

FINAL REPORT

Ethnic minority visitors and non-visitors:
An examination of constraints regarding
outdoor recreation participation in
Rocky Mountain National Park

Submitted to

National Park Service
Rocky Mountain National Park
Estes Park, Colorado

Submitted by

Donald A. Rodriguez, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
California State University Channel Islands

Alan Bright, Ph.D.
Co-Principal Investigator
Colorado State University

Nina S. Roberts, Ph.D.
Education and Outreach Specialist
National Park Service

December 2004

Copyright by Colorado State University and
The National Park Service 2004 ©

All Rights Reserved

NOTE: If information is referenced from this Final Technical Report, the following citation should be used:

Rodriguez, D.A., Bright, A., & Roberts, N.S. (2004). "Ethnic minority visitors and non-visitors: An examination of constraints regarding outdoor recreation participation at Rocky Mountain National Park." NPS Social Science Program, General Technical Report. Washington, DC: The Department of Interior, National Park Service.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Empirical research directed at outdoor recreation experiences of ethnic minorities and national parks is on the rise yet still remains largely unexplored. Despite an increasing amount of research on constraints, in particular, it is common knowledge that people of diverse cultures still do not fully experience the range of outdoor recreational opportunities that abound in Western public lands. Rocky Mountain National Park (RMNP) receives over three million visitors annually. Although various diversity initiatives have achieved some notable successes, ethnic minorities and individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds continue to be underrepresented in outdoor recreation participation in this park.

Previous studies have addressed activity preferences across different races, examined the relationship between race and recreation setting preferences and behaviors, and explored general constraints to participation. While results have varied considerably, few have collectively examined how ethnicity (i.e., beyond “race”) can shape attitudes, perceptions and experiences with constraints to recreation participation in natural areas, and what is the influence of one’s culture on these perceptions and experiences.

Using a multi-method approach, this present study explored constraints experienced by African American and Latino visitors and non-visitors to RMNP in particular, and to National Parks in general. Total participants consisted of 175 African Americans and Latinos. The issue of perceived discrimination embedded in institutional practices and among park visitors, and opinions of minority resource professionals were also considered integral to this project.

The Delphi technique consisted of a nationwide panel of experts (e.g., “key informants”) representing the target groups. Six focus groups were then conducted at different time frames with individuals from specific racial backgrounds participating together in order to maintain group cohesion. Questions developed for the third and final mail back survey phase were generated from results of the first two phases as well as from previously tested instruments. The survey was then subjected to rigorous peer review, pre-testing, and approval from the National Park Service Social Science program.

Cluster analysis resulted in the classification of three clusters of individuals based on ten constraint dimensions; secondary analyses were also used to test other relationships of interest. Results of the study indicate that while ethnicity and culture influenced visitor attitudes and non-visitor perceptions in how they experienced a variety of constraints, gender and income had a greater impact. That is, while there is a definite connection for many individuals, collectively ethnicity was not a principal determinant of constraints to visitation. Taken together, all three methods resulted in six primary categories of common constraints: Culture of the National Park Service, perceived discrimination, historical context, discomfort/safety, socialization (e.g., at an early age and ‘social permission’ from peers), and lack of knowledge and awareness.

Recommendations for management and implications for future research are discussed. Recognizing the depth of constraints perceived or experienced by ethnic minority communities should assist park managers in understanding what constraints are most salient in shaping various attitudes and perceptions; accordingly, managers can strive to reduce constraints as best as possible through effective communication and outreach.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for this study was provided by a grant from Rocky Mountain National Park. Thanks to Terry Terrell, Research Administrator at Rocky Mountain National Park, and Judy Visty, Natural Resource Management Specialist, for their belief in the value of this project and understanding of the challenges we faced along the way. Mario Alvarez, Carlota Loya, Richard Salas, and Ana Campos de Lopez for assisting with connections in the Latino community and Cheryl Armstrong, Jane Taylor and Winston Walker of the Beckwourth Mountain Club for their assistance with connections in the African American community.

The following professors and scholars served to review drafts of the survey instruments and provided invaluable suggestions throughout this research effort. Drs. Karla Henderson, North Carolina State University; Myron Floyd, University of Florida; Kim Shinew, University of Illinois; Deborah Chavez, U.S. Forest Service; Sunita Hilton, Colorado State University; Edwin Gomez , Old Dominion University; and Brian Forist, Research Associate, NPS Social Science Program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Figures.....	8
List of Tables.....	9
Overview.....	10
Problem Statement/Need for the Study.....	11
Definitions of Terms.....	16
Review of Literature.....	20
Hypothetical Model and Research Questions.....	27
Methodology.....	29
Delimitations of the Study.....	41
Results.....	42
Limitations of the Study.....	76
Discussion.....	77
Conclusions.....	83
Management Implications.....	89
Recommendations.....	93
Future Research Needs.....	99
Literature Cited.....	108
Appendix A: Projected Colorado Populations (Race/Hispanic Origin).....	116
Appendix B: Colorado County Map (and list of counties in the study).....	117
Appendix C: Delphi Method – Invitation.....	118
Appendix D: Delphi Method – Top 10 categories.....	120
Appendix E: Focus Group Consent Form.....	121
Appendix F: Focus Group Questions.....	125

Appendix G: Focus Group Results from Coding Process.....	126
Appendix H: Focus Group Sample Quotations.....	130
Appendix I: NPS/OMB Expedited Approval Form (Survey).....	138
Appendix J: Cover Letter – Mail Back Survey.....	143
Appendix K: Mail Back Survey.....	144
Appendix L: Demographic Summary of Survey Respondents.....	152
Appendix M: Tables A-D / Results of Confirmatory Factor Analyses.....	153
Appendix N: Cluster Groups with Constraint Dimension Means.....	157

LIST of FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Hypothetical model of relationship between demographics, cultural attachment, constraints and participation at RMNP.....	28
2.	Overall measure of perceived discrimination.....	46
3.	Delphi Method: Three clusters based on salience of constraints.....	50
4.	The company of constraints among all three methods.....	80

LIST of TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Counties and Households Surveyed: Latinos.....	42
2.	Delphi Method: Round 1 - Categories Developed and Total Rank Per Category.....	49
3.	Focus Groups: Constraint Themes Commonly Held between African Americans and Latinos in this Study.....	52
4.	Comparison of Selected Racial Group Characteristics.....	57
5.	Confirmatory Tests of the Four Constraints Models.....	59
6.	Importance Ratings for Constraint Dimensions for the Three Cluster Groups.....	62
7.	Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Three Cluster Groups.....	63
8.	Activity Interest in the Next 5-Years.....	68
9.	Types of Park Services/Opportunities that would Increase Desire to Visit.....	73

OVERVIEW

Increased participation in outdoor recreation and national park visitation by members of ethnic minority groups is imperative to achieving and shaping current and future outdoor recreation research. Attracting ethnic minorities and understanding their recreation needs and interests demands a multi-faceted approach and sustained commitment not only by the park but by other resource management agencies as well. The purpose of this study was to obtain information about recreation participation and non-participation at Rocky Mountain National Park from minority residents of Colorado through an examination of constraints. This study involved a multi-phase, multi-method approach.

In 1916, Congress established the National Park Service to conserve the parks “unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” Today, we must envision and ensure a system of parks and programs that benefits a new generation of citizens in a changing world. An accurate understanding of the relationship between people and parks is critical to both protecting resources unimpaired and providing for public enjoyment. One of the problems encountered is a misunderstanding between people of different cultures and the assumption that in some way world-views about the natural environment are basically the same. In particular, the national parks in America are a realized dream that have helped give this country greatness (Wernert, 1989). Not only do different groups have different world-views, they dream differently and hold different images of how things “ought to be” regarding the meaning and value of our natural resources and opportunities for outdoor recreation in these spectacular lands of wonder and beauty.

As noted in the plan for furthering social science and the national parks (Machlis, 1996), there is a growing demand for social science information by NPS managers and partners to assist with moving beyond understanding to action and change. While more and more research on the human dimension aspect of park use and visitation has occurred over the years, research on the attitudes, perceptions, and experiences of ethnic minorities remains largely unexplored. That is, despite research since the 1960s (e.g., primarily black-white differences), there is a deficiency of social science research on ethnic minority use of national parks (Floyd, 1999; Rodriguez & Roberts, 2002a).

In particular, Rocky Mountain National Park (RMNP) lacks objective information regarding perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of ethnically diverse groups. Hence, the overall purpose of this study is to cultivate a better understanding of constraints to participation by members of the African American and Latino communities within the service territory of RMNP (e.g., within 60-75 miles along the Front Range).

Problem Statement–Need for the Study

The world has changed profoundly since the first national parks were created more than a century ago; and, the national park idea continues to provide benefits of fundamental importance to this country. Our national parks are becoming increasingly more important to society as places that inspire us and uplift our spirits. Yet there are unmet recreational needs and opportunities unfulfilled. As the complexion of the nation changes, our experiences as a people are becoming more diverse. The future of the National Park Service (NPS) may well be tied to the changing demographics of the country in general and the American West in particular.

According to Machlis and Field (2000), “while the ‘average visitor’ has never existed, the diversity of visitors is likely to increase further in the next decade” (p. 7). This will serve to widen the gap among the visiting public regarding interpretation, communication, and management direction. The authors recognize that the ethnic diversity of visitors is likely to increase, bringing new recreation styles, uses, and needs to national parks and their bordering gateway communities. Furthermore, investigating the attitudes, perceptions and outdoor recreation experiences of ethnic minorities and national parks remains largely unexplored from a culturally empirical standpoint (e.g., Floyd, 1999; Hutchison, 2000; Sasidharan, 2002).

The need for this study is two-fold: 1) To obtain more information about ethnic minorities and national parks, and 2) Explore application of various methods conducive to studying minority populations. Regarding the first need, as the composition of the United States changes, the National Park Service and Rocky Mountain National Park (RMNP) must know how that change will affect them. This park has begun to observe an increase in English-speaking and non-English speaking Latino visitors to both the park and to Estes Park (the gateway community). In part, this study attempts to determine what patterns exist, and what patterns are likely to exist in the future, so the park can plan accordingly. Further, a primary focus of this study is to determine whether there are institutional, physical, or other constraints that create barriers to the diversification of park visitors.

The following was indicated in the Rocky Mountain National Park research needs statement:

“Rocky Mountain National Park receives over 3.4 million visitors annually. Although various diversity initiatives have achieved some notable successes,

people of color and individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds continue to be underrepresented in outdoor recreation participation in Rocky Mountain National Park. If these marginalized groups continue to be underrepresented in the ranks of visitors, they will often be underrepresented in the ranks of those contributing to policies developed and decisions made on natural and cultural resources management issues crucial to all Americans. Outreach programs may be tailored so they have a greater impact for a broader target group of visitors, and may include alternatives for how to cultivate certain ethnic groups depending on changing demographics of the Southern Rocky Mountain Region.”

RMNP is considered one of the “crown jewels” of the park system and is in a unique position being only an hour and a half from Denver, a major urban center and capitol of Colorado. If ethnic minorities are not represented among the visitors, the belief is that future policy decisions may serve to further exclude their involvement.

New technologies continue to emerge and change the way the U.S. Census Bureau collects and processes data. More importantly, changing lifestyles and emerging sensitivities among the people of the United States require modifications to the questions that are asked. One of the most important changes for Census 2000 was the revision of the questions on race and Hispanic origin to better reflect this country’s growing diversity (U.S. Census, 2000b).

In 2000, the Census reported over 281 million people in the United States of which approximately four million reside in the state of Colorado. Across the state, white persons not of Hispanic or Latino origin are reported at 74.5%, Black or African American at 3.8% and persons of Hispanic or Latino origin are reported at 17.1% (of this, 10.5% identified as *Mexican American*). Important to note is that the biracial and multiracial population is growing, and as part of the “Colorado Quick Facts” nearly 3% reported two or more races. Overall, projected growth of the Colorado population is expected to exceed five million people by the year 2025 (U.S. Census, 2000c).

According to a joint report from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration and the Census Bureau “the Hispanic population is projected to add more people to the United States every year than would all other race/ethnic groups combined” (U.S. Dept of Commerce, p. 1, 1996).

Regarding the second need for the study, not only does this current research benefit RMNP, new methods are also needed for the majority of NPS natural resource sites to reach audiences from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Throughout the national park system, people of all ages, races and backgrounds can engage in a broad range of pursuits that enable them to enjoy outdoor recreation opportunities and find self-renewal. This fact notwithstanding, it is common knowledge that people of diverse cultures still do not fully experience the recreational or educational opportunities that exist, or share the depth of their understanding of nature and spirit of national parks as potentially special places.

As specified in the National Park System Advisory Board Report, *Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century*, “as the demographics of America have changed, so too must the Park Service’s educational efforts. Programs, exhibits, and audiovisual presentations must be developed for different ages and in multiple languages. New methods are needed to reach audiences from disparate cultures and new technologies, such as the Internet, are creating different and exciting ways of teaching and learning in and about parks” (NPS Advisory Board, p. 3, 2001).

Natural resources are managed for a variety of uses with an increasing emphasis on recreation. Numerous studies have found significant differences in visitation to parks and natural areas and participation in outdoor recreation activities among segments of the

American public yet several important questions still persist. For example, why are National Parks of interest to some members of under-represented groups and not to others? Are the constraints experienced by non-park visitors the same for cohort minority members that visit National Parks? Why is the appeal of some park programs more pervasive among certain people within the minority community and not others? And, finally what perceptions of discrimination exist?

If the National Park Service is to create a system that is relevant, accessible, and open to “all Americans,” the answers to these questions must be provided. Furthermore, there is a growing abundance of research that has examined African Americans and Latinos and their associated “similarities and differences.” This study attempts to move beyond verifying differences, because they do exist, to explaining the depth of the ‘differences’ and complexities of outdoor recreation as a context for the need for community outreach and enhanced communication with various culturally diverse citizens.

The following four primary research questions guided this study:

1. What do ethnic minority resource professionals believe are the most salient issues relating to national park visitation of under-represented groups?
2. What types of experiences and activities are desired from travel to RMNP by African Americans and Latinos, residing along the Colorado Front Range?
3. How do ethnic minority visitors and non-visitors compare regarding reported constraints to park visitation?
4. What influence do ethnicity, culture, gender, and class have on constraints to participation?

Definitions of Terms

Given the inconsistency of these terms as used in the parks and recreation literature, combined with the intricacy of comprehending the meaning, the following definitions are provided as I have learned and adopted them. Each of these is integral to the content of this dissertation.

Race: Two disparate meanings exist. First, race commonly refers to genetically or biologically based similarities among people, which are distinguishable and unique, and function to mark or separate groups of people from one another. Race typically relates to characteristics based on phenotype (which is often based on stereotype). Second, “Race is less a biological term than a political or social one” (e.g., race is based on socially constructed definitions of physical appearance). The concept of race assumes that human groups can be divided on the basis of their biological and physical characteristics, a highly contested claim (Banks, 2001; Hutchison, 1988; Lustig & Koester, 1999).

Ethnicity: Membership in a sub-cultural group on the basis of shared country of origin, language, religion, identification with a common cultural system, or cultural traditions substantially different from other ethnic groups within society. Individuals usually gain membership in such a group not by choice but through birth and early socialization. Members of various ethnic groups also pass on the symbols, language, and other components of the cultural heritage to the next generation (Banks, 2001; Barth, 1969; Hutchison, 1988; Lustig & Koester, 1999).

Culture: Definitions of culture are numerous and there is no single definition that all social scientists would heartily accept. And, there are several approaches that are relevant to understanding culture (e.g., communication interactions/patterns, problem

solving). I have adopted the following definition for its ease of comprehension and utility: “A learned set of shared interpretations about beliefs, values, and norms which affect the behaviors of a relatively large group of people.” (Lustig & Koester, 1999). One that is more lengthy, yet captures the essence of meaning is as follows: “Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas especially attached values” (Banks, 2001).

Sub-culture: A term sometimes used to refer to racial and ethnic minority groups that share both a common nation-state with other cultures and some aspect of the larger culture (Lustig & Koester, 1999; Martin & Nakayama, 2000).

Discrimination: “Actions or practices carried out by members of dominant racial or ethnic groups that have differential and negative impact on members of subordinate racial and ethnic groups” (Feagin, 1991). In the parks and recreation literature, the concept of *perceived discrimination* is defined as that which exerts a negative affect on visitation among racial and ethnic minorities whether real or alleged (Floyd, 1999).

Assimilation: When individuals deny their ethnic identity, ethnic heritage, and family in order to *assimilate* (e.g., participate more fully) in the social, economic, and political institutions of their current society (Banks, 2001). Assimilation can be further described into two distinct concepts: Structural and Cultural Assimilation.

- *Structural Assimilation:* The social, economic and political integration of an ethnic minority group into mainstream society (Keefe & Padilla 1987, in

Gramann, 1996). Development of relationships outside the family setting and with friendships beyond ones own ethnic group (Floyd & Gramann, 1993).

- *Cultural Assimilation*: Ethnic minorities' acceptance of the dominant cultural pattern of the *host* (mainstream) society (e.g., language, religion, diet, dress, child-rearing practices) in order to “survive” (Gramann, 1996).

