United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

**Southern
Research Station**

General Technical
Report SRS-11

# Theoretical Perspectives of Ethnicity and Outdoor Recreation: A Review and Synthesis of African-American and European-American Participation

**Cassandra Y. Johnson, J.M. Bowker,
D.B.K. English, and Dreamal Worthen**

**The Authors:**

**Cassandra Y. Johnson, J.M. Bowker, and D.B.K. English** are Social Scientist and Research Social Scientists, respectively, Outdoor Recreation and Wilderness Assessment Group, Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Athens, GA 30602. **Dreamal Worthen** is a faculty member in the Agricultural Science Department, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL 32307.

Part 1 of a Two-Part Series

July 1997

Southern Research Station
P.O. Box 2680
Asheville, NC 28802

# Theoretical Perspectives of Ethnicity and Outdoor Recreation: A Review and Synthesis of African-American and European-American Participation

**Cassandra Y. Johnson, J.M. Bowker, D.B.K. English, and Dreamal Worthen**

**Abstract**

For over three decades, research has shown differences in recreation participation by ethnic group membership, particularly for African Americans and European Americans. This paper is the first of a two-part publication series that examines black/white recreation. In this first part, the literature and empirical findings on black/white leisure participation are reviewed. The implications of generalizing region-specific theories and findings of black/white participation to populations in various parts of the country are discussed. Finally, implications for forest managers and future research needs are presented.

**Keywords:** Ethnicity, marginality, place meaning, race, recreation, rural residence.

## Introduction

Current demographic trends indicate population growth for racial and ethnic minority groups is increasing faster than the rate for the U.S. population as a whole. Population trends predict that 82 percent of the nation's growth over the next 30 years will come primarily from Hispanic, Asian, African American, and other ethnic minorities (Dwyer 1994, Murdock and others 1990, USDA Forest Service 1994).

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, is responding to these demographic changes by initiating research efforts to learn more about the recreation habits and preferences of minority groups. These new directions are fostering interest in learning about the different ways in which some racial and ethnic groups use national forests and are also raising the question of why some groups have virtually no representation among forest users. Empirical studies have already identified some of these differences, the largest being between African Americans and European Americans (non-Hispanic whites of primarily European descent). For example, studies have established that African Americans are less likely than whites to recreate in dispersed-setting outdoor areas or to travel to regional recreation areas (McDonald and Hutchinson 1986).

Minority recreation behavior came to the attention of social scientists and resource professionals in the 1960's and early 1970's when social upheavals were taking place in America. Citizen groups charged that the civil unrest occurring in major U.S. cities was due, in large part, to inequitable distribution of recreation resources (Kraus and Lewis 1986, National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 1968, Washburne 1978). Policymakers and resource professionals were forced to acknowledge that recreation and leisure services were not immune from the discrimination and prejudices found in other societal institutions (e.g., housing, education, and industry). Hence, research was initiated at the Federal, State, and local levels to assess the degree of black/white differences in leisure participation and to identify, to the extent possible, other factors correlated with such differences (Hutchinson 1974).

This paper explores some of the reasons why African Americans may be less predisposed than European Americans to take part in certain forms of outdoor recreation activity or visit certain outdoor recreation places. We present our discussion in four sections: (1) an overview of the most widely discussed theoretical bases that have guided ethnic recreation research; (2) a chronological review of empirical work related to these theories; (3) a synthesis and assessment of these studies, including general inferences and relevance; and (4) future research needs. This review of ethnic leisure and recreation theories is not exhaustive. We have attempted to account for only the more widely discussed explanations and the most recent applications.

## A Taxonomy of Ethnic Recreation Theories

Two primary theoretical perspectives of black/white recreation emerged from the early minority recreation studies of the 1960's and 1970's: race/ethnicity[1] and

[1] We use race and ethnicity interchangeably although the terms have distinct meanings in the social science literature. Historically, race was used to denote differences among groups based on supposed genetic characteristics (Marger 1991). Cultural traits were assumed to follow biological traits. Ethnicity, on the other hand, refers to broader identity elements that include language, customs, religion, and, to a lesser extent, physical characteristics, e.g., a person of African descent who is also Hispanic. Because of the ambiguous connotations associated with race, most scientists and theorists agree that ethnicity is more useful in describing differences among societal groups.

socioeconomic status (income, education). If, in empirical studies, racial differences between blacks and whites remained after controlling for socioeconomic variables such as income and education, these variances were attributed to some vaguely defined normative/cultural aspect of race or ethnicity. Alternatively, if findings showed no differences or diminished differences after controlling for socio-economic factors, support for socioeconomic causes would be established (Burdge and Field 1972, Cheek and others 1976, Hartmann and Overdevest 1990, Hauser 1962, Hutchison 1988, Mueller and others 1962, O'Leary and Benjamin 1982, Stamps and Stamps 1985). Table 1 provides a summary of the most frequently cited race and ethnicity studies. It includes the major theoretical explanations and findings.

Lee (1972) was among the first leisure researchers to move discussions of ethnic recreation away from merely reporting correlations of demographic variables and activities to more comprehensive discussions that linked recreation behavior to broader theories of social organization. Lee (1972) focused on an aspect of ethnic subculture theory that involved looking at the meanings different sociocultural groups attribute to recreation places or activities. This perspective of place-meaning is derived from a social psychological view where leisure behavior is perceived as a replication of everyday norms and habits. That is, leisure time is not free time when the norms and dictates of social order are abandoned, but rather it is a time when normative constraints may be somewhat relaxed (Szwed and Abrahams 1977). Central to this theory is the idea that the definitions a group ascribes to leisure behavior are necessarily colored by the group's experiences in everyday life.

The sociocultural-meaning theory that emerged from Lee's (1972) work raises questions about what kinds of people visit recreation places or engage in recreation activities, and, most importantly, how various groups behave in the recreational setting. The potential participant must consider whether or not the real or imagined behavior of visitors is congruent with his or her own expectations. If potential users perceive that certain recreation places are defined primarily by so-called extremist behavior such as motorcycle gang or hippie activity, such places become de facto off limits (Williams and Carr 1993).

For the remainder of the 1970's, ethnic recreation research returned to the dichotomous paradigm of race versus socioeconomic influences. Two theories more specific to socioeconomic explanations were more clearly articulated during this time: (1) opportunity or demographic theory, and (2) compensation theory.

Opportunity theory grew out of research on socioeconomic barriers to participation. The theory is based on the notion that a group's nonparticipation in outdoor recreation results, in part, from monetary constraints but stems primarily from inaccessibility to resources. Opportunity theory is distinct from the more general socioeconomic explanations because greater emphasis is placed on human proximity to resources as the specific cause of nonparticipation.

Opportunity theory has also been referred to as demographic theory, which is simply another way of stating human/ resource proximity (Cheek and others 1976). If individuals with certain demographic characteristics lived near resources, they would be more likely to use nearby facilities and services. This explanation is relevant to socioeconomic issues because, traditionally, residence in better-served districts and neighborhoods has been based primarily on race and ethnicity, with minority groups restricted to neighborhoods with poorer facilities and services. The Kerner Commission Report (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 1968) on race riots in urban ghettos during the 1960's cited lack of adequate recreation facilities and programs as major grievances of rioters. Minority groups did not gain equal access to housing until the 1960's and 1970's, with enactment of civil rights legislation. Indeed, many minorities have benefitted from greater opportunities in choice of housing and residential environment, but for a great many others, such opportunities remain unrealized (Wilson 1980, 1987).

