nature of established practices. The findings support Yoesting and Burkhead’s (1973) assertion that initial choices and motivations are based
on childhood memories and later followed by recommendations from friends and family since “the security provided, and the memories kept of those activities participated in during childhood have an influence on the kinds and extent of leisure involvement during adult life” (p. 31). It further demonstrated that lifestyle mobilities of couples rely on prior repeat experiences. Such decisions were motivated by positive word-of-mouth referrals from friends and relatives. The findings are consistent with Gitelson and Crompton’s assertion that there is a “shift to visit a familiar destination [which] occurs most noticeably around the age of 40” (Gitelson & Compton, 1984). By experiencing other places in their youth but returning to a place that is easy and familiar to them, this thesis links the repeat vacation phenomenon with lifestyle mobility rooted in everyday practices, the need for a sense of familiarity of places, location clustering, and comfort and safety. In this respect, the variations and paradoxes in stories around choice and freedom was examined. The following segments develop these findings by exploring the meaning of “freedom” embedded in interviewees’ narratives.

The Discourse of Choice and Freedom

The investigation emphasized the prevalence of the topic of freedom as individuals reflected upon and considered their lifestyle mobility. The informants referenced three main cases in which their experiences of mobility resulted in their “freedom”. In the first instance, many interviewees spoke about their ability to choose their schedule, location, and forms of mobility with the first signs of the Quebecan winter. In this case, participants reported being “active” agents - they chose to come when the weather turned dark and cold in Quebec. Second, freedom was expressed in the
form of “having everything” they need in their own RV. They highlighted the benefits of being surrounded by familiar objects and having a level of control over their own choices and possessions rather than being obligated to follow the rules of a hotel or an Airbnb host. In the third instance, freedom was associated with the benefits of leading a simple and “less complicated” life during the five months. The analysis demonstrated that some of their experiences are characteristic of what has been termed “Old Tourism”, that is, repeat visitations by travelers “with limited travel motivations, one of which is a desire for sunshine and beaches” (Alegre & Cladera, 2006).

The issues of choice, one’s belongings, control, and freedom help construct an understanding of their sojourn at TY Park and gives them meaning and validity. By denying various forms of social control when travelling, participants indicate to the outside world that if one aspires to be mobile and free, one cannot rely on hotels, holiday packages, or Airbnb hosts. Furthermore, what is referred to as “freedom” is evidently the social and economic benefits of their personal lifestyle – that is access, socio-spatial inclusion, and “mobility rights” (Soysal, 1994; Urry, 1999).

In certain interpretations, one could identify a paradox in the participants’ imagined freedom through mobility that may not be substantiated by their actions; however, what is important are the many ways in which the possibility of freedom is experienced. By creating their own space and what freedom means for them, they are following their own configurations of understanding, practices, imagination, and agency, as well as ways of representing themselves as a subject based on their own needs 12.

12 A noteworthy examination of other “ways of constituting subjectivities” (p. 17) in terms of agency, power, and freedom, see Stephanie Wakefield’s (2020) Anthropocene back loop: Experimentation in unsafe operating space. London: Open Humanities Press.
Embracing their motility or their ability to move at will and at one’s own schedule in an RV, but choosing to become sedentary for 5 months, and lead routine, safe, comfortable, and a relaxed lifestyle, has proven to be a source of freedom. The participants respond to their environment (Winter) and reshape their space and mobility potential; and in so doing, create a place within the familiar, comfortable, habitual, and safe community of the RV park. From this perspective, this study advances existing conceptions of freedom and away from binary ideas of transience vs. rootedness and freedom vs. unfreedom. The interesting insight that emerged from participants’ stories is that the definition of freedom is not defined for them, rather, they are creating their own definition and what it means to live the good life. What they are describing is a way of living differently from past codes and blueprints about what it means to be free.

A significant finding from these narratives is the perception that with more mobility – the choice to drive to Florida with an RV, comes more freedom and adventure. According to Ole B. Jensen “the free choice of mobility modality not only is a claim to freedom, but also a way of relating to the socio-spatial environment and thus ultimately also to notions about self and other” (Jensen, 2008, p. 5). The paradox here is the actual mobility and freedom versus the possibility of adventure and freedom that comes with “thinking” that one is mobile. These are “expressions” of freedom that Vincent Kaufmann (2002) has included in his definition of “motility”. Whereas self-determination and autonomy are defining factors for mobility (Bonß, Kesselring & Vogl, 2004), participants’ self-reporting about the possibility of mobility and freedom are examples of motility which in turn are important elements of mobility choices. The choices and a need for unchanging routines and finding comfort in sameness transcend
definitions of lifestyle mobilities, which have traditionally been linked to wanderlust, freedom, excitement, and having an untethered and unconventional lifestyle (Foley & Hayllar, 2007; Hardy, Hanson & Gretzel, 2012; Brooker & Joppe, 2014; Pearce & Wu, 2018).