Constraints: Historically defined as “those factors that intervene between leisure preferences and leisure participation” (Crawford & Godbey, 1987). The term constraint is more “inclusive” than barrier as the term barrier fails to capture the entire range of explanations of “constrained leisure behavior.” A barrier tends to be one type of constraint as something that *intervenes* between preference and participation.

Contemporary definitions explain constraints as those factors influencing much more than the choice / decision to participate in an activity and includes other aspects of leisure such as forming preferences, receiving enjoyment, specialization, choice of facility, and so on (Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991). Several types of constraints have been identified:

- *Interpersonal* constraints are those factors that arise out of social interaction with friends, family, and others (beyond the self).
- *Intra-personal* constraints are considered psychological states and attributes that interact with leisure preferences rather than intervening between preferences and participation. Apparently, this category of constraints predisposes people to define recreation activities, locations, facilities/services, etc. as appropriate or inappropriate for them, interesting or uninteresting, available or unavailable, to name a few.

- *Structural* constraints are commonly conceptualized as intervening factors between leisure preference and participation. They are assumed to inhibit participation or some other aspect of leisure engagement once a preference or desire for an activity has been formed (e.g., family obligations take priority; lack of time; financial resources are scarce; lack of people [partner] to go/participate with; and knowledge and awareness of natural areas and availability of opportunity).

Barriers: (From the 1950s) – “Internal (intrapersonal) psychological states, attributes, and characteristics, and external (interpersonal and situational) circumstances which are experienced as individual behavioral ‘restraining forces’” (Lewin, cited in Crawford & Godbey, 1987). A more straightforward definition provided by Crawford & Godbey (1987), is “any factor which intervenes between the preference for an activity and participation in it.” Note: *Constraints* is the term now preferred to barriers because the latter term fails to capture the entire range of explanations of constrained leisure behavior (Jackson & Scott, 1999).

Perception: A process by which sensory impulses or sensory information are organized and interpreted; perception assembles the building blocks of sensory experience into meaningful patterns (Wade & Tavis, 1987). Based on the National Park Service Social Science program and approval process for conducting surveys, individual *perceptions data* include the public’s awareness and observations of the natural and social environments in the parks and nearby areas they visit. Also included in this topic area are perceptions of the values and benefits of parks, how these individual observations

influence overall experiences, and experiences regarding infrastructure and services in the parks (NPS Social Science Program, 2001).

Review of Literature

Although research on outdoor recreation has occurred in some capacity for over forty years, little to no attention was paid early on to under-represented minority audiences in outdoor settings (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2002b). Minority recreation patterns, preferences, attitudes, and behavior only came to the attention of social scientists and natural resource professionals with the onset of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report of 1962 (Hartmann & Overdeest, 1989; Johnson, Bowker, English & Worthen, 1997; Manning, 1999). Recognizing the needs and demands of ethnic minorities, recreation researchers did not really begin giving much serious attention to different racial and ethnic groups until the late 1970s and more so during the early '80s. Nonetheless, since this time, there is by no means a proliferation of research on race, ethnicity, and culture in this field.

Accordingly, numerous theoretical propositions have been explored such as marginality and ethnicity (i.e., subcultural) hypotheses, assimilation theory, multiple hierarchy stratification, discrimination theory (still a "hypothesis" in the field of parks and recreation), socio-cultural meaning, personal community hypothesis, and ethnic boundary perspective, to name a few. There has been a wealth of scholarship debating the pros and cons of these positions. More specifically, debates about the role of ethnicity and culture have sparked a movement towards research that is directly applicable to social issues and recreation resource management. This study focuses only

on *constraints theory* (explored diminutively among ethnic minority groups) and the *discrimination hypothesis* (as a construct requiring much more work in this field).

As noted in his Social Science Research Review, Floyd (1999) affirms that for the NPS to serve an increasingly diverse public and to prepare for a more ethnically pluralistic society, a more thorough, science-based understanding of factors affecting minority use of the national parks is critical. Following a structured and far-reaching review of literature related to racial and ethnic minority use of national parks, an emphasis for future research needs suggested “the role of discrimination in minority decisions regarding park use has not received adequate research attention” (Floyd, 1999, p. 18).

In preparing a questionnaire on this topic, for instance, Gomez (2002) asserts “Perceived discrimination scales should include items regarding avoidance actions, rejection actions, verbal or physical attacks by an institution or person in the dominant society” (p. 136). In the present study, the design is similar to this recommendation but also employs greater variety and more specificity than Chavez (1991), Floyd & Gramann (1995), Gomez (1999), and Hilton (2002) and while this concept is measured similarly to what Gomez contends it offers a new approach based on the literature to date and testing specific theory relating to not only discrimination but constraints as well.

Also needed is research providing baseline information on perceptions that minority groups hold towards national parks. Floyd notes that by focusing on general issues such as attitudes towards natural resources and behavior of ethnic minorities regarding outdoor recreation or on specific issues such as attitudes and behavior toward

specific parks, resources, facilities or programs, results would be extremely beneficial for a variety of purposes (e.g., research, management implications).

Regarding constraints to participation, a great deal of leisure research has been based on a model representing a hierarchical series of interpersonal, intrapersonal, and structural constraints that affect leisure choices (Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991). This suggests that individuals move from proximal constraints, which affect preferences, to distal constraints, which affect participation. Unfortunately, this evolving generalized model of leisure constraints has not directly addressed race/ethnicity as an important factor affecting recreation preferences and participation (e.g., Parry, Shinew & Arnold, 2001; Philipp, 1995). Likewise, Jackson (2000) asserts that despite the accomplishments of constraints research over the years, there are several divergent yet interconnected criticisms regarding research on leisure constraints. For instance, relating to the worth of this current study, Jackson notes there has been an over-reliance on quantitative methods of data collection with indication that qualitative methods need to be incorporated into research and second, it is important to recognize broader contextual issues for recreation and leisure such as value systems and how best to turn constraints into opportunities to develop new interests and pursuits.

Drawing on Rational Choice Theory, deVries and deBruin (1996) studied perceived constraints using cluster analysis to classify respondents based on the similarity of the perceived applicability of a range of constraints to participation in selected recreational activities. Differences in behavior between the resulting clusters and the way the clusters differ in terms of several “social-structural characteristics” (i.e., demographic variables) were analyzed. An important conclusion is that “studying patterns of

perceived constraints is a more viable approach than studying the effect of each perceived constraint separately” (p. 143). Second, findings show perceived constraints are related to demographic characteristics and, third, results support the Rational Choice Theory in which “real” (versus perceived) constraints are considered an important source of variation in interpersonal behavior.

Integrating characteristics from a variety of theoretical models pertaining to race/ethnicity, culture, and constraints to help shape research questions, Roberts (2000) conducted an exploratory study for RMNP evaluating data from focus group interviews across different cultural groups residing along the Front Range of Colorado (i.e., Hispanics or Latinos, Native Americans/Indians, Asians/Asian Americans, African Americans/Blacks). Findings show each group values the outdoors/natural environment in very positive yet differing ways (e.g., in religious or spiritual ways). While results were analyzed both within groups and between, in general, sample reported constraints include: Distance (“too far to travel to RMNP”), food caters to “white tastes and preferences,” language barriers, costs, perceptions of RMNP, and varying degrees of comfort relating to the dominant visitor being from a white/European background. Recommendations for outreach and communication with ethnic minorities revolved around marketing issues, lack of people of color in photographs/media, enhanced representation of minority staff, sponsor special events and park celebrations appealing to minority cultures (e.g., “PowWow”, “jazz in the park”).

Only one other project at RMNP has occurred on a topic similar to this current study. Erickson (2001) examined park meanings and history as constraints to visitation by members of the African American community. She conducted 47 interviews in both

Denver and at the park with visitors. Her content analysis consisted of partitioning the interviewees into six groups based on their leisure constraints to park visitation, the meanings they ascribe to the park, and previous experiences they had in natural areas. The results of this study demonstrated that both historical and cultural constraints, as well as park meanings, served as “major constraints” to park visitation by African Americans (Erickson, 2001). This work also supports the need for exploring this topic with other ethnic groups, for employing additional research methods, and determining effective strategies for outreach to African Americans and other potential visitors (e.g., communication/messaging techniques).

As clearly stated ten years ago by Berry and Gordon (1993), natural resources professions are changing; their constituents and the values they represent are different than they once were in the past, and indisputably show signs of continued rapid change. As these scholars indicate, special-interest groups of resource users still exist yet are no longer the majority as a greater proportion of the general public has increased use and interest in park and natural area management. This includes the fact that both the people residing in urban areas and urban issues themselves continue to rise in importance for federal agencies managing public lands.

Additionally, more women and people of color are increasingly represented among the ranks of resource management professionals than ever before (Berry & Gordon, 1993). Consequently, as old values and practices conflict with new ones, “painful change is obviously under way” (p. 5).

A key ingredient of these two aforementioned concepts (i.e., communication as a powerful tool and role of resource managers as leaders) is determining the best approach

for marketing to diverse audiences. As indicated by Bright (2000), “the job of recreation professionals is not only to provide opportunities for achieving benefits, but to get the word out” (p. 12). Including outdoor recreation in national parks, benefits such as peak experiences, family solidarity, cultural values, preservation, and conservation, are often most understood by a select few. As aptly noted in his work on social marketing, Bright (2000) affirms these benefits, and others, are understood by recreation professionals, academics, and students yet a large proportion of the general public may not experience these benefits to their full potential without techniques designed to educate and influence them regarding opportunities available.

Furthermore, studies utilizing mixed methodologies have great potential for examining use and/or non-use of national parks by people from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds (e.g., Floyd, 1999; Machlis, 1996; Rodriguez & Roberts, 2002a; Wicks & Norman, 1996)). For example, as noted by Floyd (1999), researchers recognize the limitations of standard social survey methods and have begun to employ focus groups and in-depth interviewing as alternative methods. These methods have their limitations as well. Hence a pragmatic and superior strategy would be to combine multiple methods of research drawing upon both quantitative and qualitative approaches. This would provide a wide-range of understanding of ethnic minority use of national parks and/or an increase in knowledge of constraints to participation.

Research that draws upon both quantitative and qualitative methods are more likely to provide a greater understanding, present a more complete picture, and contribute to better decision-making processes (e.g., Creswell, 1994). This would ultimately benefit park managers as well as education and interpretation specialists because this makes the

most efficient use of both approaches in understanding the social phenomena under consideration. Inherent in this assumption is that combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study through triangulation (e.g., using multiple methods of data collection and analysis) adds to the scope and depth of possibilities to the study.

Additionally, Census data for the U.S. population, generally, and Colorado specifically, provides an essential tool for maintaining an enlightened view of demographic changes. First, the Federal Government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts as individuals identifying as *Hispanic* may be of any race (U.S. Census, 2000b). According to this document, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) define Hispanic or Latino as “a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race” (p. 2). According to the Census 2000, over 281 million people resided in the United States and nearly 13% were Latino (i.e., 87% “not Hispanic or Latino”). Out of the total population indicating one race, Black/African American consisted of 12.3% of the total population.

Subsequently, Colorado “quick facts” obtained from the U.S. Census data on Internet include the following: More than four million residents with 17% of persons of Hispanic/Latino origin yet less than 4% African Americans (U.S. Census, 2000c). The Black population in this state is projected to increase from 196,000 in 2000 to 265,000 in 2015 and by another 44,000 by the year 2025 (U.S. Census, 2000c). This represents a projected increase of 36% in the Black population in the next 25 years. Regarding Hispanic/Latino growth, the Census projections compute an increase in this population of

44% by the year 2025 (i.e., from 594,000 to over one million Hispanics living in Colorado in the next 25 years).


Last, depending on where someone gets their information or what their experience is, descriptions of “labeling” individuals may become a preference versus a definite. The generic term “Hispanic” was officially created by the U.S. Census Bureau in 1970 to designate people of Spanish origin; this is considered “inaccurate, incorrect, and often offensive” as used for all Spanish-speaking people or Latinos (Comas-Díaz, 2001). Despite OMB’s classification, individuals whose heritage is from Central, South or Latin America, and even Caribbean groups such as Cubans, Dominicans, and Puerto Ricans, have “Latino” as their least common denominator and, according to Comas-Díaz (2001) is the preferred name of these populations. Consequently, Latin American immigrants constitute three-fifths of all Latinos residing in the United States (U.S. Census, 2000b, Kotkin & Tseng, 2003). The term *Hispanos* is another option yet, because they tend to identify with their Spanish heritage as opposed to the Mexican settlers. As a result of the predominant Mexican/Mexican American (e.g., *Chicano*) community in Colorado this paper uses the term “Latino(s)” from this point forward in general content, not including Census Bureau references that still includes use of “Hispanic”.

Hypothetical Model and Research Questions

Gómez (2002) reviewed 10 conceptual models and concluded his paper with the Ethnicity and Public Recreation Participation Model[©] (EPRP Model). Employing a few concepts from these models that relate to the survey phase of the present study, the

relationships of select demographics, cultural identity, constraints dimensions, and perceived discrimination to outdoor recreation in RMNP are explored (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Hypothetical model of relationship between demographics, cultural attachment, constraints, and participation at RMNP



Briefly, this model proposes to identify frequently occurring combinations of constraints, determine the relationship to minority participation at Rocky Mountain National Park and learn how these concepts are interrelated. Constraints dimensions were created to explore relationships among groups of people and culture will be measured with multiple indicators. In order to test the constraint and perceived discrimination theories, four primary research questions guided this study:

1. What do ethnic minority resource professionals believe are the most salient issues relating to national park visitation of under-represented groups?
2. What types of experiences and activities are desired from travel to RMNP by African Americans and Latinos, residing along the Colorado Front Range?
3. How do ethnic minority visitors and non-visitors compare regarding reported constraints to park visitation?
4. What influence do ethnicity, culture, gender, and class have on constraints to participation?

An important supplemental question asked on the survey and pertinent to both research purposes and management implications includes: *What types of park services and opportunities would increase the desire of ethnic minorities to visit Rocky Mountain National Park?*

Methodology

Data for this study was collected in three distinct phases as a means of triangulation. The *triangulation* process, using multiple and different sources, methods and theories (Creswell, 1998; Henderson & Bialeschki, 2002), was drawn upon to provide corroborating evidence from different sources to shed light on a theme (e.g., reasons for lack of participation by minorities) or perspectives of ethnic minorities regarding outdoor recreation in national parks in general, and at RMNP in particular. Following a Delphi study employing a national panel of experts (Phase 1), a second qualitative component consisting of in-depth interviews with African Americans and Hispanics residing along the Front Range in Colorado was completed (Phase 2). The results from these first two phases served as the foundation for the development of a more comprehensive, broader, and larger-scale self-report questionnaire that explored various research elements in greater depth (Phase 3).

Delphi Technique

This technique was first developed in the 1950s, descriptions and sample uses published in the 1960s, and within the last 30 years the Delphi has been one of the better known methods of studying current trends and forecasting the future (Baughman, 1985; Weatherman & Swenson, 1974). In its simplest form, the Delphi technique is “a group of

related procedures for eliciting and refining the opinions of a group of people” (Weatherman & Swenson, 1974, p. 97). More specifically, the Delphi involves inviting a panel of experts in a particular field to respond to a questionnaire and make independent, knowledgeable judgments about the assigned topic or issue under scrutiny. For a clear-cut explanation, Anderson and Schneider (1993) describe the general process in four main parts: 1) The research team develops a questionnaire focused on a selected issue and central question; 2) the panelists, remaining anonymous, respond; 3) the research team interprets and summarizes the responses and designs subsequent questionnaires; and 4) the panelists receive subsequent questionnaires allowing them to agree with other participants or modify their responses. In each subsequent round, responses are summarized in statistical terms or a ranking procedure. There is evidence to support the reliability of Delphi; this depends more on the questionnaire designs and wording in addition to a series of questionnaire rounds sent out to a group of participants at selected time intervals (Richey, et. al., 1985; Baughman, 1985). Similarly, as explained by Baughman (1985) the validity of Delphi has its greatest strength in the accuracy of its predictions.

The few scholars that have used this technique in forestry planning, forest service recreation resource management and environmental assessment, for instance, have substantiated the Delphi process as less expensive, more reliable, more versatile compared to other methods of soliciting group consensus, and a highly effective means of augmenting decision-making with useful information (e.g., Anderson & Schneider, 1993; Baughman, 1985; Clark & Stankey, 1991; Richey, et al., 1985). Consensus is defined in this technique as occurring when “the median of the responses to the final round

develops” and can be reached without asking the group to arrive at a common opinion (Weatherman & Swenson, 1974). While reaching consensus is a keystone of this method, subsequent studies using this procedure support the model whereby for iterations to continue as long as the research team deems necessary, is acceptable practice (Anderson & Schneider, 1993; Baughman, 1985). In other words, a Delphi process could consist of two or three rounds without any real loss of information and the overall investigation could involve relatively minimal time for both the expert panel and research team members.