Hauser (1962) first mentioned the issue of resource access and cost in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) report when describing lack of black participation in outdoor recreation activities. (The ORRRC was established by congressional mandate in 1958 to estimate current and expected demand for outdoor recreation resources in the United States.) Hauser states "non-white (all black) participation in these activities is relatively low apparently by reason of their high cost or the unavailability to the individual of suitable facilities" (pp. 56-57). Lindsey and Ogle (1972) formalized this explanation by proposing the opportunity theory to help explain differences in outdoor recreation that did not vary with income. The authors argued that low participation in outdoor recreation might be better explained by lack of available opportunities or resources for less affluent populations.

**Table 1—Ethnic recreation research and proposed theories[a]**

| Researcher(s) | Racial group(s) studied | Theories tested | Supported |
|---|---|---|---|
| Craig 1972 | Blacks | Residence | Residence |
| Antunes and Gaitz 1975 | Hispanics, blacks, and whites | Compensation and isolation | Blacks: compensation, Hispanics: ethnicity |
| Cheek and others 1976 | Blacks and whites | Marginality | Marginality |
| Klobus-Edwards and others 1978 | Blacks and whites | Isolation, compensation, and ethnicity | No results projected |
| Washburne 1978 | Blacks and whites | Marginality | Ethnicity, partial marginality |
| Washburne and Wall 1980 | Blacks and whites | Ethnicity and marginality | Ethnicity |
| Klobus-Edwards 1981 | Blacks and whites | Ethnicity and marginality | Ethnicity and residence |
| O'Leary and Benjamin 1982 | Blacks and whites | Ethnicity | Opportunity/ ethnicity |
| Stamps and Stamps 1985 | Blacks and whites | Marginality | Ethnicity |
| Hutchison 1987 | Blacks, whites, and Hispanics | Demographic, ethnicity, and marginality | Blacks: marginality, demographic; Hispanics: ethnicity, marginality, and demographic |
| Woodard 1988 | Blacks | Marginality and region | Marginality |
| West 1989 | Blacks and whites | Marginality and ethnicity | Partial marginality |
| Carr and Williams 1993 | Hispanics and whites | Ethnicity | Ethnicity |
| Floyd and others 1994 | Blacks and whites | Class identification | Class identification |
| Shinew and others 1995 | Blacks and whites | Multiple hierarchy stratification and class polarization | Multiple hierarchy stratification |

[a] Not all empirical studies reviewed relate specifically to outdoor recreation.

Compensation theory[2] is also related to socioeconomic explanations in that African-American leisure participation is considered a reflection of societal inequities. In contrast to the perspectives presented thus far, however, this theory posits that blacks tend to overparticipate rather than not participate in outdoor recreation activities. Antunes and Gaitz (1975) borrowed compensation theory from the broader sociological literature on social and political participation and applied it to recreation and leisure behavior. In terms of leisure, the theory postulates that because racial and ethnic minorities tend to have relatively marginal status (less well-off in terms of income, education, wealth, access to information) in society, they participate in recreation at higher levels than whites of similar socio-economic status. According to compensation theory, blacks are "exaggerated Americans" (Klobus-Edwards and others 1978) who overzealously engage in social and political activities, organized and supported by fellow blacks, in an attempt to lessen the effects of institutionalized racism.

Myrdal and others (1944) first presented compensation theory more than 50 years ago when both de jure and de facto segregation of social activities existed. It may be argued that many of the conditions that led to the formulation of this theory have been substantially reduced. Given greater freedom of choice, today's middle-class African American may be less likely than the Negro of the 1940's to feel compelled to personally compensate for societal inequities.

**Towards a Formalized Theory**

In the late 1970's, Washburne (1978) proposed a formal theoretical framework that grounded the contrasting perspectives of race versus socioeconomic factors in sociological theory. He applied a very broad interpretation of the two ideas and classified the various socioeconomic factors or causes of underparticipation or nonparticipation as marginality and racial/ethnic/subcultural explanations as ethnicity.

The marginality perspective attributes minority (particularly black) differences in recreation behavior to social structural barriers such as lack of discretionary funds, lack of transportation, and inadequate information about facilities. This perspective charges that the twin traditions of relative poverty and ignorance experienced by blacks in American society are largely responsible for the differences in black/white leisure participation.

While not ignoring the impact of socioeconomic factors, ethnicity theory maintains that minority underparticipation in outdoor recreation is better explained by distinct subcultural leisure values. According to this view, subcultures or ethnic minorities possess unique cultural value systems that determine their recreation behavior. Some researchers have even challenged the term underparticipation because it assumes that African Americans should have the same recreation aspirations as European Americans. Woodard (1988) and Carr and Williams (1993) argue that subgroup recreation should be considered in terms of the respective ethnic group standards rather than in relation to a normalized ideal.

During the 1980's, a number of empirical examinations of ethnicity and marginality theory were conducted (Klobus-Edwards 1981, Stamps and Stamps 1985, Washburne and Wall 1980, West 1989). Typically, these investigations used race as an indicator of ethnicity and defined marginality in terms of either education or income or an index of social position. Few, if any, studies examined deeper ramifications of these constructs.

As the ethnicity/marginality paradigm gained prominence, a limited amount of research began to focus on more refined interpretations of ethnicity such as geographical and residential differentiations within ethnic subcultures. Woodard (1988) proposed an interactive examination of recreation participation that included both race and place-of-residence variables.[3] With respect to outdoor recreation participation, it was argued that it is also important to consider that intraracial leisure variations may exist, for example, between rural and nonrural African Americans. Glenn and Hill (1977) and Riley (1992) would argue that these differences are influenced by more than simple demographic proximity (resource access and residence explanations). Rather, the rural environment itself—the particular combination of geography, rural economics, politics, culture, and socialization—influences leisure decisions and other life choices.

More recently, ethnic recreation research has begun to apply more sophisticated techniques and broader applications of

[2] A related explanation is the ethnic community hypothesis. The hypothesis states that ethnic minorities engage more in social activities than whites of comparable socioeconomic status because the relatively smaller, more cohesive ethnic group is able to exert pressure on the individual member to conform to the norms of the respective ethnic affiliation (Antunes and Gaitz 1975).

[3] Before the 1980's, at least one researcher, Craig (1972), had considered place of residence as a factor in recreation participation.

social theory to research problems. Along these lines, Floyd and others (1994) proposed a theory of class identification to explain leisure behavior. This explanation is related to marginality in that it views social class status rather than ethnicity as the better explicator of black/white differences in leisure behavior. The theory postulates that blacks and whites who view themselves as occupying similar social positions would express similar leisure preferences.

The same group of researchers (Shinew and others 1995) also applied the multiple hierarchy stratification and class polarization theories to leisure behavior. These theories, taken from the general literature on societal inequalities, also build on marginality explanations of leisure behavior. The multiple hierarchy theory holds that race, class, gender,[4] and age are all potential characteristics that can inhibit social access and goal realization. In other words, the recreation behavior of persons who occupy marginalized societal positions—for example, older, less affluent, minority, females—would be distinct from other racial and socioeconomic groups.

Class polarization theory posits that class differences also exist within the African-American population and are more distinct between lower-class black males and higher-class black males than between upper- and lower-class black females. Wilson (1980) charges that the widening gap among black males is due in large part to two labor related trends: (1) the decline in jobs for unskilled, physical labor typically performed by males; and (2) the growing availability of professional occupations for educated black males. Applied to leisure research, class polarization predicts that upper-middle-class black males would exhibit leisure behavior different from that displayed by lower-class black males. Class distinctions between different classes of black females are not expected to be as pronounced because occupations for black women have not become so dichotomized. Because social class is believed to be less polarized among different classes of black women, leisure preferences are also thought to be less distinct.

Theory development in ethnic recreation research continues to emerge, drawing on more comprehensive explanations which combine suppositions of different disciplines such as sociology, social psychology, economics, and history. These innovative approaches are replacing the unidimensional explanations of past decades that viewed theories as distinct and competing. Recent theories offer more integrative paradigms which, we believe, have the potential to greatly enhance our understanding of factors that influence leisure choices.