In this sense, mobility linked to the RV has taken on a full meaning of participants developing their own path of freedom via rootedness. When considering that owners spend considerable time maintaining the RV rather than going places. The reality of owning one’s home, taking it to another location for 5 months comes with great responsibility – a responsibility that roots one and yet frees one in chorus. Such practices and subjectivities display another way of interacting with existing forms of space and mobility, unlocking lifestyles differently from the restraint of existing theories.

Familiar Faces and Old Friends

The study highlights the concept of “reliability of the familiar”. These include interviewees’ experiences of familiarity, consistency and dependability of having their belongings with them and hence contributing to their sense of being at home. The journey South acts a comforting journey that help participants overcome difficulties that might have arisen should they have travelled to unfamiliar places. The ease of mobility for Canadians throughout the U.S facilitates emotional encounters that are familiar and comforting. The study demonstrated couples who root themselves within routines and structures to mirror “home” even when they are away from it. It is possible to carve out one’s home within a mobile lifestyle and be comfortable in familiar spaces rather than be
“on the move”. Hence the habitual everyday act of creating such spaces is in itself an act of liberation from one’s otherwise hectic routine and harsh weather back home.

The ease and comfort of having time to catch up with familiar faces as indicated by the phrase “we see them [our friends] more here” are unique forms of socialization and community for Movers. Community is constructed around shared arrangements, informal practices, neighborly and familiar contacts, reciprocal relations, and social networks. This corroborates Desrosiers-Lauzon’s (2011) and other research on various ethnic groups findings that community bonds re-root themselves in neighbourhoods. This study emphasized that when a territorial mobility is fixed, it marks the enclosures of a lifestyle of mobility since, instead of including non-French Canadians, it remains centered on itself by situating its community within itself.

An integral part of the findings is valuable to consumption practices in terms of the “boundedness” (Gitelson & Crompton, 1984) with regards to repeat visitations and individuals seeking to settle in the same places and meet the same people. While most consumption practices can be deemed as singular, this research recognizes the connection between mobility and Movers who seamlessly merge into their self-segregated community at a slower speed of life, that is, they “stay put” and have the freedom do relax and unwind.

In many cases, these experiences were shown to have a geographic clustering effect - what Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) has called “ethnic regression” (p. 184). From this standpoint, this analysis furthers current notions of shared meanings of place and helps position them relevant to space, mobility and lifestyle. In sum, the narrative of mobility as freedom in these cases have become stories about having a place where the individual
has her or his space and the possibility to construct personal choices about everyday routines.

Although this study does not provide a definitive understanding of lifestyle mobilities, the call for future research is to view mobile lifestyles within a broader understanding of linkages in present-day travel. More work needs to be done on the slow domains of mobility which are found by “staying put”. Lifestyle mobilities does not necessarily mean a temporary, free, and fluid life. Rather, mobility via a shared meaning of place defines a unique version of lifestyle mobility in that one is mobile and yet cocooned, is untethered to hotels but tethered to personal possessions and is free to stay within small existing social groups. In sum, the narrative of lifestyle mobilities has shown to converge into stories about how a new sense of self can be formed and redefined, and how mobility and space configurations are constantly shifting within existing structures.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SEEKING VOLUNTEERS FOR A RESEARCH STUDY

The purpose of this research study is to examine the annual lifestyle mobility of residents of Quebec from their home-spaces in Quebec to their RV-spaces in Broward County.

Participation in this study involves:

- A time commitment of a 2-hour interview
- Optional activities: a 60-minute socio-spatial network activity and/or a short (1-2 minute) narration and video mobile-phone video diaries (on your own)
- A $25 gift card for Starbucks for participation

Study Title: Mobile Passages: Unpacking the Seasonal Lifestyle from Quebec to Topeekeegee Yugnee (TY) RV Park, Broward County, Southeast Florida

Principal Investigator: Dr. Benjamin Smith - Florida International University.