The Expert Panel: This phase of the larger study involved professionals in the field of parks and recreation who attended a forum called “Black, Brown, and Green-- Seeking Common Ground: A Dialogue by Latino and African American Leaders on Natural Resource Issues.” This event was sponsored by the National Hispanic Environmental Council and the Round Table Associates in October 1999. All 40 attendees at this meeting were formally invited to participate. The nature of this conference included a uniform mix of participants related to age, years in the field, and management and leadership experience. Furthermore, participants (also known as “key informants”) worked in six different settings adding to the strength of knowledge and traditions of this group. That is, federal, state, municipal/city agency, nonprofit, private/for profit, and education institutions were represented. As for the number of participants, while none of the literature reviewed to date lent strong support to a particular panel size, according to Weatherman and Swenson (1974), the Delphi technique is typically used with groups of fifty or fewer participants. A “large scale

Delphi” (IsD) consists of 100 or more. Central to the process is that invited candidates meet established criteria and those who agreed to participate were accepted.

Position levels ranged from field staff to upper management or executive level and the breakdown of attendees by gender was 12 females and 28 males. Based on the composition of this group and familiarity with Rocky Mountain National Park, it was agreed that this collection of experts would benefit the project as a whole by seeking their knowledge, perceptions, and experiences of ethnic minority recreation in natural and wildland areas from a broad perspective.

Study Procedures: The Delphi process consisted of a series of questionnaires distributed by electronic mail as preferred by the participants. This increased the momentum of transmitting information as well as efficiency of summarizing responses for each subsequent round. In the first round questionnaire, a simple open-ended question was used to elicit a list of outdoor recreation constraints as perceived by these ethnic minority leaders working in the field:

“From your point of view, what are the barriers and constraints experienced by ethnic minorities that limit their visitation to national parks?”

The responses were organized and compiled based on keyword associations and patterns that emerged from the aggregated data then ultimately grouped into ten innovative categories. Based on the frequency of responses, these categories were considered the most prevalent ones for further analysis. Validity was achieved as each member of the research team completed this task on separate occasions, compared outcomes, and generally agreed on the meaning of the responses to formulate logical items used for the final list.

In the second questionnaire, salience was an essential aspect to obtain for the analysis. Participants were asked to rank these ten categories according to what they believed were the most notable barriers/constraints to minority use and participation of national parks. The items were ranked from 1 to 10, with “1” being the most important reason related to the greatest depth of meaning or leading deterrent to participation and “10” being the lowest in not as strong a reason in this list of constraints. Additionally, we encouraged participants to provide feedback regarding whether they agreed or disagreed with the items as stated. For instance, of interest was whether these experts believed the items reflected their perceptions of what the constraints were. Responses were then computed on the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS ver. 10) by obtaining a mean rank for each category positioned by each person. The research team then developed three classifications based on the rank order of panelist responses from round two. Because of the wide variety of opinions, experiences, and knowledge, the research team did not provide panelists with further rankings for the third round rather included these groups as “clusters” that resulted from calculating their ranks of each of the ten items.

Focus Groups

When researching individuals or groups of Latino and African American origin, use of qualitative methods can best provide an in-depth understanding of the phenomena in question such as through use of personal interviews, participant observation, symbolic interactionism, focus groups, and historical reviews (McAvoy, Winter, Wilson-Outley, McDonald, & Chavez, 2000; Stanfield & Dennis, 1993). The focus group technique has

received widespread use on these target groups in the field of recreation and leisure studies.

Methodology and Study Procedures: Six focus groups were assembled for this study ranging in size from 4 to 13 individuals with an average of 8 per group. Self-ascribed identities of participants include: 24 African American/Black, 24 Hispanic/Hispano(a)/Latino(a), and 5 bi-racial or multiracial people (i.e., Black/Cherokee, African American/Indian/Anglo, and African American or Black/Latino, $n=3$) for a total of 53 individuals. There were 34 females and 19 males ranging in age from 18 to 63. Applying a snowball technique, previously existing organizations and community groups were recommended by recognized leaders in the specific ethnic minority communities of interest. Collectively, participants represented either a contingency that has never been to RMNP or a broad range of types and experiences with the park (i.e., 26 people have visited the park). The six groups convened at six different times to maintain group cohesion within a specific racial group. A participant consent form was provided (see Appendix E), permission was granted to tape the interview process, confidentiality was assured, and each participant was given \$20.00 as incentive for their involvement.

A series of fifteen semi-structured questions set the foundation for the process (see Appendix F for the full list of questions). The interviews were taped, transcribed, and coded for content in eight major topics:

- ✓ Value of nature/natural environment
- ✓ Familiarity with NPS and specific travel/visits to RMNP
- ✓ Activity interests (e.g., included probes about ranger-led programs and/or visitor centers)
- ✓ Barriers/constraints to visiting RMNP

- ✓ Experiences of “fear” or concerns either while at the park or as possible constraints to visiting (includes discrimination as an inquiring factor)
- ✓ Comfort level (e.g., nature in general or RMNP in particular)
- ✓ Marketing issues
- ✓ Workforce diversity from a very broad stance (e.g., “does it matter to you?”)

Data Analysis: Data analysis was accomplished using a constant comparative technique (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and analytic induction as tools for analysis. First, after the data were organized, similarities between groups were established (e.g., exploration of common themes) and, second, each racial group was subdivided into similarities and differences to obtain within-group commonalities and variations. The data were analyzed in two primary ways: Interviews were first coded using descriptive codes derived from the interview questions. Second, interviews were then coded by emerging patterns, themes and categories as part of the movement from data description to conceptual clarification. This involved reading and re-reading transcripts numerous times to ensure familiarity with the data. Based on the focus group structure for this study, no effort was made to tease out the relative effects of gender, income, or marital status in the participants at this time.

Mail Back Survey

In general, the purpose of survey research in recreation is to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made, for example, about some leisure characteristic, attitude towards an activity or facility, or outdoor experience of this population. The third phase of this study was the administration of a mail-back questionnaire to residents of each target minority group (i.e., along the Front Range). The target response goal was 400 usable surveys for each group. This would allow for a generalization to the larger population of each minority group with a confidence interval

of 95% and a sampling error of +/- 5%. Less than 100 surveys were received from both groups thereby excluding the option of generalizing these results to the level desired.

Administration of the mail-back questionnaire followed a modified Dillman procedure including the initial questionnaire mailing, a reminder postcard, and a second questionnaire mailed to those not responding to the first two mailings. The second mailing included both an English and Spanish language version to households in the Latino community. The purpose of the mail-back questionnaire was to obtain the following information:

1. General measures of past participation in recreation at RMNP and future activity interests (i.e., “in the next 5 years”)
2. Constraints to participation in recreation in RMNP
3. Specific types of experiences and activities desired from a trip to RMNP, (if any)
4. Adequacy of facilities
5. The types and sources of information desired regarding opportunities in RMNP
6. Interest in future participation in recreation at RMNP
7. Respondent perceptions of RMNP and the National Park Service
8. Socio-demographic variables including age, sex, ethnicity, household income, educational attainment, residence, and occupation.

A pre-test of the survey was conducted with a small sample of Latino and African American students at Colorado State University to clarify instructions and wording on survey items. The survey then went through a revision process with key staff from the NPS Social Science program before final approval from the OMB. Back-translation, a process involving one bilingual individual translating the document into Spanish and a second bilingual individual translating the document back to the original English language, occurred to determine the accuracy of the translated material. This helps ensure that conceptual constructs serve the same purpose in different cultures.

Culture is a complex phenomenon and there are many ways to measure “culture.” In this study culture was measured by: 1) Determining if a participant was U.S. or Foreign born and whether parents and grandparents are U.S. or Foreign born; 2) Self-ascribed ethnic identity; 3) First language; 4) Language spoken at home (most of the time); 5) Value/meaning of nature and/or the outdoors; and 6) Questions relating to how the participant feels regarding elements of culture such as level of sense of attachment to their cultural group, pride in cultural heritage, self-ascribed religious/spiritual identity, and level of attachment/pride to it. A key to this study is how does one’s ethnicity or culture influence their recreation behavior?

Looking at constraints as a broad theoretical framework with minority populations must include elements of perceived discrimination. While *discrimination* could be considered as a variable for independent investigation, this study focuses on constraints with a particular emphasis on the role of discrimination as a factor hindering participation in outdoor recreation at Rocky Mountain National Park, and the relationship of racial barriers to visitation or non-visitation. In addition an overall measure of perceived discrimination developed from seven items on the questionnaire (see Appendix M, Table D), constraints are measured by items relating to: early socialization factors, fear of the “unknown,” aversion to bugs/wildlife, lack of money and/or transportation, lack of park opportunities of interest, inadequate facilities, and concern about safety issues. Individuals are asked to respond to two primary statements: *To what extent does each item describe you?* (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) and, *To what extent does each item prevent you from visiting Rocky Mountain National Park?* (1=not at all to 5=very much).

Sampling Procedure: The target population was African Americans or Blacks and Latinos residing along the Front Range in Colorado. The government Census Bureau (U.S. Census, 2000a) statistics for the State of Colorado indicate the following population percentages (18 years and older): White persons (not of Hispanic or Latino origin) = 77.3%; Black or African American persons = 3.5%; other races = 4.3%. Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin are reported at 14.9% for this category (i.e., 17.1% indicated for all ages). Based on the scarce population of these ethnic minority groups, eleven counties with the highest population and within 60-75 miles of RMNP (along the Front Range) were selected for the sample.

A mailing list of target households was purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. (SSI). To obtain the greatest balance and efficiency, the sample selection was based on “density tracts” for Black and Latino households. That is, the sample type is the listed households derived from the 2000 Census with a percentage of tracts with the greatest Hispanic population and the greatest Black population in those counties being randomly selected within the desired distance from the RMNP.

Sample Frame and Distribution: The sampling frame is the measure of size used to stratify the sample and was obtained by SSI from the Census database frame for Colorado. All figures received were estimates targeted to January 01, 2001 projected forward from the Census 2000. Although the sample was defined by demographic selections, the sample frame was based on county-level data. The households in the study were then systematically determined by a random sample ultimately procured by a targeted listing based on an analysis of the geography and density of the target population in the requested counties. Data for this study therefore relates to those counties obtained

from the geographical areas with the greatest Black and Latino populations. This process, overall, has the effect of properly allocating this sample across the geography under investigation.

Estimating the number of targeted households in these defined areas was accomplished by first determining the number of Black and Latino households per unit area based on Census data. The sampling frames (i.e., listed households) for this study were based on a 17% density tract for Blacks and 20% density tracts for Latinos. These density tracts were selected to obtain at least a 50% efficiency measure of the coverage in each respective population thereby increasing the hit rate per tract. For instance, although the effect is that some non-minorities may receive this survey, this density level was necessary to represent the population under study. A random sample was then selected from these strata and labels for these respective households were provided by SSI.

Data Collection: The survey instrument was administered as a household mail survey. A modified tailored design method (Dillman, 2000) was used to survey 3,000 households (1,500 per target group). The first and initial mailing included a cover letter with the survey and business reply return envelope. Ten days later a follow-up postcard was sent to all members of the sample thanking those that had already responded and reminding those who had not yet responded to complete the survey in approximately a week. Three weeks later, a follow-up mailing including another copy of the survey and return envelope was sent. In this mailing to Latino individuals within these strata, who still had not returned the first survey, two versions were mailed: one in the English language and one in Spanish. The following statement was indicated on the cover letter

of each version: “*If you receive two copies of this survey, please fill only one out and return it in the envelope provided.*” In cover letters to the survey mailings and postcard reminders, respondents were assured that completion of the survey was voluntary and their participation was strictly confidential.

Following this Dillman method, the postcard reminder and replacement survey were sent to help increase response rate and reduce non-response bias. To ensure ease of survey completion and establish another attempt to maximize return rate, the survey was developed to be culturally sensitive and included primarily Likert-type scale responses with only a few open-ended items used for seeking elaboration. Additionally, an attractive cover page was designed by a professional graphic artist and included photographs of visible minority people as a technique possibly increasing the response rate as well. Permission for use was granted by the source of the pictures.

To address the question of possible non-response bias, a systematic random sample of non-respondents was selected and interviewed by telephone. An attempt was made to contact twenty-five households by telephone in an effort to obtain some information on this group to measure how far from the respondent group they were. Additionally, an essential component to this phone call was to understand *why* this sample of individuals chose to not complete and return the survey by mail. One hundred and fifty phone calls were made during a four-day period. Logistical difficulties such as resistance from the target audience and individuals exhibiting rude or abrupt behavior and hanging up rendered few complete responses (n=4) and the non-response test was therefore discontinued.

Delimitations

Sample: The sample was delimited to African Americans and Hispanics who participated in the Delphi and who were included in the random sample of residents along the Front Range of Colorado (between Fort Collins and Denver). African Americans constitute 3.5% of the 18 years and older category within the state of Colorado, and Hispanic or Latino residents (any race) make up 14.9% of this adult group (U.S. Census, 2000a). Because these percentages reflect such small numbers to begin with, this created an added challenge in obtaining an adequate sampling frame for the survey procedure.

Geography: Given the extremely low percentage of African Americans and Hispanics on the Western slope of Colorado, it was decided that the focal point of data collection would be residents (from these groups) along the Front Range from Fort Collins to metropolitan Denver. The maximum distance was within 60 to 75 miles from Rocky Mountain National Park as the primary service area of local visitors and potential visitors.

Racial group subsets: The subset of African Americans and Hispanics was not large enough to allow for subgroup breakdowns and statistical controls. While this may be at the heart of modern data analysis, results of this study do not assume a false homogeneity (e.g., all Blacks do not think alike or have the same experience nor do people categorized as “Hispanic”). Not all Blacks or Hispanics are part of the same culture or nation. Each of these labels obscures the rich variety of cultures that a single term represents. Use of these overly broad terms in this study is not meant to deny the importance of ethnic or cultural distinctions but to allow for an economy of terms based on the sample.

RESULTS

Counties and households surveyed

African Americans are unevenly distributed across the Front Range and are typically difficult to locate. Therefore, because in the State of Colorado, Blacks are more concentrated in the Denver area, three counties were selected as having the greatest probable hit rate. That is, within the 17-100% density tracts for African Americans, the following counties and percentage households were sampled: Adams (10.5%), Arapahoe (41.3%), and Denver (48.1%). For the Latino households at 20-100% density tract included seven counties and percent distribution within this frame as noted in Table 1.

Table 1. Counties and Households Surveyed: Latinos

County	Latino Households	Percent
ADAMS	433	28.9%
ARAPAHOE	74	4.9%
BOULDER	51	3.4%
DENVER	633	42.2%
JEFFERSON	77	5.1%
LARIMER	16	1.1%
WELD	216	14.4%
Total:	1500	100%

The survey was administered as a household, mail survey of 3,000 households (1,500 per target group). For all households in the sample, undeliverable addresses and surveys that came back marked “return to sender” (e.g., moved/no forwarding address or insufficient for delivery) reduced the original sample of 3,000 to 2448. The nature of the sampling design, and low proportion of Blacks and Latinos in proportion to White

persons in the state, resulted in a sampling frame that did not match up perfectly with the target populations leading to errors of coverage. Furthermore, because a random sample was obtained from each of the density tracts selected (i.e., strata), a certain percentage of white households in those geographic areas received the survey; any of these individuals who filled out and returned the survey were omitted from the analysis. For example, any density tract that is 17% or more Black is qualified to draw from as part of the households in that tract; non-African Americans living in those areas may also receive the survey. This coverage problem introduced a typical error in this type of sampling process that is not easily measured or corrected.

Data analysis: In addition to a general assessment of descriptive results, the overall procedures for analysis were four-fold: 1) Dimensions were created from the development of indices and models validated using confirmatory factor analysis; 2) Cluster analysis was conducted using these dimensions and individuals were grouped based on perceptions of constraints; 3) Clusters were compared on the dimensions as well as select individual items regarding constraints; clusters were also compared vis-à-vis the effects of cultural indicators; and 4) Chi-square analyses, t-tests, and analysis of variance were employed as secondary analyses to compare the constraints across demographics of interest and other non-constraints items measured by the questionnaire.

Demographic data collected included respondent gender, age, ethnic identity, marital status, children, employment status, residence, income, birth state, length of time living in Colorado, and state of the U.S. or country of origin of both parents and grandparents. This latter question was important to help the park better understand the heritage of visitors and potential visitors. Second, a comparison was made between the

African American and Latino sub-samples on a few items. The following characteristics were examined: race, sex, age, marital status, children (presence of minor children in household), education, and household income.

Creation of Dimensions and Analytic Procedures

This study examined specific, theory driven and literature-based, *a priori* items in measuring three primary constructs of culture, perceived discrimination, and constraints (i.e., prevent from visiting RMNP and perceptions/personal experiences of outdoor areas in general) used for analysis. Exploratory factor analysis was the first step used to assist with the initial creation of internally consistent sub-scales based on the underlying structure of the phenomenon (i.e., constraints). Creation of scales based on single item indicators, coupled with theoretical principles, was then assigned to separate dimensions; each of these sub-scales was tested for reliability resulting using Cronbach's *alpha* coefficients.

This series of sub-dimensions measured three concepts based on constraints and one based on culture and was tested using confirmatory factors analysis (CFA). Four models were therefore assessed with multiple indices and tested for goodness of fit using Amos (ver. 4); a CFA was conducted on each model. Three measures of fit were used to test these models: Chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Normed Fit Index (NFI). Inevitably sample sizes vary so one challenge was interpreting what ratio represents an adequate fit. Consequently different researchers have recommended using chi-square/*df* ratios as low as 2 or as high as 5, with an NFI and CFI greater than .90, to indicate a reasonable fit (Marsh & Hocevar, 1985).