## Empirical Assessment of Competing Theories

This section presents some of the most frequently cited investigations of black/white differences in outdoor recreation. We present a chronological review of findings related to each of the theories previously discussed.

### Ethnicity

Using chi-square analyses, Washburne (1978) examined the ethnicity/marginality paradigm of wildland recreation participation. He compared use of wildland areas for a sample of black (N = 1,193) and white (N = 838) urban Californians. The secondary data were from a 1969 multistage, stratified sample of low-income residents in the State. Results provided partial support for the ethnicity explanation. Blacks were significantly less likely than whites to participate in undeveloped, primitive areas, even when socioeconomic factors were held constant. In support of marginality, however, blacks were more likely than whites to report that lack of transportation prevented them from traveling to recreation areas outside of their neighborhoods. Overall, Washburne (1978) concluded that socioeconomic factors alone provided a poor explanation of wildland recreation participation and recommended more indepth investigations that explored the influence of ethnic norms and values on recreation choices.

Washburne's (1978) study is viewed as a classic in the ethnic recreation literature, a benchmark against which virtually all subsequent marginality-ethnicity-type studies have been compared. He was the first investigator to clearly articulate a theoretical basis for the race-versus-socioeconomics debate. However, findings from Washburne (1978) may be restricted by limitations in the sampling time frame (1969); but even more suspect is the population from which the data were drawn. The sample consisted of individuals with "unusually low incomes and other disadvantages." As a result, findings may represent only individuals in the lowest socioeconomic strata, rather than working-class, middle-income, and upper-income populations. This caveat would seem to limit extrapolation to lower income groups.

[4] Both Floyd and others (1994) and Shinew and others (1995) refer to gender rather than sex. It is not clear whether they make the sociological distinction between the terms. Sociologists define gender (masculine, feminine) as a socially and culturally constructed concept (Abercrombie and others 1988); while sex (male, female) is biologically determined.

Washburne and Wall (1980) reported results similar to those found by Washburne (1978) using data from the U.S. Department of Interior's 1977 Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service's national study (U.S. Department of Interior 1979). The study consisted of a stratified probability sample of 4,029 households throughout the country. Age and sex quotas were used to select actual household respondents. Analyses were conducted on both the actual sample and on a subsample of 170 black and 170 white respondents from the larger data set. The black and white subsamples were matched on sex, age, income, education, and place of residence. Washburne and Wall (1980) avoided the sampling limitations of Washburne (1978) by using a broader sampling frame. This study tested marginality theory. The sample represented a cross section of the population in terms of income, education, and other sociodemographic variables.

Washburne and Wall's (1980) chi-square analyses showed significant differences in participation rates between blacks and whites for certain forest-type activities (developed camping, primitive camping, boating, and sightseeing) for both the larger sample and the matched subsamples. However, differences either before or after matching for socioeconomic characteristics were not significant for fishing, off-road vehicle use, picnicking, and driving for pleasure. These findings are similar to subsequent studies which show that blacks and whites are least similar with respect to camping, hiking, and backpacking activities (Dwyer 1994).

To further assess the impact of marginality, Washburne and Wall (1980) asked respondents to indicate those factors that restricted participation in outdoor recreation. Marginality factors included money, time, transportation, and information about outdoor recreation areas. A larger percentage of blacks reported that lack of transportation was a barrier, but no significant differences appeared for any of the other marginality factors. The only ethnicity factor was lack of interest, and in this no significant black/white difference was found. This single finding seems to lend support for marginality; however, the authors did not discuss implications of this finding.

The authors also examined marginality theory by assessing latent demand for activities. According to marginality, minorities would express greater demand for activities they have been denied. Results showed that blacks were no more likely than whites to express a desire to engage in activities other than those in which they were currently engaged.

Washburne and Wall (1980) concluded that differences in recreation behavior resulted from differences in subcultural values and norms associated with leisure behavior rather than socioeconomic factors. The authors based their conclusions primarily on the findings that racial differences for camping, boating, and sightseeing remained or changed only slightly after the samples were matched on demographic characteristics. Washburne and Wall also recommended further studies to explore ethnicity from an ethnographic standpoint. Such investigations would involve focusing on the social environment of black leisure and how overall leisure time is used.

Klobus-Edwards (1981) used data from a recreational-needs study of residents in Lynchburg, VA, to assess the strength of relationships among race, residence, and leisure style. The study examined black (N = 193) and white (N = 492) household participation in two categories of outdoor recreational involvement: (1) outdoor recreation (camping, picnicking, boating or canoeing, walking, hiking, and jogging); and (2) wildland activity (backpacking, orienteering, fishing). Respondents reported actual participation in outdoor recreation activities but preferences for wildland activities rather than actual involvement. She also compared blacks living in racially diverse communities and those living in predominantly black neighborhoods to determine the extent of within-race leisure differences.

The analyses consisted of means difference tests (multiple analysis of variance), both zero-order comparisons and comparisons holding constant age, sex, income, education, and household size. Results showed blacks had significantly greater involvement than whites in outdoor recreation activities, while whites indicated significantly higher preferences for wildland activities. When residential comparisons were made for blacks, results showed blacks in predominantly black neighborhoods had significantly higher participation in outdoor recreation activities, but blacks in racially mixed communities showed significantly higher preferences for wildland activities.

The study further compared involvement in leisure participation by both race and sex, for example, black males and white males. (At the time of publication, this study was one of only a few ethnic recreation studies that had examined within-sex differences by race or within-race differences by residence.) The race/sex subgroups were compared on reasons for participation (competition, relaxation, physical condition, enjoyment, and personal contact) and reasons prohibiting participation (no available time, lack of interesting programs, inadequate information, and transportation problems). After controlling for

socioeconomic variables, male participation differed for only one reason—physical conditioning. Female participation differed for two reasons—physical conditioning and relaxation. Among the reasons prohibiting participation, black males were nearly twice as likely as white males to indicate lack of time. White females were more likely than black females to say they did not participate because of lack of interesting programs.

Results of general race comparisons showed some support for ethnicity theory in terms of activity preference (blacks having greater preference for outdoor recreation and whites showing more preference for wildland activities). Race/sex comparisons partially supported ethnicity (greater black male and female preference for physical conditioning). The subgroup analyses also showed no significant differences for inadequate information or transportation problems. This latter finding contrasts with Washburne (1978) and Washburne and Wall's (1980) finding of significant racial differences in access to transportation.

Klobus-Edwards (1981) concluded that little support was established for marginality because the inclusion of socioeconomic variables into the analyses did not lessen general black/white differences. Though significant differences were found for blacks by residence, Klobus-Edwards (1981) minimizes the marginality implications of these results. Instead, she suggests that blacks living among whites may try to emulate white behavior to connect with the "alien environment." Our review found evidence to support both ethnicity and marginality. These mixed results are similar to those reported earlier by Washburne (1978) and Washburne and Wall (1980).

The Stamps and Stamps (1985) study of 750 Syracuse, NY, residents examined the effects of race and class (marginality) on leisure participation. The authors used the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position to represent socioeconomic status or social class. The index, developed by Hollingshead (1971), includes weighted measures of occupation and years of schooling as indicators of social position. This measure was an improvement over methods used in previous studies to operationalize marginality. Earlier studies relied solely on separate, census-type variables, such as education or income, to represent this very complex construct (Washburne 1978, Washburne and Wall 1980).

Holding social class constant, Stamps and Stamps (1985) used chi-square analyses to test for black/white differences in a selected number of leisure activities, including sports participation and outdoor recreation (camping, fishing, and cultural activities). The authors hypothesized that differences in leisure activities for blacks and whites would not be significant when social class was controlled. However, findings showed that race rather than social class was the greater predictor of leisure behavior, particularly among middle-class respondents. Fewer differences were found between lower-class blacks and whites. Activities that showed the greatest differences for middle-class blacks and whites were outdoor recreation, yardwork/gardening, socializing/partying, and resting/relaxation.