To participate in this research, you must:

- Be 18 years old or older
- A resident of Quebec who comes to Broward County and stays at TY Park on an annual basis
- Speak English

To find out more information about this study, please text/call/email Tara Kai
Phone: 786-479-7575
Email: tarakai09@gmail.com
APPENDIX B

Screener script

Before I confirm that you are eligible for this study, can you answer the following questions?

1. Are you over the age of 18 and can provide an ID before you sign the consent form, and the interview begins?
2. Are you a resident of Quebec who comes to Broward County and stays at TY Park on an annual basis?
3. Would you say you speak English well enough to conduct an interview in English?
4. Do you have a time slot of 2-hours in the coming weeks to do an interview that will be recorded on an audio device?
APPENDIX C
Participant Questionnaire

5. Participant ID number
6. Age
7. Gender
8. Vocation
9. How many times have you stayed at the RV Park in the past 30 years?
10. When do you leave Quebec every year?
11. What types of transportation do you use from Quebec to Florida?
12. When do you arrive in Florida/Broward County/RV Park?
13. How long does it take?
14. Travelling with how many?
15. Detail how many are friends, how many families, with age (e.g., 1 daughter (12), 1 son (15), husband (45), etc.)
Appendix D

Interview Schedule

1. **Spatial and temporal relations over time.**
   a. What brought you to Broward County the first time?
   b. What brought you to the RV Park the first time?
   c. What features and characteristics of Florida/Broward County/RV Park do you like and those you dislike?
   d. Has Broward County/RV Park changed in terms of places and neighborhoods?
   e. Have these changes had any impact on your daily life and your opinion?
   f. What did you do when the changes happened?
   g. Which are the most important places for you?
   h. Are there things about these places or the physical surroundings are significant to you?

2. **Lifestyle and Daily Activities.**
   a. Where do you go to meet people?
   b. What types of leisure activities do you participate in, and where do you participate?
   c. How often do you visit such places?
   d. How has your lifestyle changed since you have been coming here on a regular basis?

3. **Routine (habits, habitus, and life-space).**
   a. Do you have particular routines for specific chores that are different than when you are in Quebec?
   b. Is there any specific reason behind your routine here vs. Quebec?
   c. Have these routines changed over time? Or changed because you do them differently in each location?
   d. Do you have a preferred time of the day to do your errands? Here vs. Quebec?

4. **Independence and Security**
   a. Which aspects of both places contribute to a feeling of security?
   b. How much of both places do you experience after dusk?
   c. Has your perception and behavior changed with time?

5. **Mobility**
   a. Do you feel you have familiarity with the entire neighborhood? Here vs. Quebec
   b. How do you go around in the neighborhood? Here vs. Quebec
   c. How do you attend your basic shopping and other services? Here vs. Quebec
   d. How do you access health, and personal or financial services? Here vs. Quebec
   e. How much and for what purposes do you use the car, on foot or bicycle? Here vs. Quebec
   f. Does any physical feature of both places impact your general mobility?
   g. Has this situation changed over time?
h. How has the frequent mobility from Quebec to Broward, and then back affected your opinion about being mobile?

6. **Satisfaction.**
   a. Is there a relation between your ability to go back and forth between Broward and Quebec, being satisfied and your degree of appreciation for both places?
   b. How much do you feel the neighborhood here belongs to you?
   c. Are you emotionally bonded to the Broward neighborhood?
   d. Did you feel at home in Broward? Why or why not?

7. **Social Connections.**
   a. What do you do to avoid loneliness? Where do you go to meet people?
   b. Do you have friends/relatives in this neighborhood? Vs. Quebec
   c. How often do you see them? Vs. Quebec
   d. Do distances matter to you? Vs. Quebec
   e. Do you use or plan to use the Internet to stay connected socially or to perform activities such as shopping without leaving home? Vs. Quebec
   f. Do you use the neighborhood for cultural, religious, and recreational activities? Vs. Quebec

8. **Future.**
   a. Do you see yourself coming here in the coming years?
   b. Do you see yourself moving to Florida permanently?
   c. What would make you not come back? What, instead, would make you stay?
   d. What would you change in Broward/RV Park to better fit your present needs?
Appendix E

Photographs Taken by the Researcher
Here, 2 Types of RVs (Interior/Exterior)
TY Park Lake