Dimensions of culture: Culture can serve to define at least some of the characteristic attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of a group of people that share a common cultural identity. The extent to which a person conforms to those culturally determined values and behaviors depends on both cultural identity and the level of identification with that culture. The culture model consisted of three primary scales encompassing sixteen indicators. Given the small proportion of ethnic minorities in Colorado this is a potentially valuable element of this study.

Constraints to RMNP visits: On this section of the survey a series of statements were listed reflecting several reasons why people may not visit RMNP. Individuals were asked to respond to these statements on a 6-point scale from *Not at All* (1) to *Very Much* (5). “Don’t know” (6) was included for NPS Social Science requirements. Given the exploratory nature of this study and process of triangulation, difference tests assessing improvement in fit by alternative models were not conducted and all subsequent dimensions of this concept were included in the analyses.

Constraints - Perceptions/personal experiences: Part of the study built in the understanding that many respondents, although they reside along the Front Range, may never have ever been to RMNP. Items on the survey therefore included important factors from the literature and previous studies indicating there is an overall human dimension regarding values and meanings of outdoor areas including a variety of settings (e.g., from local neighborhood and city parks to wilderness areas/national parks) (Ewert, 1996). Four primary dimensions were used to measure this concept: Culture of the NPS, marginalized nature of ethnic minorities (i.e., personal funds available, transportation issues, historical impact of ‘slavery or migrant labor’ on current attitudes), safety

concerns, and cultural filters (i.e., comfort level of visiting outdoor areas regardless of ethnicity/race, preference for participation/park visits with people of same or different ethnic/racial group, whether or not going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is “part of the culture” of the individuals ethnicity or race).

Perceived discrimination: This concept, as measured in this study, sought to document the extent of perceived discrimination and included important variables of avoidance and displacement as behavioral consequences of possible discrimination factors. In this analysis, perceived discrimination was measured by responses to the following seven statements ultimately used as items developed into an overall index to measure *perceived discrimination* (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Overall measure of perceived discrimination¹

- 1) “I feel that people of my ethnicity or race are not very welcome at places like RMNP.”
- 2) “People of my ethnicity or race have been discriminated against when visiting some parks and outdoor areas.”
- 3) “In outdoor recreation areas I have been to, police or law enforcement rangers often watch or stare closely at people who are of my ethnicity or race.”
- 4) “When I do visit outdoor areas, if I feel uncomfortable because of my ethnicity or race, I leave that place and go to another location.”
- 5) “If I think I might not be comfortable or welcome in a specific outdoor area, because of my ethnicity or race, I usually decide not to go there at all.”
- 6) “I don’t believe Anglo visitors (at parks) accept me because of my ethnicity or race.”
- 7) “If I do not feel safe because of other people at an outdoor area that I want to visit, I will go to a different area.”

¹ Modified, in part, from instruments used by permission from Chavez, 1991; Floyd & Gramann, 1995; Gomez, 1999; Hilton, 2002.

Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis was used as the primary technique of choice for two primary reasons: 1) The goal is to organize the constraints data within a people-based perspective about how individuals encounter, experience, and respond to an assortment of constraints

that may influence their attitudes towards natural areas and subsequently their outdoor recreation behavior, and 2) RMNP is concerned with the optimization of visitor services for different user groups. The advantage is that cluster analysis facilitates the examination of not only the number, type, and intensity of constraints, but also the combinations that may intersect groupings derived from factor analysis (Clustan, 1998; Jackson, 1993). Consequently, cluster analysis has proven to be very useful in marketing—an underlying objective for outreach efforts by RMNP. Additionally, cluster analysis is a useful exploratory tool for classifying individuals from a large set into smaller, more homogeneous subsets based on patterns of responses across a set of criterion variables (i.e., preferred recreation experiences at RMNP and constraints to participation).

Object cluster analysis was used to determine types of outdoor recreation constraints impacting visitor and potential visitor (e.g., currently non-user) experiences. Each type of constraint describes distinct challenges inhibiting participation for consideration in the planning process for marketing and outreach for diversifying park visitors.

The selection of variables that served as the criteria for clustering included the ten dimensions measuring the three main constructs: Items preventing visits, perceptions and experiences/general constraints to outdoor recreation, and perceived discrimination. Second, activity interests for participation over the next five-years were factored into nature-based/passive and high skill indices that served as criterion variables for comparison. A third set of criterion variables included the types of park services and opportunities that would increase respondents' desire to visit RMNP.

The measure of similarity included a resemblance matrix comprised of squared Euclidian distances and the method of clustering was the un-weighted pair group method (i.e., average linkage between groups) performed using SPSS version 10. To determine the number of object clusters to accept, two steps were followed: First, not knowing how many clusters there might be in the sample, a hierarchical procedure was conducted to help determine the possible number of clusters. That is, a hierarchical analysis can also be used to determine the initial cluster centers for a *k*-means analysis (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). Next, a *k*-means procedure was done using a two, three, and four cluster solutions. Cluster groupings were then chosen based on the highest number of clusters producing a group of respondents that remained stable (i.e., multiple solutions were evaluated using cross tabulations to determine which solution produced distinct clusters).

Phase 1: Results of the Delphi Technique

The invitation was sent to 40 participants (“key informants”) and twenty-five responded with an affirmative “yes” to participate in this phase while only four gave a definitive “no.” To maximize the involvement, the remaining 11 were included in correspondence unless they requested otherwise. After two follow-up reminders 14 (56%) responded to the initial question. The second questionnaire was sent and after two reminders, 17 (68%) completed round two. It was determined that a third and final round would occur. Important to note about this final round is that it took place right after the “9-11” tragedy in America. Two reminders were again sent resulting in 14 completed questionnaires (i.e., 56% response rate).


Identification of key results. From round one, initially 15 categories were identified and further analysis revealed five of the categories were similar enough to other categories to collapse the list into the top 10 (see Table 2). In round two, participants received the list of ten categories organized randomly and were asked to rank them according to what they believed are the most notable constraints to minority use and participation of national parks. The items were ranked from 1 to 10 with “1” being the most important constraint and “10” the least important issue. Responses from ranking these 10 categories were run against the response list for all panelists to generate a new frequency set and were rank ordered based on those frequencies (Table 2). The order of importance has an inverse relationship to the mean rank; that is, the lowest total rank is equivalent to the most important, highest rated constraint by this panel. (See Appendix D for explanations of each item in the final order of ranks).

Table 2. Round 1 - Categories developed and total rank per category

Constraint Category	Total Rank
1. Socialization as a child into outdoor recreation and exploring natural areas	54
2. Lack of marketing efforts towards minority communities	57
3. Culture of the National Park Service	65
4. Education about the outdoors	70
5. Marginalized nature of ethnic minority groups	86
6. Safety concerns	87
7. Lack of a range of opportunities for minority groups	97
8. Perception among minority groups	97
9. Historical context	109
10. Perceptions by whites that perceive these areas are "their place"	118

For the third and final round, three clusters were created with these categories and panelists were asked to review them and respond to two questions (see Figure 3). For these questions, the term "priority" represents degree of influence these issues could have (or should have) on natural resource management decisions in helping to "break down" barriers and constraints for minority communities in visiting outdoor/natural areas, such as national parks, whether constraints are perceived or real.

Figure 3. Three Clusters Based on Salience of Constraints



The items in Figure 3 are listed in each group as a whole, not the order of importance per cluster. The questions asked pertaining to these clusters are:

- 1) *Do you agree with the items that make up each cluster? Yes or No. If no, please describe how you would reorganize any of the items and into which group*
- 2) *Do you believe that there is some other useful type of information about constraints for minority visitation to National Parks that needs to be collected that was not included in this list of 10 items? Yes or No. If yes, please explain.*

Consensus was reached for most aspects but not for priority of items per cluster. In this case the majority responses were recorded. The observed failure to reach consensus was not due to technical problems (e.g., poorly defined categories, inadequate coverage of cluster options) but more to a real disagreement among panelists. For

example, as indicated by one panelist *“The categories don’t completely dovetail with my own perceptions and priorities as to the issue.”* Another individual stated, *“All the effects stem from one cause: systemic racial discrimination. That has to top the list. The categories seem too sanitized; they don’t really address the cause so I’m at a loss how to arrange or why!”* As such differences are generally real, it makes sense that the Delphi method lends itself more readily to conceptual or philosophical issues than to issues requiring exact, or quantitative, answers as a whole (Richey, Mar & Horner, 1985).

The most important issues relating to constraints to outdoor recreation participation in national parks were a combination of structural, inter- and intrapersonal constraints: Socialization (e.g., upbringing as a child), lack of marketing efforts to minority communities, National Park Service “culture,” and lack of education about the environment and natural resources. Sample comments provided by the panelists include the following:

- 1) Socialization – *“This is true, particularly lack of role models;”*
- 2) NPS Culture – *“If people of color were genuinely considered ‘owners’ of the park, as are Anglos or desirable visitors, as Europeans and Asians – if we benefited from our tax dollars through employment, contracts and concessions, we’d be there! The dominant society within the NPS has kept these benefits exclusive for as long as they could. Now, with Americas changing demographics, they realize that their very survival depends on ‘reaching out’ and ‘involving’ the burgeoning diverse population.”*
- 3) Education – *“Parks are doing a better job of outreach. However, efforts are not sustained on an on-going basis as a result of visitation demands, limited staff, increasingly scarce resources, etc. and we’re not seeing enough about environmental education in our schools...”*

Constraints relating to overall perceptions by whites, perceptions among minority groups, and historical contexts were rated least important as issues to consider regarding

the potential for enhancing visitation by ethnic minorities or improving the quality of the outdoor recreation experience. One significant statement made about class as an interpersonal constraint is this:

“It is upper income visitors versus whites that perceive these areas as their place; this is about class, not race. Minorities may feel unwelcome based on lack of social acceptance by the dominant higher-income visitor.”

Phase 2: Results of Focus Groups

Analysis of focus group interviews resulted in nine primary themes. Table 3 presents these themes and their overall meaning.

Table 3. Constraint Themes Commonly Held between African Americans and Latinos in the Focus Groups

Theme	Meaning
Preference/convenience of city/local parks	Proximity to residence and/or neighborhood
Safety issues	Physical and/or emotional; fear; discomfort
Costs and transportation	Marginalized nature of ethnic minorities
Marketing and public relations	Lack of attention/consideration for minorities
Perceived discrimination	Someone exerting a negative effect on visitation
Socialization and exposure	Parental/family involvement as youth; culture
Lack of knowledge & awareness	Benefits of participation; opportunities; facilities
Historical context & perspectives	Effects of slavery; migrant labor; share croppers
Trust issues (“social permission”)	Peer pressure; lack of role models; disbelief

As indicated in Table 3, common themes emerging between the African Americans and Latinos in the study sample are distinct yet contain common relationships between dimensions. While themes are included in each sphere separately there is no particular order to the groupings as shown. Five other similarity categories emerged that are considered “general issues or concerns” yet are noted as independent from the above constraint themes: 1) Cleanliness of facilities; 2) Strong values and sense of appreciation

towards nature/natural environment; 3) Workforce – Importance of more ethnically diverse staff; 4) Gender roles; and 5) Overall experiences for those who have visited RMNP have been positive and favorable. Again, although not a focal point of this study, rather more indirect, it is worthy to note that of all individuals’ interviewed, 42% reported that having more ethnic minorities employed at the park would “definitely make a difference” in their desire to either visit more often or feel more comfortable, 9% indicated this factor “does not matter,” and the remaining half stated “no, this would not make a difference” to them.

Regarding differences between African Americans and Latinos (see Appendix G) there were seven primary categories that surfaced: Language barriers, racial reminders, awareness or knowledge of RMNP, “Looking Good” syndrome (e.g., importance of personal appearance), family structure, cultural stereotypes, and perceptions of whites. First,

“...We go and we don’t understand the places we’re in. We’re in the woods and people are making comments about us. You know, the onus is always on us. We go in and are surprised there’s one of us, two, three, four maybe five of us out there hiking. And, there’s probably a thousand white folks. But we become the issue; we become the central focus point. But the problem is them, not us. Sometimes we forget; we actually forget we’re black until somebody reminds us.”

the variable of language as a barrier is an issue in the Latino community not with Blacks.

This related to a Spanish speaking background versus English only.

Second, Blacks felt they were constantly reminded they were Black by virtue of “stares and glares,” possibly how they were treated, based on certain levels of discomfort (e.g., lead to displacement or avoidance). Latinos never mentioned this as part of the interview process. Third, more Blacks than Latinos in the sample had any knowledge or

awareness of RMNP as even existing let alone being a “national park.” That is, more Blacks than Latinos had either visited or knew about the park.

Fourth, the Black community boasted about this “looking good” factor that dictates much of their attitudes, place within their community, decisions relating to recreation preferences and ultimately recreation behaviors. Latinos do not seem to place high value on this as an issue in their community and choices. The focus for Latinos is on survival by any means and pursuit of recreational opportunities that will bring enjoyment to their children and whole family (e.g., “if the children are happy, everyone’s happy”).

The fifth divergent category between the two ethnic groups is family structure. For example, this sample included more single-heads of household in the Black community than in the Latino community. The idea of planning recreational pursuits/activities may sometimes be a “burden” and family priorities are different. Blacks in this system live on “what happens day to day and not what they’re going to do tomorrow.” It is important to note that this statistic of more single-headed households in the Black community is supported by Census data (U.S. Census, 2000c). Within this category a major dissimilarity is Latinos prefer large group activities as their recreational preferences. This is also consistent with other research (e.g., Chavez, 1991; Gramann, Shaull, & Saenz, 1995; Shaull & Gramann, 1998).

Regarding cultural stereotypes, the Black community suggested that a common attitude among this population is that outdoor recreation

“I’m comfortable in city park and every other park because I know my crowd...When I went up there though [to RMNP], it was weird because we were the only minorities there so it was like we already got the looks like ‘what they doin’ up here, they just lookin’ for some weed or somethin’...’ – We automatically had these barriers and all we were tryin’ to do was what ya’ll were doing...”

activities in national parks is “a white thing; Blacks just don’t do that...” This factor was not mentioned nor discussed among Latino participants. Last, what was verbalized in the Black community was their perception that white people may think certain outdoor places are for them and consequently Blacks feel stereotyped regarding perceptions of why white people think they might be visiting or why they would want to (e.g., assumptions of theft, vandalism, dealing drugs). The concept was not mentioned as much with the Latinos, however, as they did bring up notions of “oppression” this type of perception of stereotyping could have been implied (e.g., Latinos mentioned concerns of their children being kidnapped). Appendix G provides details of the results from the coding process for both similarities and differences within groups and between groups. Additionally, Appendix H provides a series of sample quotes from all interviews.

“I’ve always wondered when I talk to my friends and family; there’s this kind of invisible class barrier about the outdoors. And then like a lot of people mentioned, it’s not ‘cool’ to be outdoors hiking and stuff. I mean it’s kind of strange because we’re talking about within black, within culture differences. Seems to me to be an obvious kind of class and political question...So does it make me less Black because I like to spend time in the outdoors?”

Phase 3: Results of Mail Back Survey

The general purpose of the survey phase was to explore relationships between variables and compare groups based on cluster analysis. Inferential statistics (e.g., t-tests, chi-square, ANOVA) were used to test for significant differences between groups. A series of bivariate correlation tests were conducted to determine direction and strength of association between variables. Basic descriptives were completed for single questionnaire items of interest.

Response rate: Eighty-two surveys were returned by Blacks and Latinos and all of them were completed in full and considered usable. Only two surveys were returned without the racial category completed and were therefore not included in the analysis. Two approaches for calculating the response rate occurred; taking an extra step was a tactic used to ensure a greater range of accuracy. First, based on the number mailed (less undeliverables and known white or non-Black/Latino households) versus the number received represents a lower bound response rate of 4%. Second, an additional analysis was calculated by estimating the number of Latinos and African Americans that were in the overall sample by way of the non-response bias test. Using the number of known Black and Latino households we estimated the number of target households in the original sample and obtained an upper bound response rate of 8%. Consequently, we estimated the actual response rate to be between 4 - 8%.

Regarding the duration of residence in Colorado and country of origin, findings show that 40% of all respondents were born in this state and have lived here for an average of thirty-three years. Regarding origin of parents, nearly one-fourth of all mothers and 18% of all fathers were born in Colorado. In the Latino community, the majority of mothers and fathers were born in Mexico (i.e., 15% and 20%, respectively) while 15% of both sets of respondents' grandparents were also born in Mexico.

Comparisons of other selected group characteristics are represented in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of selected racial group characteristics¹

Characteristic	Sample			
	Sample n = 82	Blacks n = 37	Latinos n = 33	Mixed Race n = 12
Percent racial group	--	45%	40%	15%
Percent female	45%	51%	44%	33%
Median age	48	53	41	39
Percent married	42%	43%	47%	25%
Percent children at home <18	33%	16%	42%	58%
Percent 4-yr college or greater	61%	82%	52%	67%
Percent homeowners	72%	70%	78%	58%
Household income (median range)	\$25k - 49k	\$25k - 49k	\$25k - 49k	\$25k - 49k
Percent income over \$75k	18%	22%	18%	8%

¹Chi-square tests showed the Black and Latino samples were significantly different for education only (p<.01)

Black and Latino respondents in the sample were comparable for percent males and females completing the survey, median age, individuals who are married, percent of children under the age of 18 living at home, homeowners, and household income. Within the sample, these racial groups were statistically different for education (i.e., individuals with the highest level of education completed as 4-yr degree or higher). While this may be an interesting finding, educational attainment is also comparable within the U.S. population. For instance, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2003) the proportion of the Hispanic population with a bachelor's degree increased by only 2% in a ten-year period (from 1987-1997) and, more recently, did not increase at all between 2001 and 2002; the educational attainment of Blacks, on the other hand, completing a bachelor's degree or higher increased by 1.3%.