The ethnicity studies reviewed in this section are typically cited as part of a homogenous body of research supporting the ethnicity perspective of recreation and leisure. This is generally true; however, as our review has shown, the studies contain both similarities and differences. In terms of similarities, most investigations reported black/white differences for wildland-type activities such as camping, hiking, and backpacking. These results suggest that for certain kinds of wildland activities, racial differences may be consistently strong. The underlying reason for finding differences in these particular activities is a matter of more indepth, empirical inquiry.

Differences among the studies were also noted. For example, Washburne (1978) found support for racial differences between lower-class blacks and whites; whereas Stamps and Stamps (1985) found that racial differences were most evident for middle-class rather than lower-class groups. The methods used to test for marginality also differed. The earlier studies (Klobus-Edwards 1981, Washburne 1978, Washburne and Wall 1980) used income and education as indicators of the construct. Later, Stamps and Stamps (1985) used a somewhat more sophisticated index of social position that included both education and occupation. Thus, a closer examination of these studies reveals that seemingly congruent findings also contain differences and that both methods and results should be carefully scrutinized.

### Socioeconomic Status, Marginality, and Related Theories

**Socioeconomic status**—Cheek and others (1976) compared leisure participation for a representative sample of blacks (N = 144) and whites (N = 1,383) living in "Coaltown," a large manufacturing city in the Eastern United States. Mean difference tests compared leisure preferences and rates for

various categories of activities[5]— outdoor recreation, urban activities, social participation, sports, and hobbies. This was done for both the entire sample and for a matched subset (N=144) of blacks and whites. The black and white subsamples were matched for sex, age, education, residence, and income. The authors hypothesized that leisure differences would diminish when these factors were controlled.

Bivariate results for the overall sample showed significant differences between the races on all activities except hobbies, but when the samples were matched on the socioeconomic characteristics, differences disappeared for all activities except number of sports played. The authors concluded that socioeconomic factors, rather than race, provided a better explanation of recreation behavior.

The models used in this study were similar to models used later by Washburne (1978) [except that Cheek and others (1976) included neighborhood residence as a control variable], yet the two studies revealed dissimilar findings. The variant findings could be attributed to geographic and/or socioeconomic differences and to differences in how the investigators categorized recreation activities. The Cheek and others (1976) sample was restricted to a northeastern manufacturing city that included respondents with varying levels of socioeconomic status, whereas Washburne's (1978) sample involved a State-wide sample of low-income, urban Californians. Moreover, race may be more salient an issue for recreation participation in some regions of the country than in others. As Klobus-Edwards' (1981) study subsequently showed, even within a single city, race was not as important a variable in determining leisure preferences for blacks in racially mixed communities as it was for blacks in primarily black communities.

**Marginality**—West (1989) tested the marginality theory for a sample of Detroit residents, where visitation to city and surrounding regional parks was compared for black and white samples using chi-square analyses. Initial results showed that blacks used city parks more often than whites, while whites visited regional parks more often than blacks. After controlling for income, education, and sex, significant differences between blacks and whites remained. However, some support for marginality was found in terms of access to transportation. Blacks indicated lack of transportation often prevented them from visiting regional parks outside the city. This finding was similar to results reported earlier (Washburne 1978, Washburne and Wall 1980). West (1989), however, emphasized racial discrimination as reasons for differences between black and white visitation.

**Class identification**—Floyd and others (1994) used data from a national telephone probability sample of 1,607 respondents to explore the relationships among race, leisure preferences, and social class using class-identification theory. Investigators hypothesized that respondents of similar social class would indicate similar leisure preferences. Survey respondents classified themselves into the researcher-defined class categories of either middle class or working/poor class. Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation (SAS 1988) was used to test for associations between race and leisure preferences and class and leisure preferences.

Few significant racial or social class differences were found for activities such as games, fine art, and camping/hiking. Racial comparisons of rank order were then conducted, controlling for social class differences. Blacks and whites who defined themselves as middle class showed similar rankings for activity preferences. Contrary to expectations, however, working-class/poor subgroups of blacks and whites showed less correspondence in preferred activities. This was particularly evident for females of the lower classes. These results contrast with those found by Stamps and Stamps (1985), where recreation preferences of the lower classes tended to be more similar than those of the middle class. Further analyses of race, social class, and gender effects showed that middle-class black and white males were most similar in terms of favorite activities, and lower-class black and white females were least similar.

The authors explain the incongruence between these studies, suggesting that the different results may be attributed in part to their use of subjective social class designations rather than researcher-imposed categorizations. Floyd and others (1994) propose that subjective social class designations provide a better representation of social class than previously used objective measures and, hence, a more accurate reflection of the impact of socioeconomic factors on recreation choices.

[5] Leisure indices were constructed for activity types. For example, outdoor recreation activities included picnicking, swimming, camping, fishing, hunting, and snow skiing. Urban activities included gardening, driving for pleasure, bowling, dancing, and golfing. The social participation index was based on degree of involvement in social activities, ranging from one (low involvement) to three (high involvement). Sports included attending or playing football games, playing or attending basketball games, attending wrestling matches, and playing golf, softball, baseball, and badminton. Hobbies included woodworking, decorating, painting, cooking, music, sewing, and reading books.

To explain the different racial impacts on leisure choices among middle and lower classes, Floyd and others (1994) postulate that the influence of race on recreation decisions may depend on social class level. The authors suggest further that the multiple effects of class, race, and gender on leisure choices should be investigated simultaneously because these factors serve as indicators of societal inequalities. Overall, the study concluded that overwhelming evidence supporting marginality (class identification) or ethnicity (indicated by race) was not found because responses differed between lower- and middle-class subjects.

**Multiple hierarchy and class polarization**—Using a methodology similar to Floyd and others (1994), Shinew and others (1995) analyzed the multiple hierarchy stratification and class polarization theories. Multiple hierarchy theory was proposed in response to findings reported by Floyd and others (1994). Shinew and others (1995) examined secondary data from a national telephone sample (N = 138 black, N = 1,374 white). Findings partially supported the hypothesis that the middle classes of both races shared similar leisure preferences. Like Floyd and others (1994), middle-class black and white men expressed similar preferences, but less congruency was found for middle-class black and white women. Moreover, the leisure preferences of lower-class black women were different from those of whites and middle-class black men but similar to middle-class black women and lower-class black men. The authors found no support for the hypothesis that leisure preferences differed more among black men than among black women of different social classes.

Results from both Floyd and others (1994) and Shinew and others (1995) indicate that leisure choices of middle-class black and white men may be more similar than those of middle-class black and white women. However, the multiple hierarchy perspective may not explain leisure choices of lower-class black women because they did not differ significantly from those of other black women and from black males of similar socioeconomic standing. Also, class polarization theory does not appear to hold for the black population with respect to leisure choices identified in this study. Results suggest that other mitigating factors not considered by the authors are involved in black leisure behavior.

**Opportunity/demographic**—The opportunity theory of outdoor recreation participation was addressed in a study of the recreational use of a nearby national forest by residents of a county in Utah (Lindsay and Ogle 1972). Though the study made no mention of minority groups within the sample, the results have implications for the present discussion because they offer empirical support for the opportunity theory. Researchers used bivariate analysis of variance (means difference) to test for differences in use of a recreation area on the forest. Means for forest users and nonusers on several demographic variables were compared: education level, age, age of children, number of children, sex, urban versus rural upbringing, income, and transiency (frequency of moves).