RV Park – COVID Shut-Down
# LIST OF TABLES

## TABLE 1

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Status Married (M) # of years</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th># of times stayed at TY Park in the past 30 years</th>
<th>Leave Quebec (Month)</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Arrive at TY Park (Month)</th>
<th>Length of Journey (Days)</th>
<th># of people travelling</th>
<th>Go back to Quebec (Month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>64/65</td>
<td>F&amp;M</td>
<td>M - 25 yrs.</td>
<td>Used-Car Dealership</td>
<td>15 October</td>
<td>Drive/Fly</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>3-4 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M - 63 yrs.</td>
<td>Pilot - now repairs RVS (&amp; &quot;Campground Host&quot;)</td>
<td>15 October</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>76/76</td>
<td>F&amp;M</td>
<td>M - 50 yrs.</td>
<td>&quot;Half-Retired&quot; CPA for almost 50 years/Homemaker and helped husband as bookkeeper</td>
<td>6 December &quot;after Christmas&quot;</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M - 37 yrs.</td>
<td>Bank Customer Service - now works at ticket booth at Racetrack</td>
<td>4 November</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>November (Disney), December in TY</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M - 50 yrs.</td>
<td>Retired Oil refinery operator</td>
<td>9 November</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>stay 2 weeks in Jupiter State Park Dickinson (Maximum allowed on state parks)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M - 47 yrs.</td>
<td>Civil Servant - Department of Indian &amp; Northern affairs, used to be a science teacher (taught in Canada and in Africa)</td>
<td>10 January</td>
<td>Drive/Fly</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>4 days (stop at a truck stop and sleep in their RV there for free)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M - 10 yrs. Second Marriage</td>
<td>Superintendent in construction</td>
<td>19 December &quot;after Christmas&quot;</td>
<td>Drive/Fly</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 days (stop at an RV park for 1 night and 1 night at Cracker Barrell parking)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Status Married (M) # of years</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td># of times stayed at TY Park in the past 30 years</td>
<td>Leave Quebec (Month)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arrive at TY Park (Month)</td>
<td>Length of Journey (Days)</td>
<td># of people travelling</td>
<td>Go back to Quebec (Month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M - 45 yrs.</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>December &quot;after Christmas&quot;</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 days (stop at an RV park for 1 night and 1 night at Cracker Barrell parking)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>62/65</td>
<td>F&amp;M</td>
<td>M - 40 yrs.</td>
<td>Vibration mechanic/Nurse</td>
<td>4 (in TY - 5 years total first time in Twin Lake)</td>
<td>December &quot;after Christmas&quot;</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>4 days (stop at an RV park for 1 night and 1 night at Cracker Barrell parking)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>81/80</td>
<td>F&amp;M</td>
<td>M - 56 yrs.</td>
<td>Both teachers in high school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leave last Friday of October</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>Middle of November</td>
<td>Go to Jetty park in Cape Canaveral, by the ocean for 2 weeks (next year we will only stay there because TY Park mixed up our reservation) Canaveral is only $22 less and they have more plots (200) lots of trees and parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2  
Summary of Data Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Topic</th>
<th>Emerging Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial and temporal relations over time</td>
<td>• How Participants First Came to Florida</td>
<td>• Family memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Familiar Faces and Old Friends</td>
<td>• Sq footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very central</td>
<td>• Very central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short distance</td>
<td>• Short distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle and Daily Activities</td>
<td>• Choice and Freedom</td>
<td>• Don’t want to rent this is my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Familiar Faces and Old Friends</td>
<td>• Same routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being Active and in Nature</td>
<td>• Relax/slow pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine (habits, habitus, and life-space)</td>
<td>• Choice and Freedom</td>
<td>• Know where everything is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Home: Here, There, Every Where</td>
<td>• Home/No home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being Active and in Nature</td>
<td>• Never bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence and Security</td>
<td>• Home: Here, There, Every Where</td>
<td>• Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>• Familiar Places and Consumption</td>
<td>• Free to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We stay put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>• Familiar Places and Consumption</td>
<td>• Slow pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being Active and in Nature</td>
<td>• Quiet here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Walk nature outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Friends here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Services in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Connections</td>
<td>• Home: Here, There, Every Where</td>
<td>• Don’t need to speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quebecan friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>• Being Active and in Nature</td>
<td>• Will come back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Results of Socio-Spatial Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th># of Couples you socialize with at the RV park who are from Quebec</th>
<th># of Couples you socialize with at the RV park who are from the U.S.</th>
<th># of couples you socialize with who are from Quebec but do not live in the RV park</th>
<th># of couples you socialize with who are from Quebec and live here year-round</th>
<th># of couples you socialize with who are from the U.S. and live here year-round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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