The results from this survey phase are clearly not generalizable and must be viewed with caution yet, again, responses are not considered independent from the first

two phases of this study. Important to note is that “even in well-educated populations, response rates vary from as low as 3% up to 90%” (Creative Research Systems, 2001, p. 6). Furthermore, according to Dolsen and Machlis (1991) social scientists have generally disagreed about what constitutes acceptable response rates. The overall response rate for this phase of the study was predictably low; however, this is not unusual for mail surveys where no previous contact with respondents has been established (Dillman, 2000) and second, this is more typical that an even lower rate is returned by ethnic minority communities, also known as “hard-to-reach” populations (Johnson, et.al., 1997; Pottick & Lerman, 1991; Smith, 1993; Wicks & Norman, 1996). The response rate of ethnic minorities in the present study is similar to the number of African Americans, for instance, completing mail back surveys (compared to Whites) by Toth and Brown (1997), Philip (1993), Johnson (1998), Johnson and Horan (1997) and Philip (1995) (i.e., $n = 63$, 96, 116, 124 and 136 surveys returned by Blacks, respectively).

In general, this shortcoming has been accepted and the accompanying problem of generalizability is acknowledged rather than disregarding the data for this phase without considering the information offered by the respondents on this important topic. Again, this helped justify triangulating the data.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses: Fit indexes for each of the four models based on constraints and culture were acceptable for all groups except for one that merely resulted in a weaker fit but was deemed adequate for analysis (i.e., items *preventing* individuals from visiting the park).

The culture model consisted of three primary scales encompassing sixteen indicators; Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .78 to .91. The

dimensions created were “Sense of Identity, Ethnic Interaction Preferences, and Cultural Connections.” The sixteen questions assessing these dimensions are in Appendix M. A single model measuring culture was constructed using these dimensions and related indicators, and results of the CFA are noted in Table 5.

Table 5. Confirmatory Tests of the Four Models ¹

Concept with dimensions measured ²	X²	X² / df	CFI	NFI
Culture	148.36	1.47	.98	.96
Sense of Identity scale				.78
Ethnic Interaction Preferences scale				.90
Cultural Connections scale				.91
Prevent from visiting RMNP (at all or more often) *	376.30	3.01	.88	.84
Socialization & Early Exposure scale				.67
Personal Discomfort/Safety scale				.71
Access Issues scale				.75
Cultural Conflicts scale				.82
Lack of Knowledge/Awareness scale				.69
Perceived Constraints/Personal Experiences *	103.22	1.45	.98	.95
Culture of the NPS scale				.62
Marginalized Nature of Ethnic Minorities scale				.69
Safety Concerns scale				.73
Survival Schemes scale				.67
Perceived Discrimination ³	58.70	4.19	.95	.94

¹ Factor loadings are represented in Appendix M for all items comprising each dimension.

² Variables coded on a 6-point Likert-type scale including "Don't Know " (6)

³ One dimension was created to measure this concept using variables relating to police/law enforcement, discomfort/displacement, discomfort/avoidance, perception of acceptance by white visitors, perception of not feeling welcome, known discrimination of others at some parks/outdoor areas.

* These scales are different in that "prevent" specifically relates to visitation to RMNP and "experiences" refers to perceptions with any outdoor/natural area or "similar" setting.

The constraints to RMNP visits (i.e., *prevent from visiting*) model examined five dimensions measuring 18 variables that resulted in reliability coefficients from .67 to .82 (items measured can be found on the survey in Appendix K, Section 2, Part B).

Regarding the perceived constraints model from a broader personal experience with outdoor areas, although the reliability coefficients for each scale created were an average range from .62 to .73, these dimensions resulted in an overall strong fit of the model (see

Table 5). Given the intent in focusing on the concept of *perceived discrimination* from a theoretical standpoint and based on research needs noted in the literature, one dimension was tested for fit in this model using seven indicators; the CFA in Table 5 shows reasonable goodness of fit statistics suggesting a close fit of the data being measured.

Cluster Analysis

Classifications derived from cluster analysis enhance the opportunity to begin investigation of the experience and operation of leisure constraints in people's lives, and of processes such as adaptation and negotiation (Crawford, et al., 1991).

While the hierarchical method resulted in two clusters, the 3-cluster solution in the *k*-means method was selected for two reasons: From a psychometric standpoint, there were three distinct clusters rendered as stable across each cluster grouping analyzed (e.g., the same group of people “hang” together regardless of whether we use a 2 group or 3 group solution) yet with 3 solutions the dissimilarity assessment is greater. Second, it is consistent with *a priori* segmentation procedures in which the researcher identifies at the outset the bases for defining the segments (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). From this perspective, the cluster grouping is also based on the fact three distinct levels emerged from the Delphi technique (i.e., low, moderate, high salience).

Constraint experience types: Cluster analysis resulted in the classification of three clusters of individuals based on the ten constraints dimensions being measured: The Content, the Curious, and the Concerned (see Appendix N). First, the “Content” refers to the cluster of individuals rating the constraints dimensions as low consideration or salience and who have most likely negotiated or minimized these concerns. Second, the “Curious” denotes the group responding to the dimensions as having moderate

consideration indicating a relatively conscientious perception and mild degree of experience with the constraint items. Third, the “Concerned” stands for a small cluster of individuals who, on average, had a high level of regard and concern for these constraints (Table 6).

Bivariate correlations of all 10 dimensions resulted in all scales having positive correlations at $p < .01$ with no problems of multicollinearity. One exception is the relationship between the perceived discrimination index and the lack of knowledge and awareness index is still significant, but not as strong as the others ($R^2 = .24$, $p < .05$).

To validate the clustering solution, a univariate analysis of variance was performed on the variables used to generate the solution in order to test for the significance of the clusters. Results indicated all ten constraint dimensions were highly significant in relation to the cluster groups ($p < .001$).

The magnitude of the F-values from the ANOVA performed on each dimension is another indication of how well the respective dimension discriminates between clusters. Additionally, the clustering explained 86% of the variance in the constraint dimensions. Interesting to note within all three groups is that the perceived *culture of the NPS* had the highest mean rating for this dimension as the number one constraint (total mean score=3.1). This was measured by items relating to lack of ethnic minority park employees, lack of opportunities of interest, inadequate facilities, and belief the park is “intended for middle to upper class white people.” For both the Content and Curious groups the perceived discrimination index had the next highest mean rating of all indices (2.5 and 3.4, respectively). Respondents in the Concerned group (after culture of the NPS) rated cultural conflicts ($M=5.0$), marginalized nature ($M=4.9$) followed by

access issues (M=4.8) as having the greatest salience to them. The degree of variability is greatest with four of the indices in the cluster 3 group representing types of people with high concern/salience of the constraints: marginalized nature (SD=1.32); safety concerns (SD=1.27); personal discomfort/safety (SD=1.48); and lack of knowledge/awareness (SD=1.31) (see Table 6).

Table 6. Importance ratings for constraint dimensions for the three cluster groups

Constraint Dimensions	Respondent Classification ¹						ANOVA	
	Content (n=48)		Curious (n=29)		Concerned (n=5)		F *	Eta ²
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
General/Personal Experiences ²								
Culture of the NPS	2.4	.79	3.6	1.01	5.0	.55	39.52	.51
Marginalized nature	1.5	.70	2.9	.94	4.9	1.33	48.90	.57
Safety Concerns	1.6	.49	2.8	1.04	4.5	1.28	45.44	.59
Cultural Filters	1.6	.71	2.2	.94	4.2	.84	24.25	.40
Prevent from visiting RMNP ³								
Socialization & Early Exposure	1.5	.66	2.5	1.01	4.6	.95	39.79	.52
Personal Discomfort/Safety	1.2	.35	2.1	.97	3.6	1.48	33.10	.47
Cultural Conflicts	1.4	.55	3.0	.90	5.0	.55	107.66	.74
Access Issues	1.3	.51	2.9	.85	4.8	1.02	90.49	.71
Lack of Knowledge/Awareness	1.7	.66	2.8	1.12	4.7	1.31	34.02	.48
Perceived Discrimination ²	2.5 ^a	.95	3.4 ^{ab}	.70	4.0 ^b	.27	16.08	.30

¹ Using Scheffe's procedures for post hoc multiple comparisons, all means (read across rows) for each cluster group are statistically different at p<.05 with the exception of the *perceived discrimination* index where mean differences are represented by superscripts.

² Items in each index measured on a 5-pt Likert type scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Scale relates to similar outdoor areas or other national park settings.

³ Items in each index measured on a 5-pt Likert type scale; 1=not at all to 5=very much. Scale refers specifically to RMNP visitation.

* All dimensions significant at the p<.001 level.

The strength of association is greatest with the *cultural conflicts* index (eta² = .74). For example, items preventing people from visiting RMNP relate to stories heard in the past of “bad things happening to people like me,” lack of ethnic minority park employees, not feeling welcome, perceived or real acts of discrimination, and

decisions to visit are influenced by historical aspects relating to slavery or migrant labor issues. The second highest effect is *access issues* ($\eta^2 = .71$) pertaining to lack of discretionary money, lack of convenient or affordable transportation, and lack of adequate facilities to “meet the needs or interests for me and/or my family.”

Comparison of cluster groups with select demographics. First, a table displaying all demographics based on racial category can be found in Appendix L. Second, gender, race, income, education, and family status are reflected in Table 7 and highlighted below with cluster group comparisons.

Table 7. Sociodemographic characteristics of the three cluster groups

Variable and category	Respondent Classification ¹			χ^2	p ²
	Content (n=48) %	Curious (n=29) %	Concerned (n=5) %		
Race				7.78	n.s.
African American	46	48	0		
Latino	37	37	100		
Mixed race	17	15	0		
Gender				7.65	0.02
Females	33	65	60		
Males	67	35	40		
Income				10.67	0.03
Lower class	16	35	80		
Middle class	63	45	20		
Upper class	21	20	0		
Education				4.92	n.s.
Some h.s. to some college	28	21	75		
Four-yr degree or higher	72	79	25		

¹ Cell entries are percents (rounded up) within each cluster solution. Total %=100% within demographic.

² Categories are statistically significant at the observed p <.05 level.

Gender – There is a statistically significant relationship between gender and what cluster membership group an individual falls within. More males than females are in the Content typology of the constraints groups. More females than males are in the Curious

group of constraints. Slightly more females are in the Concerned group. These findings support results of previous studies on gender and constraints (e.g., Henderson & Bialesckhi, 1993; Jackson & Henderson, 1995; Virden & Walker, 1999). In exploring specific dimensions, t-tests reveal six of the ten dimensions are significantly different between women and men ($\chi^2=7.65$, $p<.05$) with women rating each dimension higher, on average (see Table 7). First, those items measuring the concept of constraints preventing visitation to RMNP more often or at all include personal discomfort/safety, cultural conflicts, and access issues. Second, the concept measuring constraints based on general personal experiences and perceptions where females and males differed include culture of the NPS, marginalized nature of ethnic minorities, and safety concerns.

Race – As directed by the NPS Social Science program, this section first asked the yes or no question “Are you Hispanic or Latino?” Race was then measured using categories as provided in the U.S. Census Bureau with the opportunity for respondents to “check one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.” Race was therefore measured by self-ascribed identity and resulted in collapsing the responses into three categories used for analyses: African American/Black ($n=45\%$), Hispanic/Latino ($n=40\%$), and Mixed Race ($n=15\%$). What is conducive to this study with a small sample is that Blacks and Latinos are nearly evenly split among all respondents. Interesting to note is that despite the categories provided, several Latinos still wrote in the margins to specify their ethnic group (e.g., “I’m Mexican not Hispanic” or “Mexican American”). There is no statistical relationship between race and cluster membership (Table 7), and as previously mentioned, whether an individual has ever visited RMNP or not.

Consequently, there is no interaction effect regarding one's gender and race in terms of how they perceive or experience constraints.

Income – This was measured by self-reported annual household income listed on the survey in a range. Variables were collapsed into 3 categories and social class status is therefore operationalized as lower class, middle class, and upper class. There is a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2=10.67$, $p<.05$) among income and one's cluster membership (Table 7). That is, individuals in the lower class status were statistically different from those in the upper class status ($F=4.03$, $p<.05$). Additionally, it is interesting to note that nearly 2/3 of the respondents in the middle income bracket were in the Content constraints group. Of all individuals in the low income status 80% belonged to the Concerned group membership reporting constraints dimensions as a high or strong consideration.

Education – This was operationalized as a two-category variable anchored in some high school to some college, and four-year degree or higher. There was no significant difference regarding one's level of education and what cluster group membership they belonged to in terms of their constraint perceptions and experiences. Although the majority of people in the sample with a four-year degree or higher fell within the middle-class status, this relationship is not very strong with lack of statistical significance.

Family Status – As a secondary variable of interest, family status was measured by marital standing and whether there are any children under 18 living at home. Given the common knowledge based on years of sociological research of the importance of family in the Black and Latino communities (e.g., Dent, 1992; Marín & VanOss Marín,

1991) and family as priority in recreational decision-making (Gramann, 1996), this was an important variable to explore. Twenty-three percent are married with children under-18 at home and 24% are not married (e.g., divorced, widowed, separated, living with partner). Nearly 1/3 are married, yet reported no children or no children at home under the age of 18. The remaining 25% are either single with no children, or single parents with young children at home (e.g., 10% are single parents). There is no relationship of one's family/household status in terms of the cluster group membership. Second, the majority of respondents, regardless of family status in all three cluster groups, were Content (i.e., classified as having low concern or little consideration) in their constraint perceptions and experiences with outdoor areas in general or RMNP in particular.

Measures of culture: The primary measure of culture was comprised of three dimensions: Sense of Identity Index, Cultural Connections Index, and Ethnic Interaction Preferences Index (see Appendix M, Table A). These revolved around individuals' level of attachment to their cultural group, interaction preferences with people from their own ethnic group or not and in what types of settings, and level of importance of celebrating holidays specific to culture, connection to raising of children, maintaining values of culture, and so forth. An alternative measure of culture consisted of standardized scores representing one's national origin, first language and language spoken at home ("most of the time"), and religious/spiritual affiliation. A reliability test for this index resulted in a standardized alpha of .67. In both of these culture measures, a high score represents higher attachment to one's culture whereas a negative or low score suggests less or very little attachment to one's culture. Understanding the level of attachment to one's cultural

group, to what extent, and how strong the tie is, provides added meaning to results of this study.

One's level of attachment to their cultural identity, connections to cultural values, and ethnic interaction preferences is not statistically related to cluster group membership in terms of constraint measures. Noteworthy to this study however is that, on a five-point scale, respondents rated items in the *cultural connections* index higher, on average (M=3.74, SD=1.00), than the other two followed by sense of identity (M=3.41, SD=1.01) with seemingly less importance vis-à-vis one's ethnic interaction preferences (M=2.44, SD=1.09).

The alternative measure of culture (e.g., language preferences, national origin, and religious/spiritual affiliation) is significant ($F=4.65$, $p<.01$) among cluster groups. That is, an individuals' high level of attachment to these attributes of culture is a major influence in one's cluster group membership based on perceptions and experiences of the constraints presented in this study. In particular, people in the Concerned group (high constraint ratings) are statistically different from both the Content and Curious clusters. However, there is no statistically significant relationship between those who have low constraint ratings compared to individuals with a moderate level of constraint considerations in terms of their attachment to these cultural features.

Activity participation: Current outdoor recreation activity participation and level of interest in taking part in these activities "in the next 5 years" was assessed. A series of 12 activities were presented in the survey and an exploratory factor analysis was performed using the Varimax Rotation method. Two primary components resulted and

were factored into nature-related/passive index and high skill/high investment index (see Table 8). These indices were used as measures of future activity interest in the analyses.

Table 8. Activity Interest in the Next 5-years ¹

Scale / Items	Factor Loadings	Alpha
Nature-related/Passive Index		.91
Wildlife viewing	.60	
Bird watching	.82	
Cookout/BBQ	.71	
Outdoor/Nature photography	.75	
Learning about protecting nature	.80	
Scenic viewing	.83	
High Skill/High Investment Index		.88
Fishing	.83	
Boating (any type)	.70	
Hiking	.85	
Camping	.55	
Horseback riding	.66	
Cross-country skiing/snowshoeing	.62	

¹ All items were measured on a scale of 1=very uninterested to 5=very interested with an option for "don't know."