Findings indicated no significant income differences between forest users and nonusers. Income groups were fairly evenly distributed among users and nonusers. Contrary to findings from previous studies, users also tended to have less education rather than more, while males were associated with higher use patterns. Because these results (with respect to income and education) were inconsistent with those reported earlier by Hauser (1962), Lindsay and Ogle (1972) concluded that nonparticipation may be more a reflection of lack of opportunity or access to resources rather than lack of money. However, study findings may be biased because analyses were limited to bivariate analyses. The study did not specify a model that controlled for income and education along with the other socioeconomic variables.

Hutchison (1987) found support for the demographic explanation in a study conducted as a field survey of 18,000 black, white, and Hispanic visitor groups to neighborhood and regional parks in Chicago from 1980 to 1981. The purpose of this study was to assess the ethnic, racial, and social group composition of park visitors and to observe primary group activities. Field surveyors recorded information on the number of people in each group and the social composition of the groups, for example, age, sex, and race. Chi-square analysis showed statistically significant differences in activity types (mobile, stationary, and sports) for the three groups. Results also showed that a large number of park visitors were older whites who lived near the parks. Hutchison noted that overall differences in demographic composition of the black, white, and Hispanic groups, particularly with respect to age, reflected residence more than some inherent ethnic or social class factor. Older individuals were more predominant in white groups because they had greater access to the parks.

Results from Lindsay and Ogle (1972) and Hutchison (1987) are not directly comparable because they used different methods to collect and analyze data. The former study involved a random sample of households; the latter involved a convenience sample of actual participants, and the results may not be applicable to the general population.

In addition, the overall goals of the two studies were different. Lindsay and Ogle correlated usage with a number of demographic variables, while Hutchison conducted a comprehensive assessment of recreation styles.

**Compensation**—Antunes and Gaitz (1975) conducted an empirical investigation of compensation theory by examining social and political activities of 1,441 Houston, TX residents. The data were from a larger study conducted during 1969-70 that included general information on social and political behavior, leisure, and mental health. The larger study related to general nonwork time activities more than to leisure or recreation in particular. Antunes and Gaitz (1975) used this secondary data to test the hypothesis of no difference in nonwork activities between whites and blacks and whites and Mexican Americans.

Differences in participation for 11 activities[6] were assessed by analysis of variance, holding constant ethnicity, age, and socioeconomic status.[7] Black involvement was significantly higher than white involvement for two of the three leisure related activities: enjoyment of clubs and interaction with friends. Black involvement in club activities exceeded white participation across all socioeconomic status levels. In addition, both upper- and lower-class blacks reported more recreational interaction with friends than whites; however, black middle-class interaction with friends was slightly less than white middle-class interaction.

This study's findings of higher involvement among blacks for leisure activities contrasts with those of other investigations which report lower participation by blacks (O'Leary and Benjamin 1982). Perhaps the types of leisure activities investigated (e.g., interaction with friends and membership in clubs) were more relevant to black interests. Subsequent research has shown that black leisure tends to be more group oriented than white leisure (Dwyer 1994, Dwyer and Gobster 1991, Gobster and Delgado 1993). In a national report on the status of African Americans, Jaynes and Williams (1989) also support this contention, stressing that historical patterns of discrimination and segregation have effected "a heightened sense of group consciousness [within the black community] and a stronger orientation toward collective values and behavior than exists generally among Americans."

**Sociocultural meaning**—Sociocultural-meaning theory has not been subjected to many empirical investigations. Conceptually, sociocultural meaning is similar to ethnicity but broader because sociocultural meaning can derive from sources other than ethnic or racial identity, for example, peer group affiliation (Cheek and others 1976). The extent to which a group, ethnic or otherwise, maintains distinct sociocultural definitions of leisure is the extent to which leisure differences between that group and other groups will be observed.

In testing sociocultural-meaning theory, Lee (1972) conducted a qualitative study of park use by Hispanic, Asian, African-American, and European-American ethnic groups in a major metropolitan area in California. Lee used a combination of conversational interviews, observation, and documentary analyses to collect data in neighborhoods and city and regional parks. The purpose of this exploratory study was to obtain an overall sense of the meaning neighborhood residents attributed to their residential environments, including neighborhood and district parks and recreation facilities.

Lee (1972) observed that park activities of various sociocultural groups seemed to be representative of visitors' broader lifestyles in nonleisure settings. For example, in the early morning hours, one section of a park in a Chinese district was used by Chinese Americans to engage in martial arts exercises. Later in the day, white office and construction workers sat on benches throughout the park and ate lunch. The sections of the park frequented by white collar and construction workers took on a more typically European-American atmosphere because martial arts activities had ceased, and fewer visitors of Asian descent interacted freely in these areas.

In another area of the city, Lee (1972) observed how a playground and recreation center were defined by racial groups who lived in the community. White, middle-income residents in one part of the neighborhood felt the recreation facilities existed for lower-income blacks who lived in the opposite end of the neighborhood. The white residents, many of whom owned property, viewed the presence of blacks without property in the neighborhood as a threat to public safety and property values. Consequently, white residents tended to discourage their children from participating in activities promoted by the recreation center. Lee described the phenomena he observed in these parks

[6] Three of these activities related to leisure and recreation: (1) attendance at cultural events (plays, concerts, museums); (2) recreational interaction with friends; and (3) enjoyment of clubs and organizations.

[7] Socioeconomic status was measured by occupation, coded by Duncan Index Numbers (Reiss and others 1961) into high, medium, and low categories. The study did not control for gender differences, hence, the analyses do not address potential sex differences for either the overall sample or the respective subgroups.

and communities as boundary regulation, a process by which social and cultural groups partition off sections of outdoor recreation places and make either formal or informal claims to these territories.

West (1989, 1993) also refers to boundary maintenance, calling it interracial relations. However, he views the issue primarily in terms of racial conflict. He accuses researchers of using euphemisms to describe racial conflict in park settings and charges that studies focusing on under-representation among minority groups have blatantly ignored social aspects of usage.

Buchanan and others (1981) examined the meanings of recreation activities for three social groups[8] (family, friendship, and family/friendship) using discriminant analyses. They hypothesized that meanings assigned to selected recreation activities would differ by social group affiliation. Data for the study came from a proportional sample of visitors to an Army Corps of Engineers reservoir in Illinois. Sample size consisted of 649 respondents engaging in boat fishing (N = 315), powerboating (N = 219), and swimming (N = 115). These activities were the dependent variables. The independent variable was the range of meanings attributed to these activities, operationalized by recreation experience preference scales. These scales measured the specific satisfying experiences of recreation activities. Scale items included experiences such as achievement, being with friends, creativity, escape from personal and social problems, and temperature change.

Results showed no variation by social group in meaning assigned to powerboating. Variation in activity meaning was found for boat fishing (chi-square differences significant at $p < .01$). These meanings included being with friends, reflecting on values, seeking security, escaping family, and changing temperature. Family/friendship groups were more likely than other groups to say boat fishing afforded them the opportunity to be with friends and escape family. Family groups most often mentioned reflecting on values, seeking security, and changing temperature.

The greatest amount of variation in activity meaning was attributed to swimming (chi-square differences significant at $p < .05$). Meaning assigned to this activity included risk-taking, nostalgia, learning/discovery, exercise/fitness, security, and temperature change. Another meaning of swimming included social contact, escaping family, creativity, and catching fish. Family groups were more likely than the other two groups to mention security as one of the reasons they engaged in swimming; friends were more likely to mention risk-taking, learning/discovery, and creativity; and family/friends mentioned nostalgia, exercise/fitness, and temperature change most often.