First, on average, more individuals selected passive, nature-based activities (M=3.1, SD=1.60) over the high skill/high investment type activities for future participation interest (M=2.6, SD=1.55). Regarding cluster membership, neither the nature-related activities nor the high skill index were significantly different indicating one's constraint perceptions and experiences are not related to potential participation patterns in the next 5-years. Ancillary analyses indicated that nearly 50% of cluster 1 individuals (i.e., Content) were in the middle-aged bracket (41-60) which may account for lower average scores regarding interest in high skill, higher activity and investment level than other age cohorts. When determining the relationship to gender, there was no significant difference between females and males regarding what type of activities they were interested in pursuing in the near future.

Visitors versus non-visitors: When examining visitors versus non-visitors, whether an individual has been to RMNP or not has a highly significant relationship to their cluster group membership ($\chi^2=15.74$, $p<.001$). First, nearly 2/3 of all respondents ($n=52$) have been to RMNP while 36% ($n=30$) have never been. The ethnic background of respondents, however, is not statistically significant indicating there is no relationship of this variable to whether an individual has visited RMNP or not. Blacks and Latinos in the study have visited the park in nearly equal proportions (46% and 40%, respectively) and 41% of both ethnic groups have not; the remaining mixed race people were also split evenly regarding whether they have ever visited the park.

Results show that of all the individuals who have never been to RMNP, the majority fall into clusters 1 and 2 of low to moderate salience of constraints. Corroborating with the perceived discrimination hypothesis, all respondents' segmented into the Concerned group have never been to the park (e.g., potential "avoidance"). The majority of respondents who have been to the park belong to cluster 1 with respect to not much concern for the constraints in terms of their perceptions and experiences. Twenty-percent of respondents classified as Content, who have never been to the park, infer these constraints do not matter with respect to visiting or not. Comparatively, nearly half of the individuals classified as Curious has been to the park while the other half has not (i.e., 54% visitors, 46% non-visitors). This suggests ones' level of experience or perceptions with the constraints highlighted in this study are present regardless of visitation to the park.

Importance of cultural holidays celebrated by RMNP: Whether it was important for holidays celebrated by the respondents based on their culture be recognized by RMNP

was a unique element to include in the survey. Although there was no statistically significant relationship between the three cluster groups, the results are interesting nonetheless. First, asking this type of question regarding national park visitation is breaking new ground. This was measured with one dichotomous question by seeking a simple “yes” or “no” answer. There is a good chance that people may not have really known how to respond to this question. For instance, this was a forced choice response omitting an option of “doesn’t matter to me.” Of all surveys returned, 74 people responded with 55% indicating ‘no’ it is not important to them that RMNP recognize holidays celebrated by their culture, yet the remaining 35% who said “yes” may be sending a valuable message. When examining this variable based on cluster groups, 60% were identified as this not being important to them; the majority of these respondents belong to the Content group where constraints were a low concern or of little consideration regarding their overall experiences and perceptions.

Interest in visiting RMNP in future: Two important supplementary questions related to individuals’ interest in visiting RMNP in the future, and included what might enhance future visits. This was measured in two ways. First, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=very uninterested to 5=very interested) respondents were asked *how interested are you in visiting RMNP in the future?* And second, *what types of park services and opportunities would increase your desire to visit RMNP* related to the following five items:

- 1) Organized/affordable bus tours from a metro/city area to the park;
- 2) Greater variety of ethnic food service options in the park;
- 3) Park visitor center near my community/metro area;
- 4) More ethnic minorities working at the park; and
- 5) Expanded interpretation

and/or education programs in the park relating to people or events of my ethnicity or race. Other ideas were invited with space for an open-ended remark.

Findings show a significant relationship between cluster group membership and level of interest in visiting RMNP in the future ($\chi^2=11.38$, $p<.05$). As anticipated, the majority of people (84%) considered Content were interested or very interested whereas a handful of people in this category regardless of a low salience of constraint experiences indicated no interest in visiting in future (13%) while the remaining expressed being unsure or having no evaluation. In terms of their perceptions/experiences with constraints, the Curious are significantly different from those expressing a low end constraint concerns ($F=5.50$, $p<.01$). Consequently, how interested an individual is in visiting in the future was dependent on what cluster group one belonged to.

Regarding what services or opportunities would potentially increase one's desire to visit the park more often or at all, none of the variables were statistically significant between groups as possible factors the park could consider in management/marketing decisions to assist with increasing visitation. Despite the non-statistical significance between cluster groups, three key findings are worth noting. First, providing organized and affordable bus tours from the metro/city area to RMNP was the only variable that resulted in nearly 2/3 of all respondents indicating "yes, this would increase my desire to visit;" all other factors resulted in the majority indicating "no" to not boosting ones' desire to visit. Second, having a visitor center or RMNP kiosk along the Front Range was the closest variable to having statistical significance at the $p<.05$ level. Third, as with the focus groups, the statement about whether having more ethnic minorities


working at the park would augment desire to visit resulted in a near split response (i.e., “no” = 56%; “yes” = 47%).

As noted earlier, there is no relationship between cluster group membership and what services or opportunities would increase visits. Despite no statistical significance, it is valuable to note the results from a frequency standpoint revealed the majority of respondents did not support the options provided (Table 9). Other ideas written in as open-ended comments that would increase visitation include: More information in other languages, cultural tolerance education for employees, more inviting literature or local advertisements, more information on park activities in general distributed locally, and African American events in the summer. Clearly this is an important area where further research is needed with a larger sample of the population involving other ethnic groups.

Table 9. Types of park services/opportunities that would increase desire to visit ¹

Item	YES		NO	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Organized/affordable bus tours	51	62%	31	38%
Greater variety of ethnic food options	24	29%	58	71%
Visitor center near community/metro area	30	37%	52	63%
More ethnic minorities employed at park	35	43%	47	57%
Expanded interp/educ. programs (cultural)	20	25%	62	75%

¹ All cells represent n=82 and total 100%



Specific Items Compared with Race/Ethnicity

To determine which specific items associated with race/ethnicity that may have the greatest influence on perceptions and experiences with constraints, a one-way ANOVA was completed on constraint statements comprising each dimension. Only three statements were statistically significant between racial groups at the observed $p < .05$ level. All of these were part of the concept measuring the question “to what extent

does each item prevent you from visiting RMNP?” and were collapsed from a 6-pt scale (including “don’t know” option) to 1=not at all, 2=yes, can influence decisions, 3=definitely prevents, and 4=don’t know:

- ▶ *I’ve heard stories in the past that bad things happened to people like me in some parks,*
- ▶ *Going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of my culture,*
- ▶ *My decisions to visit are influenced by the history of slavery or migrant labor.*

Only two items were very close to statistical significance including the need for convenient or affordable transportation to get to RMNP and the statement reflecting the belief that “people of my ethnicity or race are not very welcomed at places like RMNP.” For all five of these items, on average, while on the low end of the “prevent from visiting” scale (i.e., the Content), Latino respondents rated these higher than Blacks or mixed race people. In particular, although the mean differences are statistically significant for the “not at all” indicator, it is noteworthy to include the frequency results where both Latinos and Blacks responded equally to the statement *going to RMNP/other outdoor areas is not part of my culture* in terms of the response “yes, this can influence my decisions.” That is, less than ½ of both groups (i.e., 37%) reported this prevents them from visiting RMNP slightly or somewhat. This same item was asked as a general statement regarding whether an individual believes this merely describes them versus as a factor specifically preventing visits to RMNP or similar outdoor areas. There was no statistical significance between racial groups and the majority of all respondents disagreed with this as *not* being an accurate statement for them. However, as a general characteristic, more Blacks overall agreed this did pertain to them than the other groups.

Although not statistically significant regarding mean differences, African Americans rated the following sample statements, on average, higher than Latinos or

mixed race people in terms of the salience of these items as constraints (either in general or as measures preventing visitation): Lack of feeling welcome; inadequate facilities; beliefs that ‘people of my ethnicity or race’ have been discriminated against when visiting some parks and other outdoor areas; “stares and glares” by law enforcement personnel; avoidance (e.g., if might be uncomfortable because of ethnicity/race decision made to not go); lack of knowledge understanding benefits of visiting RMNP; and preference to recreate in settings where groups are different from their ethnicity or race.

Also not statistically significant, it is interesting to report examples where mixed race people, on average, rated the following statements higher in level of agreement than individuals’ identifying fully as Black or Latino: *If I don’t feel safe because of others at areas I want to visit, I will go to a different area; I visit the park with friends from different ethnic or racial groups; I do not have enough money to visit; and my family/friends never went to the park when I was a child.*

Last, in terms of the level of attachment to ones’ culture (although not statistically significant), African Americans had a stronger connection to all three of the primary culture measures of sense of identity (M=3.7, SD=.78), cultural connections (M=4.0, SD=1.09), and ethnic interaction preferences (M=2.6, SD=1.03). Mixed race people were second (and close) to Blacks in their average rating of cultural attachment based on ethnic interaction preferences (M=2.5; SD=1.24). Latinos had a greater attachment to their culture than the other groups based on language, religious/spiritual affiliation, and national origin (F=4.65, p<.01).

Limitations

Funding: Based on a limited budget the full Dillman method of survey research was reduced to a modified procedure. This included the fact an introductory postcard was not sent out. That is, we were unable to make preliminary contact with households in the sample to explain the purpose of the study and notify specific individuals that they had been selected for participation.

Over sampling option / mail back surveys: The literature suggests researchers should be prepared for small sample sizes, both statistically and logistically. One approach to ensure a sufficient return rate from minority communities to allow for generalization is to systematically *over sample* those tracts having higher concentrations of ethnic minorities in the target group. The project budget would not support this strategy. Because we did not have sufficient funds to “over sample,” the procedure for obtaining the sample occurred by Black and Hispanic household density strata is defined in this study as follows: High Black density included households in all predetermined counties with a Black population of 17% or more and the high Hispanic density consisted of households in all predetermined counties with a Hispanic or Latino population of 21% or more. These percentage density tracts were considered having the greatest hit rate, and were deemed as intuitively and theoretically more cost-efficient than over sampling these ethnic groups.

Non-response bias: The lower the response rate to a survey, the greater the likelihood that those who responded are significantly unlike those who did not, and so the greater the risk of systematic bias in the survey results. This particular analysis was discontinued

due to several problems administering the non-response test (e.g., resistance from the target audience, rude or abrupt reply, hang-ups) and the inability to contact potentially willing participants after numerous attempts made this response check unachievable.

“September 11”: The unpredictable catastrophe of 9-11-01 may have created an acute impact on the Delphi technique as the first phase of this study. There was an upward momentum of responses until that time. While it is sometimes, but not always, typical for response rates to decline after a certain period of time elapses (e.g., “study taking too long”), the fallout of 9-11 seems to have played a role as a factor in the decline of responses from this panel of experts.

Discussion

The results corroborate with past research clearly indicating there is no single, uniform constraint or experience with discrimination. Measuring situational influences (e.g., interpersonal, intrapersonal) can generate a better understanding of constraints to participation and choices of outdoor recreation behavior. The information obtained from this study has the potential to determine ways to mitigate some of these constraints where feasible and practical based on the park service mission.

The duration of the Delphi phase occurring during summer months which, coupled with the devastation of September 11, may have contributed to the low number of respondents in proportion to those who agreed to participate. A related aspect of this dynamic included the fact that one-third of the panel lived and worked in and around the New York and Washington, DC areas and “9-11” was a contrasting event serving to limit their participation.

Where the Three Shall Meet?

Corroborating with the literature (Dwyer, 1994; Jones, 1998; Parker & McDonough, 1999; Hutchison, 2000; Rodriguez & Roberts, 2002a), respondents in this study expressed high regard for outdoor recreation, strong values for parks, and genuine concern for the natural environment. There seems to be a persistent myth that ethnic minorities do not value the outdoors or related recreational activities (e.g., “we just don’t do that”). Instead, balance in nature and connecting with the “Creator” through special places are hallmarks of both African American and Latino lifestyles. In general, nearly 2/3 of all respondents indicated understanding the values their culture places on the natural environment is somewhat important to very important. Similarly, more than half indicated some positive level of interest in “learning about protecting nature” as an activity of interest in the next five years.

Taken together, all three methodological procedures point toward socioeconomic and gender issues of high consideration in the reporting of constraints, and that respondent perceptions and experiences also cut across ethnicity and culture in varying degrees. Consequently, from a statistical standpoint, analyses reveal that gender and income (i.e., class status) were the only two demographic variables that are more likely to influence what level or impact of consideration and salience the constraints have on individual perceptions and experiences with constraints to participation in outdoor recreation in natural areas in general or RMNP in particular. There was no interaction effect between these variables. Similarly, the comparison between Blacks and Latinos in the focus groups, as well as comments by key informants in the Delphi, was aligned with survey results. For instance, respondents in these phases indicated gender roles seem to


play a large part in the opinions or way of thinking about the outdoors and natural resources. Examples include involvement because of husband or male companion, concerns about daughters being outdoors, issues with hair and activities where women/girls would get dirty, and when participating women – in some cases – would remain “close to camp to watch the children and/or cook the meals”.

While “lack of transportation” (or reliable transportation) was a concern for people at some level, overall results also show that decisions to visit RMNP move beyond merely focusing on this issue (e.g., marginality) to the influence of cultural values and perceived discrimination regarding perceptions of the park or desire to visit. Consequently, the common ground in the results of all three methods includes the following constraint dimensions (see Figure 4):

- 1) Intrapersonal: Lack of knowledge of the benefits of visiting or participation regarding programs/activities (e.g., “what to do there”) and lack of range of opportunities of interest.
- 2) Interpersonal: Personal discomfort/safety issues, and socialization (e.g., “not part of my culture”), and exposure as a child.
- 3) Structural: Culture of the National Park Service (including lack of ethnic minorities in the workforce), perceived discrimination, and historical contexts;

Evidence of a hierarchical process of constraints experiences was not tested. That is, whether or not individuals responding in this study encounter constraints hierarchically first at the intrapersonal level, next interpersonally, then only when these constraints have been overcome that structural constraints occur was not determined.

Figure 4. The company of common constraints among all three methods ¹



¹ Total participants; $n = 175$

Cluster analysis was used to identify sub-groups of people characterized by similarities in the type, intensity, and combinations of constraints reported. The constraints typology developed can also help select the kinds of facilities and interpretation/education programs to increase the likelihood that opportunities for specific experiences desired by a growing number of ethnic minorities are available.

The majority of people were characterized by combinations of constraints that intersect the dimensions established by confirmatory factor analysis. Each cluster contained people affected by essentially two primary constraints lending support to the perceived discrimination hypothesis: *Culture of the NPS* and *perceived discrimination*. The high consideration group also reported the marginalized nature of ethnic minorities and access issues dimensions as being of greater concern constraining participation and increased visits than the other cluster groups.

Other dominant attributes in common, lending support to constraint theory with regarding structural, intra- and interpersonal constraints, include historical context,

discomfort and safety, lack of knowledge and awareness, and socialization issues. Some of these factors may cross racial boundaries other results seem to apply to ethnic minority communities. For example, historically there are many aspects that impact ethnic minority decisions to visit RMNP (Erickson, 2001). One aspect explored in this study was the consequence of slavery and migrant labor as having exerted negative meanings of the land as “work” and hard labor versus the sanctuary that whites found in it – respondents in all phases alluded to this as a consideration based on one foundation of their ancestry.

There were numerous responses to questions asked about discomfort and safety that surfaced in the focus group interviews and Delphi process providing relevant questions to ask on the survey. Discomfort and safety indices on the survey thus related to aspects of fear of the unknown, do not like bugs/wildlife, heard stories that “bad things have happened to people like me” at RMNP or other similar natural areas. While this index included the statement “I would personally not feel safe visiting the park” it is difficult to know why as only six people completed the option to explain. Two comments made were: “*I personally have no inferior thoughts on race issues, I just enjoy*” and “*Not a people issue, it’s an uninvited animal safety issue.*” On the other hand, two comments offer a contrasting perspective for why they would not feel safe at RMNP regarding other people as constraints:

I would use the term ‘yokels’ or ‘rednecks’ – other categories are prejudiced, white middle-class to bigoted upper ‘Anglo’ class people.

[African American male]

The rangers or other personnel assume I am there to cause trouble.

[Latina female]

There was an overall concurrence among respondents in all three phases that lack of knowledge and awareness was a strong consideration for under-representation in park visitation. On the questionnaire, for instance, key questions comprising this dimension related to not knowing much about RMNP, and poor understanding for benefits of visiting or participating in park activities (e.g., ranger-led interpretive programs). Interview responses were similar in descriptions provided. For example, individuals noted they did not know anything about RMNP or what the opportunities are for why they would want to visit. *How would I benefit?* was a common question asked back by respondents. Comments made by key informants in the Delphi phase were consistent with focus group participants such as lack of knowledge regarding the national park system and mission as well as the role of ethnic minorities in shaping the NPS over the years (e.g., early African American rangers, Buffalo Soldiers, Smoke Jumpers). Additionally, remarks included uncertainty about the opportunities at RMNP and other national parks as an issue.

Socialization issues in all three phases varied from childhood upbringing, to trust issues and the need for “social permission” from members of one’s community and peers. Individuals in both the focus groups and Delphi agreed that early childhood exposure to national parks is central to educating children about the parks and developing an interest and support in the future. This may or may not occur in family settings. The survey results showed the majority of people have not visited RMNP or other similar natural areas because “my family/friends never participated or went to RMNP when I was a child.” On the other hand, nearly 2/3 of all respondents disagreed with the statement “going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of my culture.” Outdoor recreation

is clearly very much a cultural norm; part of what this study revealed is the preference for leisure activities in neighborhood parks and/or local city parks for many reasons, some which are aforementioned.

Finally, as a supplemental area of inquiry, having more ethnic minorities working in the park was a fairly balanced concern among respondents in all three phases (e.g., approximately ½ of all individuals in each phase expressed this as a concern). Comments related to the need to educate the park staff regarding reasons for promoting ethnic diversity in employment. Having minority role models and “people like me” in leadership positions was very important to individuals in this study.

Conclusions

“I truly appreciate the effort being made to reach out to minority populations! It is a relevant issue that deserves attention.”

~ 24 year old Latina female

The findings of this study, for all three phases collectively, make a significant contribution to our understanding of leisure constraints specific to African American and Latino communities. Furthermore, results enable us to view the general theory of leisure constraints from a different perspective. As speculated by previous research, a couple of noteworthy additions to the body of knowledge on this subject are as follows: 1) Some groups may experience entirely different types of constraints; and 2) The conventional dimensions of constraints believed to hold for any population may require some modifications before they can be successfully applied to minority populations.

On the basis of this analysis from triangulating the data, several conclusions supporting both the discrimination hypothesis and constraints theory can be drawn. First,

race, ethnicity, and culture (independently or some combination thereof) are factors that study participants could articulate when they discussed their attitudes or experiences relating to Rocky Mountain National Park and other similar natural areas. This fact notwithstanding, important to note is that for some ethnic minorities, culture was a larger factor than for others. Latinos noted that language issues and national origin, for instance, heavily influenced one's perception, and this was not a concern with Blacks or mixed race people. On the other hand, more Blacks had a slightly stronger attachment to their culture based on their sense of identity, connections to cultural norms and traditions, and ethnic interaction preferences. Mixed race people reported the lowest sense of identity score, a fairly high cultural connections score, and strong affiliations based on religious ties.

The structural constraint dimension relating to *culture of the NPS* is a universal characteristic among respondents to some degree in all three phases. Lack of ethnic minorities on staff, not enough opportunities of interest, inadequate facilities, and the perception that RMNP is intended for middle-to upper class white people are examples highlighting the high average survey ratings with a strong parallel to comments resulting from focus group interviews and responses from Delphi participants. One key informant stated:

“I believe the fairly rigid National Park Service definition of what a national park service visitor should do and how the visitor should do it is, after the obvious economic barrier by lower income families, is the biggest constraint to ethnic/cultural diversity among national park visitors.”

Likewise, one Latina woman speaking in her native Spanish stated, *“I think color or race is not as important or where you are from, the important thing is that the park staff –*

including police rangers – need to be educated on how to relate better with people from different cultures.”

One common denominator is for NPS managers to recognize the interconnectedness of their actions and the fact that the difficult questions they face are ultimately questions of value judgments and the desire for social change, not supplying political rhetoric. Social science is a key input to decision-making, but this represents only part of the answer. Hence, results show the need to sort out economic-based questions and issues from those that are social and/or political in nature. And, most important, there is a need to strike a balance between them.

A significant result from all three phases is that while race and ethnicity should not be overlooked, this is not the most salient factor contributing to ones constraint experiences and perceptions. Additionally, education, family status (e.g., children living at home), and work/employment status were not significantly related to constraints; these factors—along with race/ethnicity—is consistent with the assimilation paradigm.

When comparing groups for significant differences, gender and income have a stronger relationship to constraints as reflected in the focus groups and survey, and to a lesser degree of salience with the Delphi panel of experts. Results corroborated findings from previous studies on gender where, for example, females report higher constraint scores than males (e.g., Arnold & Shiness, 1998; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1993; Jackson & Henderson, 1995; Virden & Walker, 1999). Additionally, social class may have a more powerful influence on participation and nonparticipation than what may be truly understood or perceived (Hartmann & Overdeest, 1989; Hutchison, 2000; Philipp, 1995). As noted by Crawford et al. (1991), constraints experiences may be more related

to a *hierarchy of social privilege*. Nonetheless, results of this study also indicate neither gender-specific nor socioeconomic factors alone are adequate explanations of these differentials but these two sets of variables influence the determination of racial-ethnic differences in park visitation and constraints to participation/visiting.

The challenges in addressing the constraints facing African Americans and Latinos along the Front Range of Colorado – regarding outdoor recreation – go beyond race and must be considered in terms of social and economic terms rather than exclusively ethnic or cultural ones. With the changing demographics comes a changing “ethnic economy.” We must better understand the implications. Although “times have changed,” we cannot ignore the importance of economic factors in contributing to both constraint and discrimination theories. That is, as discovered in this study, outdoor recreational decisions of both Blacks and Latinos depend largely on their economic resources as well as their cultural resources.

As noted by Pickering (2000b) each society (or community) has its own understanding of the “economic behaviors and values” for that community. The need for sensitivity to cultural conceptions of economy is paramount in any field of study and outdoor recreation and resource management is no exception.

Inquiring about ones perception and/or experience with *discrimination* in the outdoors can be a powerful and loaded assertion. Historically, for example, there were rules and regulations excluding Blacks from participation in public parks and beaches. Although the Civil Rights and other similar movements have helped diminish these prohibitions, lingering effects have impacted people’s attitudes and perceptions in varying ways. “The persistence of discrimination, even among those who are

educationally most similar, implies that discrimination – at least as a residual measure – cannot be ignored (or declared overestimated) and may have historically been as central to explanations of SES gaps as education itself” (Marks, 1993, p. 167).

Results show noticeable support for the discrimination hypothesis. In the focus group interviews nobody expressed experiencing any overt or blatant discrimination. All experiences and perceptions on this topic revolved around discomfort with other visitors (e.g., examples provided about white visitors), displacement (e.g., moving from one location to another to avoid being on the receiving end of potential discriminatory acts), and avoidance (e.g., not visiting certain areas because of preconceived fears, stories they heard from elders, things they have read).

Where discrimination surfaced for informants participating in the Delphi phase was with inequity of national park facilities and opportunities (e.g., not accommodating extended families or neighborhood groups), perception by ethnic minorities that the national parks are an “exclusive club” for middle-upper class white people and “are not welcoming” to minorities. Other common themes for this category pertained to hiring procedures, park programs, and interpretive efforts geared to the mainstream, traditional audiences. Again, regarding the survey results, it is interesting to note this concept of *perceived discrimination*, measured by seven items recurring in these first two phases, was among the top-ranked constraint for the majority of respondents.

Furthermore, the structural constraint of institutional racism is a powerful, very real, and largely documented problem among Native American communities in anthropology and ethnographic studies (Pickering, 2000a), yet scholars in parks and recreation continue to dance around this issue with Blacks and Latinos calling it

“perceived discrimination.” The constraint dimension, for example, of “culture of the NPS” received the highest rating among all cluster groups as the greatest barrier to visiting RMNP more often or at all. The underlying strength of racism as a potentially very real issue should not be overlooked, rather addressed head on. The NPS has made a variety of concerted efforts at educating employees internally about the “need” for outreach; special programs and initiatives have occurred in some areas, and a few collaborative management efforts have only just begun (e.g., Golden Gate National Recreation Area). Ethnic minority communities, however, from the lay-person up to solid leaders and professionals continue to express lack of connection – not to the land, special places, and spectacular natural beauty, but a disconnect from how the Park Service manages these areas and conducts their business. This needs to change if attitudes towards the NPS will change. Results of this study suggest the need for the NPS to help mitigate the constraining forces and encourage more broad-based, integrative approaches to enhancing outdoor recreation and improving natural resources education.

National Parks have really always been, and always will be, cultural icons. The management structure, political pressures, and heavy historical military influence have contributed to the current perceptions of these special places and often activities that may occur there as “a white thing.” Enormous efforts have taken place over the years by the NPS to welcome diversity and be more inclusive. Now is the time for the vision of the American dream we have for our parks to

Welcome to post-ethnic America. You may not have heard much about it yet, since it hasn't fully seeped into the intellectual and political realms that define the national discourse on racial issues. But it's in full bloom on American streets and in the marketplace, changing the long-standing notions of ethnicity and race and reshaping interpersonal relationships in a manner that would have been unthinkable a generation ago.

~ Washington Post, 2003, p. B1.

become real. We need to fulfill a vision of the dream for our national parks in which we are liberated from the politics of race to openly embrace any style, cultural dialogue, or image of parks as special places to all of us in some capacity regardless of what that might be. Learning about the attitudes, perceptions, and experiences of different ethnic and cultural groups has huge merit; this fact is indisputable. As reflected in this study, this means there is still a need to understand these facets about ethnic minorities to ensure or enhance their national park experience. Finally, at some point the National Park Service must adjust to the new “post-ethnic” reality because this is a trend that will only accelerate.

Management Implications

The lessons learned from this study may also contribute to understanding implications for park management regarding other public land agencies (more broadly), policy directives, staff training, marketing and outreach to diverse communities, and workforce enhancement. While this study revolved around Rocky Mountain National Park as the institution of concern, the results have nationwide implications relating to similar natural resource units. The observations of Gramann, Floyd, and Ewert (quoted in Floyd & Johnson, 2002), illustrate the way ethnic minorities may view recreation areas: “It is evident among outdoor recreationists that how people of color define recreation settings has begun to challenge researchers’ and agencies normative ideals regarding how natural areas should be experienced and managed” (p. 71).

While individuals may define recreation settings in varying ways and ascribe different meanings to “the outdoors,” some ethnic minorities, in particular, may lack

understanding of the value and/or benefits of some outdoor pursuits. Hence, one of the most important things national parks can do is continue to introduce anyone who has lacked exposure, and youth in particular, to the wonders of nature in a memorable, positive way. One cannot care about that which one does not know; developing a deeper relationship with nature provides a certain degree of respect or appreciation for something they have ultimately experienced first-hand.

While early research efforts on race and ethnicity in outdoor recreation have focused on explaining differences in leisure participation, recent studies have directed new attention to the importance of examining ethnic identity as a variable in order to comprehend the degree and form of influence that ethnicity takes in regards to recreation management (Rodriguez, 1996). For example, for most of their lives, Latinos born in this country may view themselves, and their experience as American through the prism of their ethnic identity.

Policy implications

From a policy standpoint, there are a variety of reasons why RMNP and other land management agencies must harvest support of ethnic minority communities. A lack of education about the Park Service mission and mandates in preserving and protecting these sites for enjoyment of present and future generations only harms the efforts to accomplish this purpose. Similarly, the Service must be inclusive and committed to public involvement and stakeholder needs in whatever capacity possible based on resources available. Experience shows that ignoring or failing to include multiple perspectives can be one of the ingredients that ultimately cause the NPS to face costly, time-consuming controversy and legal challenges. By working more closely with the

general public (e.g., interested parties) RMNP can build stronger public and political support for the decision-making processes and the outcome that may be produced. By attaining this type of ongoing, long-term objective, relationships with minority communities are enhanced, public trust is augmented, and help from a more diverse public in carrying out the stewardship mission is secured.

Staff training

As noted by Floyd and Johnson (2002), “Aside from satisfying policy mandates, an improved understanding of what leads to disparate negative impacts on people of color and low-income communities in the context of recreation management results in better delivery of services and benefits, and ultimately improved quality of life” (p. 60).

Discrimination, for instance, is a sensitive issue and is difficult to address. Of all the sources of perceived discrimination in the study, those stemming from ‘culture of the NPS’ (e.g., law enforcement, facilities, visitor services, diverse staff) may be the most feasible to remedy. Awareness and sensitivity training of staff, for instance, could help minimize perceptions of discrimination, but more often a stronger commitment is needed.

Marketing and outreach

Regarding participation patterns, at least half all respondents had been to the park and, of these, approximately 1/3 noted they visit once or twice per year with fewer visiting 3-6 times per year. Additionally, the majority of visitors most often recreate with family. In the past two years, the majority of respondents have enjoyed activities such as cookout/BBQ with family and/or friends, scenic viewing, fishing, and wildlife viewing. The survey included what activities might be of interest in the next five years; more nature-related and passive activities were given the most positive attention (i.e., wildlife

viewing, bird watching, cookout/BBQ, outdoor nature photography, learning about protecting nature, scenic viewing). When marketing or involved in public relations with ethnic minority groups, opportunities for families should be encouraged and these types of activities promoted.

Another outlook of what patterns are most likely to exist is that the majority of all respondents in the study expressed some level of interest in visiting RMNP in the future whether or not they had ever been. Furthermore, participants in the survey phase were asked what types of park services and opportunities would increase their desire to visit the park. The most popular response was “organized/affordable bus tours from metropolitan area to the park” followed by more ethnic minorities working at the park and a park visitor center (e.g., Kiosk) near my community or metro area. These are all important factors for management consideration.

Workforce enhancement

Support for outreach and inclusive visitor experiences must come from the highest levels of RMNP and sustained at all sections and sub-divisions of the park. Diversity must be valued at the park; in this regard, clear measures of what is meant by “diversity” needs to be established and all employees ought to comprehend the foundation of why this is essential. Point of views will indisputably vary and should be valued within this park as well as agency-wide; the key is that employees must understand the reasoning behind the decisions that are made and that their expertise, knowledge, and opportunity for involvement are invited. This includes cultivating the intellectual capacity for knowing why a more ethnically diverse staff is vital for the future.

For the NPS overall, having a diverse workforce is only one aspect of being a diverse agency. Whether RMNP, as the focus of this study, serves ethnically diverse populations, represents all cultures, and groups respectfully, designs and develops facilities to be inclusive, and has programs – which address multi-cultural issues – are aspects of diversity for the park to address. One of the main barriers to change in the area of diversity is “fear.” Park employees are often afraid they will be impacted and may be afraid of offending others amidst their efforts.

These issues raise other interesting management-related questions: To what degree should the National Park Service and other federal land management agencies be sensitive to these cultural differences and needs of different ethnic communities? To what extent to current management frameworks and practices maintain the status quo and how can this be mitigated to truly embrace “diversity”?

Recommendations

To better manage RMNP, a heightened understanding of the values, attitudes, perceptions, and experiences (e.g., behaviors) of the ethnic minorities they serve is very important. RMNP can effectively meet the recreational needs by recognizing and incorporating the diverse set of values, perceptions, and activity interests of ethnic minority communities by also involving them in planning, decision making, and implementation of outdoor recreation initiatives. For instance, it is common knowledge that local community involvement and participation in parks and recreation services is important for the preservation of healthy park lands. Subsequently, assessing ethnic minority populations’ values and perceptions of the natural environment (including

wildlife), and educating them about the importance and value that RMNP has on their local urban communities (e.g., metropolitan Denver) should lead to increased feelings of ownership.

For instance, as noted a decade ago by Berry and Gordon (1993), the change of environmental leadership *seems* to be changing toward a more participatory and open model. This has, indeed, become more of a “norm” within the NPS (in particular) especially with NPS Director Fran Mainella’s philosophy of establishing a “seamless network of parks” accompanied by her recent Director’s Order (D.O.) 75A, *Public Participation and Community Engagement*. The NPS strategic plan “Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century” (NPS Advisory Board Report, 2001) also endorses and is leading the way for more community-based participation. The challenge continues to be inviting people from under-represented groups to the table; establishing a venue for voices of ethnic minorities, specifically, has not been an easy task.

As indicated in the draft D.O. on *Civic Engagement and Public Involvement* (Office of Policy and Regulations, 2003), the overarching purpose include “all NPS units and offices embrace civic engagement as the essential foundation and framework for creating plans and developing programs.” Accordingly, adopting a philosophy and vision of civic engagement means “we do more than meet the minimum legal requirements for public involvement in our decisions and activities. It means a regular, natural and sustained level of interaction with people, both from within and outside the NPS.” A core component of this D.O. revolves around the fact that true civic engagement is “a continuous, dynamic conversation with the public on many levels.” An essential ingredient, relevant to the importance of this section is the emphasis on collaboration

with others and “building long-term collaborative relationships with a broad range of stakeholder communities.” The scope of specific policies, benefits, standards, responsibilities, and accountability is clearly explained in this D.O. Hence, recommendations also advise RMNP staff to read, become familiar with, and comply with the content of this D.O. when it is approved and becomes effective.

Because of the structure of government relations and policies, the NPS is not permitted to engage in marketing, per se. When this occurs—if at all—it is typically the undertaking of the parks’ Friends Group or collective effort of various community partners. *Social marketing*, on the other hand, could be utilized as a way of promoting social ideas and recreation behaviors to benefit both individuals and society as a whole (Bright, 2000). In making use of this approach, Bright (2000) suggests several strategies for social marketing including being customer-focused in that the agency should comprehend the values, needs, and desires of their audience. Also important to the results of this study, is his premise that use of market segmentation techniques should target groups of people whose members have similar relevant characteristics; these groups become a focal point for developing programs and determining what emphasis is placed on what types of information.