Carr and Williams (1993) examined recreation meaning for broader classes of social groups. This research focused on Hispanic (Mexican American, Central American) and Anglo (European American) recreation in the San Bernardino and Angeles National Forests in California. A self-administered survey collected demographic data and information about the meaning of the recreation experience. The meaning of the recreation setting was measured with open-ended questions: What does respecting the forest mean to you? What was your primary reason for visiting the forest? The meaning of the recreation activity was explored through a series of Likert-scaled items relating to various facets of the recreation experience. Surveyors also collected data on group behavior and on-site activities by observing respondents and recording observations. Data collection yielded a sample of 732 Hispanic and Anglo visitors.

Carr and Williams (1993) performed chi-square analyses to examine the relationship between ethnicity and meaning. They used a complex measure of ethnicity that included ancestry, generational status, and acculturation level as indicators of the construct. Ancestral groups (Mexican American, Central American, or Anglo American) differed significantly in responses related to respecting the forest and also for reason for visit. Generation was also significantly related to respecting the forest. Anglos and second-generation Hispanics were more likely to report that respecting the forest meant acting in an appropriate and decent manner. Immigrant and first-generation Hispanics were more likely to say respecting the forest meant experiencing the place in a positive manner. Further, more acculturated Mexican Americans were more likely to interpret the respect question in behavioral terms such as acting in appropriate ways while visiting. Less acculturated Mexican Americans were more likely to say respecting the forest meant respecting oneself.

**Race and place**—A few studies have considered the influence of residence or region on recreation participation (Craig 1972, Klobus-Edwards 1981, O'Leary and Benjamin 1982, Philipp 1986, Woodard 1988). Craig (1972) examined the recreation patterns of a sample of 3,400 rural blacks recently migrated to a black, urban community

[8] This research referred to social groups rather than sociocultural groups. Social groups were defined as any group of people who view themselves as members of a group and who are also defined by others as belonging to a particular group.

adjacent to Baton Rouge, LA. It was hypothesized that rural upbringing was more influential in shaping migrants' recreational pursuits than a change in residence or an immediate improvement in education. Respondents were queried about their leisure time activities before and after moving to the city. Simple comparisons of data from the two time periods showed many recreational pursuits carried over from the rural milieu, suggesting that rural upbringing has some effect on recreation choices for recently migrated residents. Craig (1972) does not mention using any statistical analysis. It can only be inferred that he used some type of descriptive analysis to compare the data.

In their study of ethnic leisure preferences, O'Leary and Benjamin (1982) also reported that rural blacks apparently have distinct reasons for engaging in activities, when compared to either urban blacks or rural or urban whites. Using data from the 1976 Indiana Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey (U.S. Department of Interior 1979), (N = 782 black; N = 29,093 white), they found substantive differences ($\geq$0.5)[9] between rural blacks and other groups in mean ratings of reasons given for recreation participation. Larger proportions of rural blacks chose activities based on cost. Rural blacks were also more likely to view their participation as a way to meet new people, be with family and friends, and teach others about recreation.

Woodard (1988) examined the influence of both social class and region on urban leisure choices of African Americans in Chicago. Like Craig (1972), he restricted his sample to African Americans (N = 311). Woodard (1988) hypothesized that middle-class individuals would be more likely to engage in metropolitan activities such as attending the theater, ballets, and symphonic concerts. No class differences were expected for informal, domestic activities (card playing, visiting family) requiring fewer financial outlays. Blacks reared in the rural South were expected to participate more in domestic activities; city-reared respondents were expected to engage more in night-life activities (going to bars, clubs, partying).

Woodard (1988) used the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position as a proxy for social class, and region of origin (urban North versus rural South) represented region. Controlling for social class, region, and other socio-demographic factors, discriminant analyses identified those variables that best distinguished participants from nonparticipants for specific activities. Unlike Craig's (1972) findings, his results showed that regionality was somewhat less important than social class in predicting leisure behavior. Nevertheless, Woodard concluded that both region and education were important factors in understanding how African-American leisure preferences vary.

Differences in findings between Craig (1972) and Woodard (1988) may be attributed to methodological differences. Craig used no statistical analyses, while Woodard employed fairly elaborate techniques. These differences may also be attributed to more general differences in the social and political climates of early 1970's Louisiana and mid-to-late 1980's Chicago. Access to recreational facilities and nontraditional activities had only recently become available to the majority of blacks in the 1970's; and even then, de facto social restrictions remained for activities that were considered "white" (Kraus and Lewis 1986, Meeker 1973). Woodard recognized this temporal difference, as the aim of his study was to assess regional differences for African Americans in the post civil rights era.

## Synthesis and Knowledge Gaps

No one factor—ethnicity, marginality, attributed meaning, or place of residence—offers a definitive explanation of racial differences in recreation behavior. No unambiguous evidence supports any of these theses. Some investigators attribute the lack of definitive findings to the general difficulty involved in independently operationalizing the concepts in empirical studies (Carr and Williams 1992, 1993; Floyd and Gramann 1993; Pfister 1993). For example, no standard definition exists for what constitutes marginality nor is there a consistent measure across studies of factors to represent the construct. Socioeconomic status,[10] resource access, and knowledge of recreation resources have all been used to represent marginality factors, but none has been used consistently.

Philipp (1995) also charges that a deeper understanding of marginality indicators such as socioeconomic status and access to resources is needed. He argues that marginality is more complex than annual income, and indicators such as socioeconomic status and resource access should be viewed both temporally and cross sectionally. For example, ethnic minorities who are first-generation middle class may

[9] The rating scale ranged from 1 to 4, so half the distance between ratings or half the interval was considered substantive. No statistical tests were conducted for these responses.

[10] Income, education, occupation, or some combined index such as the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (Hollingshead 1971).

express different leisure preferences than members of the same ethnic group who have been middle class for several generations. Philipp (1995) argues that acquiring the tastes, habits, mannerisms, spending patterns, time allocation patterns, and leisure preferences of the middle class may take more than one generation.

Measurement of ethnicity has also been criticized because race is usually the sole indicator of this very complex construct. For example, in multivariate analyses, differences that persist after accounting for marginality factors are usually assumed to be associated with subcultural norms associated with racial groups or ethnic identity. Few attempts have been made to determine more precisely how race affects recreation behavior. According to O'Leary and Benjamin (1982), ethnicity is a social psychological phenomenon and must be treated as such if it is to provide a meaningful explanation of leisure behavior. Such an examination would include an assessment of how ethnic leisure values, attitudes, and preferences influence the formation of leisure meanings.

Along similar lines, the opportunity/demographic theory merits additional empirical investigation. It follows logically that people would participate in recreation opportunities most convenient to them. However, rigid application of the theory becomes somewhat difficult when populations begin to diversify along racial, religious, and economic and social lines. In these instances, recreation decisions may become more laden with considerations of normative behavior and group identity.

Findings from the sociocultural-meaning studies are also difficult to synthesize because meaning is often a relative concept and cannot always be easily communicated, particularly when the object of meaning is nebulous (e.g., a recreation experience or environment). Neither Lee (1972), Buchanan and others (1981), nor Carr and Williams (1993) directly asked respondents what meaning recreation places and experiences conveyed. Rather, they used indirect methods from which they could, at best, only infer meaning. For example, the Carr and Williams question: "What does respecting the forest mean to you?" may not have been relevant to the meanings people assigned to recreational settings.

Differences in sampling, research focus, and analyses have produced a body of ethnic recreation literature that is somewhat difficult to compare. Because approaches vary, attributing recreation differences to a single dominant perspective is nearly impossible. As Carr and Williams (1993) and Floyd and Gramann (1993) surmised, a number of influences probably work together to determine recreation behavior. In the absence of overwhelming evidence of a single explicator, it may be that so-called opposing theories (e.g., marginality/ethnicity) work jointly to explain recreation preferences and behavior. For example, ethnicity may be less important to African Americans exposed to certain activities as youths or to those living among whites (Klobus-Edwards 1981). And as Floyd and others (1994) concluded, race may affect the leisure decisions of individuals differently, depending on social class level.

## Future Research

Social science theorists and investigators studying racial and ethnic recreation must develop theories and methods that include a wider range of social science disciplines within an integrated framework. We should ask to what degree theories x, y, and z interact to explain behavior, not whether behavior is determined by x, y, or z. Examining behavior from a variety of perspectives helps establish a more holistic impression of both the issue under consideration and the groups or individuals being studied.

Many of the studies that spawned the various ethnic recreation theories came from investigations of primarily urban populations (Hutchison 1987, Kraus and Lewis 1986, Stamps and Stamps 1985, Washburne 1978). Researchers tend to generalize findings from geographically specific studies (e.g., Chicago, Detroit) to the entire black population regardless of region or residence (Carr and Williams 1993). However, regional or other variations may exist within subcultural groups. The few studies in the 1980's that examined the influence of residence on leisure participation suggest that structural effects of place (the interplay of political and social ideologies, labor markets, culture, and economics) influence leisure behavior and should be examined more carefully (Klobus-Edwards 1981, O'Leary and Benjamin 1982).

Along these lines, we recommend that more research focus on regional and geographic differences within racial and ethnic groups. This line of inquiry would add the dimension of place, which may be as strong a socialization agent as are culture and economics (Proshansky 1978).

Information on the recreation behavior and interaction of rural blacks with the natural environment is scarce. The general lack of research on rural, black involvement in resource-based outdoor recreation could be caused by the relatively small numbers of rural blacks in most parts of the

country. In the Southern States, however, substantial proportions of African Americans reside in rural areas, especially in Black Belt[11] counties. Moreover, American Indians compose a notable percentage of North Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana's nonmetropolitan populations (U.S. Department of Commerce 1992).

Planners and policymakers should obtain a better understanding of rural black and other minority use of, and perspectives on forested lands. The environmental attitudes, use patterns, and beliefs of this substantial segment of southern, rural populations need to be recognized by resource managers and incorporated into land management decisions. Information from these local constituents is vital to understanding the relationships between people and natural resources in rural areas.

More survey data would better document local population perceptions of supply and demand for outdoor recreation facilities and resources in rural, southern regions. On the supply side, many rural areas in the South lack organized, comprehensive recreation programs, due in large part to lack of funds.[12] On the demand side, any rural recreation assessment should examine both participation and perceived barriers to participation.

Future research should also incorporate some examination of social definitions of resources (Lee 1972). Recreation managers could benefit from studies that use qualitative methods to examine how recreation resources are socially defined. This topic may be especially pertinent to managers on southern forests adjacent to rural communities because of longstanding traditions associated with different types of places and sociocultural groups. For example, the availability of a fishing locale on a national forest may be less important to local users than who fishes at the resource. The fishing locale may not exist de facto for a person who considers him/herself to be excluded from the society of those who frequent the spot.

Social definition is an often overlooked, yet important, aspect of the outdoor recreation experience. Qualitative research methods could aid such investigations. Qualitative methods are more indepth data-gathering techniques that involve small-group or one-on-one interaction with research respondents. If survey data show residents are generally dissatisfied with recreation services, a researcher might use qualitative methods to better ascertain specific causes for the dissatisfaction. For example, the researcher might ask a subset of respondents exactly what they like or dislike about current offerings.

The theories and issues raised in this paper all point to the need to consider issues of equity and inclusion, to the extent possible, when formulating recreation policy. This exercise in democracy is necessary if we, as Federal land stewards, are to become more responsive to both current and potential recreation users; for it is the right, rather than the privilege, of law-abiding, taxpaying citizens to have equitable access to public outdoor recreation opportunities. The provision of such opportunities may be said to be a reflection of the regard with which a society holds its citizens.

## Acknowledgment

We thank Deborah Carr, Al Hall, Christine Overdevest, and Julia Parker for their helpful comments and suggestions.

---

[11] Rankin and Falk (1991) define the Black Belt as a continuous group of rural, southern counties extending from Virginia through the Carolinas to Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. In these counties, at least 33 percent of the population is African American, and many have black populations in excess of 50 percent.

[12] Harwell, Rick; Larson, Tommy. 1996. South Carolina rural recreation project: assessing the impact of rural recreation. In: 1996 Program and Abstracts of the Southern Rural Sociological Assn. Meeting, 1996 February 3-6, Greensboro, NC. On file with Dr. Dreamal Worthen, Florida A&M University, Perry Paige Bldg., Room 116, Tallahassee, FL 32307.

## Literature Cited


**Abercrombie, Nicholas; Hill, Stephen; Turner, Bryan S.** 1988. The Penguin dictionary of sociology. 2d ed. London: Penguin Books. 320 p.

**Antunes, George; Gaitz, Charles M.** 1975. Ethnicity and participation: a study of Mexican-Americans, blacks, and whites. American Journal of Sociology. 80(5): 1192-1211.

**Buchanan, Thomas; Christensen, James E.; Burdge, Rabel J.** 1981. Social groups and the meanings of outdoor recreation activities. Journal of Leisure Research. 13(3): 254-266.

**Burdge, Rabel J.; Field, Donald R.** 1972. Methodological perspectives for the study of outdoor recreation. Journal of Leisure Research. 4(1): 63-72.

**Carr, Deborah S.; Williams, Daniel R.** 1992. Understanding diverse recreationists: beyond quantitative analysis. In: Gobster, Paul H., ed. Managing urban and high-use recreation settings. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station: 101-106.

**Carr, Deborah S.; Williams, Daniel R.** 1993. Understanding the role of ethnicity in outdoor recreation experiences. Journal of Leisure Research. 25(1): 22-38.

**Cheek, Neil H., Jr.; Field, Donald R.; Burdge, Rabel J.** 1976. Leisure and recreation places. Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Science: 172.

**Craig, William.** 1972. Recreational activity patterns in a small Negro-urban community: the role of the cultural base. Economic Geography. 48: 107-115.

**Dwyer, John F.** 1994. Customer diversity and the future demand for outdoor recreation. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-252. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 58 p.

**Dwyer, John F.; Gobster, Paul H.** 1991. Black/white outdoor recreation preferences and participation: Illinois state parks. In: VanderStoep, Gail A., ed. Proceedings of the 1991 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. 1991 April 7-9; Saratoga Springs, NY. Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-160. Radnor, PA: U.S.Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station: 20-24.

**Floyd, Myron F.; Gramann, James H.** 1993. Effects of acculturation and structural assimilation in resource-based recreation: the case of Mexican-Americans. Journal of Leisure Research. 25(1): 6-21.

**Floyd, Myron F.; Shinew, Kimberly J.; McGuire, Francis A.; Noe, Francis P.** 1994. Race, class, and leisure activity preferences: marginality and ethnicity revisited. Journal of Leisure Research. 26(2): 158-173.

**Glenn, Norval D.; Hill, Lester, Jr.** 1977. Rural-urban differences in attitudes and behavior in the United States. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 429: 36-50.

**Gobster, Paul H.; Delgado, Antonio.** 1993. Ethnicity and recreation use in Chicago's Lincoln Park: in-park user survey findings. In: Gobster, Paul H., ed. Managing urban and high-use recreation settings. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station: 75-81.

**Hartmann, Lawrence A.; Overdevest, Christine.** 1990. Race, ethnicity, and outdoor recreation participation: a state-of-the-knowledge review and theoretical perspective. In: Zera, Karen R., ed. Proceedings, 1989 Southeastern Recreation Research Conference. 1989 February 15-17; Asheville, NC. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, Institute for Behavioral Research; 11: 53-63.

**Hauser, Philip M.** 1962. Demographic and ecological changes as factors in outdoor recreation. In: Trends in American living and outdoor recreation; report to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission 22. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office: 27-59.

**Hollingshead, August B.** 1971. Commentary on the indiscriminate state of social class measurement. Social Forces. 49(4): 563-567.

**Hutchinson, Ira J.** 1974. Recreation and racial minorities. In: Stein, Thomas A.; Douglas, H., eds. Recreation and special populations sessions. Boston: Holbrook Press: 323-353.

**Hutchison, Ray.** 1987. Ethnicity and urban recreation: whites, blacks, and Hispanics in Chicago's public parks. Journal of Leisure Research. 19(3): 205-222.

**Hutchison, Ray.** 1988. A critique of race, ethnicity, and social class in recent leisure and recreation research. Journal of Leisure Research. 20(1): 10-30.

**Jaynes, Gerald David; Williams, Robin M., Jr.** 1989. A common destiny: blacks and American society. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. 13.

**Klobus-Edwards, Patricia.** 1981. Race, residence, and leisure style: some policy implications. Leisure Sciences. 4(2): 95-112.

**Klobus-Edwards, Patricia; Edwards, John N.; Klemmack, David L.** 1978. Differences in social participation: blacks and whites. Social Forces. 56(4): 1035-1052.

**Kraus, Richard; Lewis, Charles.** 1986. Ethnic and racial minorities in urban recreation. In: A literature review: President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office: 19-30.

**Lee, Robert G.** 1972. The social definition of outdoor recreational places. In: Burch, W.; Cheek, N. Jr.; Taylor, L., eds. Social behavior, natural resources, and the environment. New York: Harper and Row: 68-84.

**Lindsey, John J.; Ogle, Richard A.** 1972. Socioeconomic patterns of outdoor recreation use near urban areas. Journal of Leisure Research. 4(l): 19-24.

**Marger, Martin N.** 1991. Race and ethnic relations: American and global perspectives. 2d ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.: 17-36.

**McDonald, Jessyna; Hutchinson, Ira J.** 1986. Minority and ethnic variations in outdoor recreation participation: trends and issues. In: A literature review: President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office: 41-51.

**Meeker, Joseph W.** 1973. Red, white, and black in the national parks. In: Machlis, Gary E.; Field, Donald R., eds. On interpretation: sociology for interpreters of natural resource and cultural history: 195-205.

**Mueller, Eva; Gurin, Gerald; Wood, Marie.** 1962. Participation in outdoor recreation: factors affecting demand among American adults. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report 20. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. 93 p.

**Murdock, Steve. H.; Backmann, Kenneth; Colberg, Edli [and others].** 1990. Modeling demographic change and characteristics in the analysis of future demand for leisure services. Leisure Sciences. 12(12): 79-102.

**Myrdal, Gunnar; Sterner, Richard; Rose, Arnold.** 1944. An American dilemma: the Negro problem and modern democracy. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

**National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders: Kerner Commission Report: Grievances.** 1968. In: Recreation and leisure services for the disadvantaged: 41-48.

**O'Leary, Joseph T.; Benjamin, Patricia J.** 1982. Ethnic variation in leisure behavior: the Indiana case. Station Bull. 349. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources. 45 p.

**Pfister, Robert E.** 1993. Ethnic identity: a new avenue for understanding leisure and recreation preferences. In: Ewert, Alan; Chavez, Deborah J.; Magill, Arthur W., eds. Culture, conflict and communication in the wildland-urban interface. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 53-68.

**Philipp, Steven F.** 1986. Race and rurality: the issue of outdoor leisure participation. Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences. 32(2): 85-91.

**Philipp, Steven F.** 1995. Race and leisure constraints. Leisure Sciences. 17: 109-120.

**Proshansky, Harold M.** 1978. The city and self-identity. Environment and Behavior. 10(2): 147-169.

**Rankin, Bruce H.; Falk, William W.** 1991. Race, region, and earnings: blacks and whites in the South. Rural Sociology. 56(2): 224-237.

**Reiss, Albert; Duncan, Otis; Hatt, Paul K.; North, Cecil C.** 1961. Occupations and social status. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. 305 p.

**Riley, Robert B.** 1992. Attachment to the ordinary landscape. In: Altman, Irwin; Low, Setha M., eds. Place attachment. New York: Plenum Press: 13-32.

**SAS Institute.** 1988. SAS/STAT User's Guide. Release 6.03 ed. Cary, NC: 533.

**Shinew, Kimberly J.; Floyd, Myron F.; McGuire, Francis A.; Noe, Francis P.** 1995. Gender, race, and subjective social class and their association with leisure preferences. Leisure Sciences. 17: 75-89.

**Stamps, Spurgeon M., Jr.; Stamps, Miriam B.** 1985. Race, class and leisure activities of urban residents. Journal of Leisure Research. 17(1): 40-56.

**Szwed, John F.; Abrahams, Roger D.** 1977. After the myth: studying Afro-American cultural patterns in the plantation literature. In: Crowley, Daniel J., ed. African folklore in the New World. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press: 65-86.

**U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.** 1994. RPA assessment of the forest and rangeland situation in the United States-1993 update (For. Resour. Rep. 27). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 75 p.

**U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.** 1992. 1990 Census of population and housing summary tape file 3a-CD ROM (Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. CD-ROM.

**U.S. Department of Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.** 1979. The third nationwide outdoor recreation plan: the assessment. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. 264 p.

**Washburne, Randel F.** 1978. Black under-participation in wildland recreation: alternative explanations. Leisure Sciences. 1(2): 175-189.

**Washburne, Randel F.; Wall, Paul.** 1980. Black-white ethnic differences in outdoor recreation. Res. Pap. INT-249. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 13 p.

**West, Patrick C.** 1989. Urban region parks and black minorities: subculture, marginality, and interracial relations in park use in the Detroit metropolitan area. Leisure Sciences. 11: 11-28.

**West, Patrick C.** 1993. The tyranny of metaphor: interracial relations, minority recreation, and the wildland-urban interface. In: Ewert, Alan; Chavez, Deborah J.; Magill, Arthur W., eds. Culture, conflict and communication in the wildland-urban interface. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 109-115.

**Williams, Daniel R.; Carr, Deborah S.** 1993. The sociocultural meanings of outdoor recreation places. In: Ewert, Alan; Chavez, Deborah J.; Magill, Arthur W., eds. Culture, conflict and communication in the wildland-urban interface. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 209-219.

**Wilson, William Julius.** 1980. The declining significance of race: blacks and changing American institutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 243 p.

**Wilson, William Julius.** 1987. The truly disadvantaged: the inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 254 p.

**Woodard, Michael D.** 1988. Class, regionality, and leisure among urban black Americans: the post civil rights era. Journal of Leisure Research. 20(2): 87-10.

**Johnson, Cassandra Y., Bowker, J.M., English, D.B.K., and Worthen, Dreamal.** 1997. Theoretical perspectives of ethnicity and outdoor recreation: a review and synthesis of African-American and European-American participation. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-11. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 16 p.

For over three decades, research has shown differences in recreation participation by ethnic group membership, particularly for African Americans and European Americans. This paper is the first of a two-part publication series that examines black/white recreation. In this first part, the literature and empirical findings on black/white leisure participation are reviewed. The implications of generalizing region-specific theories and findings of black/white participation to populations in various parts of the country are also discussed. Finally, implications for forest managers and future research needs are presented.

**Keywords:** Ethnicity, marginality, place meaning, race, recreation, rural residence.

The Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is dedicated to the principle of multiple use management of the Nation's forest resources for sustained yields of wood, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation. Through forestry research, cooperation with the States and private forest owners, and management of the National Forests and National Grasslands, it strives—as directed by Congress—to provide increasingly greater service to a growing Nation.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, and marital or familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs). Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250, or call 1-800-245-6340. USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.