The following examples provide recommendations and outreach strategies for RMNP, and other national parks as deemed appropriate for specific geography and local populations:

Reduce Constraints

1. Produce multilingual brochures/publications and have them readily and easily available at various park locations. Multilingual recruitment, outreach, and

- interpretive materials and other communication resources are important (e.g., park newspaper: “High Country Headlines”).
2. Assess and incorporate needs of diverse populations in park facility and program development (e.g., interpretation/education, visitor services). Design public participation processes to be open and inclusive of ethnic minority populations to assist with collaborative decision-making. Clearly, if park policies based on mandates should conflict with public involvement provisions, the statute and/or regulation should govern.
 3. Develop partnerships with Front Range ethnic community groups and encourage collaboration. Increase contacts with urban schools/teachers, and other multi-ethnic agencies.
 4. Conduct public meetings with the local [Estes Park] Latino community to obtain input and ideas to ensure diversity in decisions affecting visitor use.
 5. Review hiring practices to identify and address any hiring barriers. Recruit and recognize staff with bilingual skills.

Increase Awareness

1. Incorporate diversity component at seasonal interpreter trainings and meetings.
2. Expand visitor and employee surveys to incorporate diversity-related questions.
3. Market to under-represented audiences using communication modes of greatest use and interest (e.g., articles of interest submitted to printed, radio, and television news media widely read by ethnic community groups).
4. Promote an image of diversity through careful selection of photographs, print articles, touch-tone monitors at visitor centers, and other media.

5. Allow time for District Supervisors and/or Park Rangers to conduct outreach to diverse communities along the Front Range (e.g., through presentations, attendance at board and staff meetings with established community programs, planning youth programs for those not currently being reached, create an urban junior rangers).
6. Publicize the successes of diversity efforts as routine component of park newspaper and other public material.

Program Improvement/Enhance Opportunities

1. Revitalize the *Corps of Discovery* program established in 1998 by the former Chief of Interpretation, Bill Gwaltney. This program was created to give diverse urban populations access to the same high quality programs and services that other park visitors experience. Park managers should encourage and support the interpretation staff in bringing the national park and awareness of the extraordinary outdoor recreation opportunities back into the community. Six primary programs were once active with leadership of staff liaisons; today, one remains in effect (i.e., Beckwourth Outdoor Education Center). Either these can be reinstated or new partnerships can be formed. Strong leadership and overcoming staff resistance can ensure success. (The education staff has an established outreach component with Front Range schools, including metropolitan Denver).
2. Determine what kinds of interpretation and educational programs should be developed to reach ethnic minority communities with both a national parks message and relevance to culture where applicable.

3. Continue and expand the *Native American Lifestyles* program and consider other historical and/or contemporary programs representing other cultural groups use of RMNP (e.g., *Life and Times of the Black Cowboy*).
4. Promote diversity with volunteer participation in park programs.
5. Continue and expand exhibits, waysides, and visitor displays to reflect cultural values of the complete history of the park.

On a pragmatic, more applied level, RMNP, in cooperation with minority organizations along the Front Range, could conduct a national park education campaign through those media outlets most utilized by ethnically diverse communities. RMNP must develop a plan to ascertain (e.g., long term) if progress has been made. Developing benchmarks of success will ensure a “win-win” for everyone overall.

Future Research Needs

Each of the research techniques presented in this study raises a number of conceptual, methodological, and interpretation considerations vital to carrying out culturally relevant research. Issues related to the historical and socio-cultural realities, for instance, of ethnic minorities under investigation must be considered with an emphasis on helping the researcher ask the appropriate questions as research activities are prepared and developed. Consequently, communication and language issues must be considered more readily. In addition, the NPS specifically should study the social, political and economic impacts of non-white populations that do not have access to our national parks. As touched upon in this current study, what works well in increasing services to communities that have not had access to RMNP also needs to be studied.

Communication and power dynamics

Communication and language issues must be well thought-out in an effort to assist scholars with developing tools or strategies that are useful and effective with the populations to be investigated. Additionally, a consistent theme throughout each of the three phases of this study, pertinent for future, relates to the need to interpret and disseminate the research findings that are meaningful and relevant to the populations, and that reflect a fundamental knowledge of the racial, cultural, and sociopolitical context within which they exist.

According to Floyd, “another area of increasing importance, and where no research has been conducted, is communication involving minority groups” (1999, p. 19). He proceeds with the following sample questions that are basic and typically omitted from scientific investigation:

“What information sources are used by minorities in planning recreational trips? How do members of minority groups obtain information about national parks? What is the relative effectiveness of different methods of communicating with minority groups, particularly non-users?” (p. 19)

Fundamental to these questions is the notion that all communication is, on some level, intercultural and thereby related to the notion of *power*. Consequently, as a central process in the creation and negotiation of *meaning* (e.g., of the resource or recreation activities), or benefits of participation/park visits and communication, regardless of its motive, cannot be isolated from issues of power. For instance, Martin & Nakayana (2000) indicate this stance is not necessarily about adapting to given sets of norms within specific cultures or contexts, armed with appropriate communicative behavior. Rather, it is about becoming aware of one’s dynamic position of power within a larger and more complex social structure. We can link this perspective to national parks in that, as part of

a larger power structure, the management efforts at communicating to the general public have been dedicated to the dominant user groups (e.g., mainstream or traditional users). There is a growing need however, to acknowledge that intercultural communication is a daily part of life and decision-makers must learn to live within the changing social dynamics of park management that this need represents.

Suggested Methods

While mixed method studies will continue to be crucial for obtaining a variety of results from different data gathering techniques, my conviction (as supported by the literature) is that qualitative methods provide the richest data when studying people from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. How ethnic minorities make sense of their lives, experiences, and structures of the world can be understood more deeply with qualitative research designs. Depending on the target population, one method (or multiple methods) may be more appropriate than another; similarly, methods may need to be adapted to fit a certain community (McAvoy, et al., 2000). Furthermore, research should examine cross-cultural differences in perceptions of natural resources in general, and national parks in particular using more ethnically diverse populations and, as noted in Gobster (2002), a wider range of sensory dimensions and analytical methods should be used than in the past. This fact notwithstanding, a series of research approaches are recommended that provide common ground for both Blacks and Latinos to remain succinct in this section.

Based on both lessons learned as well as results verified by previous research, several recommended techniques for conducting research with Blacks and Latinos are presented. First, an ethnographic approach will continue to be much more valuable in

the future. For example, the focus group phase in this study had the most merit. Having the opportunity for face-to-face dialogue with open-ended questions provided the depth of response required to truly comprehend the myriad of experiences and issues, and determine new ways to help “roll out the welcome mat.” Working through established community groups such as neighborhood groups, community activists, or churches is an effective way to connect and ensure some success with the process.

Second, other approaches using individual/personal interviews, researching historical archives, and conducting oral histories would provide solid ingredients for reaching new heights. Regardless of what approach is used, offering an incentive to individuals or community-based organizations opening their doors, would greatly increase the support and likelihood of participation by members of these communities.

Theoretical Frameworks

A variety of reviews have occurred investigating what theories have been developed, tested, criticized, triumphant, or remain largely unexplored (see Allison, 1988; Benepe, 1992; Floyd, 1999; Gómez, 2002; Gramann, 1996; Hutchison, 2000; Johnson, et al., 1997). In addition to theories currently needing further refinement, testing, and advancements to make progress, fresh perspectives integrating ethnographic analyses that incorporate feminist theories and perspectives, rational choice theories, critical theories, symbolic interactionism, and ethnic boundary maintenance may provide new directions for future research.

First, feminist theories have been employed in leisure research and should continue to provide a greater understanding of social change and may support inquiry into gender roles, gender identities, or gender relations (Henderson, et al., 1999).

Henderson and others affirm that gender is reflected in cultural norms and societal structures that may lead to immediate circumstances such as participation, perceived benefits or constraints to leisure all which are applicable to exploring issues in conjunction with ethnicity and social class.

Second, rational choice theory (RCT), originally developed in the 1940s and 50s within the discipline of economics, has emerged over time with widespread use in sociology and psychology to explain decision-making (Scott, 1999). A major component is to build a model that helps us explain and understand various social phenomena. This theory was tested in a study employing cluster analysis where deVries and deBruin (1996) classified respondents according to the constraints they considered relevant to their participation in outdoor recreation. Typically beginning with an individual who has certain preferences and faces constraints, RCT provides a framework for how best to achieve the preferences given the set of constraints and choices available. Scott (1999) explains that RCT attempts to explain social norms and how collective action can emerge from individual decision-making as well as aims to look at individual action and interaction within “social systems” with the idea of building models that can explain larger phenomena (e.g., perceptions of national parks; constraints to participation in outdoor/natural areas).

Third, nearly fifteen years ago Henderson (1989) provided rationale for using the critical theory model for studying race, class, and gender in relation to recreation and leisure. This framework, as applied to sociology, provides a model for social reality, or how social reality ought to be. Unfortunately there has been an absence of this approach in the literature since she brought this forth to the profession. Given the results of the

present study, this model makes sense to employ in future in contributing to the discovery of the meaning of leisure (e.g., outdoor recreation, wilderness use) for ethnic minorities. Applying the critical theory model would shed light on the leisure experiences for people of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Fourth, use of symbolic interactionism as a qualitative tradition for more than forty years would substantially enhance our understanding of how different ethnic and cultural groups interpret the natural environment. In other words, it provides a model for studying how people interpret objects, events, and other individuals' in their lives, and for investigating how the process of interpretation leads to a certain behavior in specific situations (Henderson, 1991; Miles & Huberman, 1994). People do not act toward social structures or institutions or roles, per se, they act toward situations, and the individual defines the situation. Consequently, as humans, actions (e.g., behaviors) occur on the basis of meanings these "symbols" (e.g., nature, recreational activity) have for us as individuals. As noted by Henderson (1991), meaning determines action, and interpretation (e.g., of a situation, event, object) is a way to handle meaning that, for an individual, is central in its own right. Symbolic interactionism can be used in a variety of qualitative or quantitative methods and can be particularly useful as a perspective for "understanding theoretical issues of freedom and constraint in leisure" (Samdal, in Henderson, 1991).

Finally, one framework underutilized on this topic in the field of parks and recreation that I strongly advocate is *ethnic boundary maintenance*. Founded in Anthropology, the premise is groups that come into contact with one another initiate and maintain on-going relationships of interethnic negotiation. These informal and frequently

subconscious negotiations define the rules, nature, and quality of present and future interactions between groups. When ethnic groups view themselves as persecuted or discriminated against, they often react by maintaining social, psychological, and physical boundaries between themselves and other groups. These boundaries inhibit the assimilation process. This concept may be one reason for the persistence, despite increasing contact with other cultures, of the distinctive ethnic identities of certain ethnic/cultural groups (Barth 1969 in Allison, 1988; see also Gramann, 1996).

Non-Response Bias

Direct information about the non-responding households is valuable, although by definition difficult to obtain. Future research should consider obtaining as much information as possible about non-respondents a priority. Any information that can be obtained about the non-respondents would be useful both in terms of future attempts to improve the overall response rate and also potentially improve the weighting of sample results.

For years, research has shown that individuals who participate in outdoor recreation typically have a higher level of education than those who do not (ORCA, 2000; NSRE, 2000). For example, more than half of all outdoor enthusiasts for most activities have completed some level of college education. Of all the SES variables, Marks (1993) asserts that demographers have been most hopeful about the declining gaps in education attainment levels between African Americans and whites, for instance. While the gap is narrowing it still exists, however, and any optimistic assessment must of necessity end with the caveat that there is still a long way to go in both decreasing the gap

in general and enhancing recreational use of natural areas as a result of increasing levels of education.

Need for New or Expanded Models

In the present study constraint dimensions that stand out as needing further investigation include the culture of the NPS and perceived discrimination, in particular. Additionally, cultural conflicts such as relationships and experiences with other visitors, historical underpinnings, and attention to the lack of workforce diversity need more attention.

Given the assortment of results among the different study phases, more information must be gathered in different regions across the country coupled with a shift in perspective in conducting future research of this kind. We agree with Sasidharan (2002) in his conclusion that new outcomes might reveal there are really more similarities than dissimilarities, both across and within cultural groups, in regard to outdoor recreation characteristics, thereby alleviating some of the agony facing park managers and policymakers. This has yet to be observed.

The concept of constraint negotiation has been explored to a minimal degree yet in varying ways (e.g., factors relating to gender – see Henderson and Bialeschki, 1993). And, as noted by Samdahl and Jekubovich (1997), “even the busiest people purposefully set aside time for themselves on a regular basis to ensure that their personal needs are being met, often rearranging work and family schedules so that their free time could be shared with another person. In these interviews, the idea that constraints are negotiated seemed to be more salient than the idea that barriers exist actually blocking participation” (p. 446). A new (or expanded) model based on the premise of *negotiation* with ethnic

minorities ought to be developed to provide a more effective framework for understanding how constraints are negotiated versus speculation of mere lack of involvement.

Furthermore, although her research focuses on Native Americans, the parallel of some of Pickering's general findings to the present study, and basic viewpoint in relation to other minority groups, is remarkable (Pickering, 2000a). For example, when discussing economic implications of gender identities (e.g., single parent households), conflicts over political and economic futures, expectations to follow models of mainstream white society/hidden pressures for assimilation, and attitudes and behavior based on ethnicity (e.g., full blood versus mixed ancestry), are common denominators worth understanding and pursuing in future research.

Last, new models must begin to incorporate the experiences of mixed-race people. Before the Census, mixed-race people were forced into the "pick one" syndrome acknowledging one part of their ancestry, while denying the others. The "check all that apply" option on the latest Census changed that and the NPS social science program fortunately subscribed to this milestone by permitting multiple choices for self-ascribed racial and ethnic identity for survey designs. Among the issues in data analysis is whether our growing identity as a separate group (e.g., "mixed-race") dilutes the longtime efforts of research in outdoor recreation and human dimensions of resource management. Do people from mixed-heritage backgrounds, as a smaller but growing proportion of the population lose their ability to speak with a strong voice? Instead they could be ignored as "negligible" due to low representation. Researchers must continue to educate themselves about the roles minorities and mixed-race people have played in the

parks and recreation movement. With that knowledge, researchers can paint a more complete picture of the mixed-race experience. Trends and new generations are showing growth of diverse cultures that are rapidly transcending old racial barriers and redefining familiar racial themes (e.g., hip-hop music, clothing, food).

LITERATURE CITED

- Aldenderfer, M.S. & Blashfield, R.K. (1984). *Cluster analysis for the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Allison, M.T. (1988). Breaking boundaries and barriers: Future directions in cross-cultural research. *Leisure Sciences*, 10, 247-259.
- Andersen, M.L. (1993). Studying across difference: Race, class and gender in qualitative research. In, J.H. Stanfield and R.M. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in research methods*, pp. 39-52. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Anderson, D.H. & Schneider, I.E. (1993). Using the Delphi process to identify significant recreation research-based innovations. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 11(1), 25-36.
- Arnold, M. L., & Shiness, K. J. (1998). The role of gender, race, and income on park use constraints. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 16(4), 39-56.
- Babbie, E. (1990). *The practice of social research, 8th ed.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Banks, J. & McGee, C.A. (2001). *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives, 4th Ed.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Baughman, M.J. (1985). Effective use of the Delphi process. In R.A. Leary (Ed.), *Discovering new knowledge about trees and forests* (US Forest Service GTR No. NC-135, pp. 69-76). St. Paul, MN: North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Benepe, S. (1992). *Racial and ethnic diversity in wilderness use and environmental education*. Unpublished manuscript. Lander, WY: National Outdoor Leadership School.
- Berry, J.K. & Gordon, J.C. (1993). *Environmental leadership: Developing effective skills and styles*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Bright, A.D. (2000). The role of social marketing in leisure and recreation management. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 12-17.
- Chavez, D. J. (1996). Leisure experiences of Hispanic families [Abstract]. *Proceedings of the NRPA Symposium on Leisure Research*, National Recreation & Park Association, 67.

- Chavez, D. J. (1991). *Crowding and discrimination: The unwelcome guests in wildland recreation*. Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters. "Pacific Rim Forestry: Bridging the World", San Francisco, CA.
- Clark, R.N. & Stankey, G.H. (1991). New forestry or new perspectives? The importance of asking the right questions, *Forest Perspectives*, 1(1), 9-13.
- Comas-Díaz, L. (2001). Hispanics, Latinos or Americanos: The evolution of identities. *Cultural diversity and ethnic minority populations*, 7(2), 115-120.
- Crawford, D.W., Jackson, E.L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 309-320.
- Crawford, D.W. & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure, *Leisure Sciences*, 9, 119-127.
- Creative Research Systems (2001). Survey design. Retrieved October 22, 2001, from <http://www.surveysystem.com/sdesign.htm>
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Dent, G. (1992). *Black popular culture*. Seattle, WA: Bay Press.
- deVries, S. & deBruin, A.H. (1996). Between real constraints and leisure participation, *Loisir & Societe-Society and Leisure*, 19(1), 119-150.
- Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method*, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dolsen, D. & Machlis, G.E. (1991). Response rates and mail recreation survey results: How much is enough? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23(3), 272-277.
- Erickson, E. B. (2001). Rocky Mountain National Park: History and meanings as constraints to African American park visitation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Ewert, A. (Ed.). (1996). *Natural resource management: The human dimension*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Feagin, J.R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Antiblack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 101-116.
- Floyd, M. F. & C. Y. Johnson (2002). Coming to terms with environmental justice in outdoor recreation: A conceptual discussion with research implications. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 59-77.

- Floyd, M. (1999). *Race, ethnicity and use of the National Park System*. National Park Service, 1: 1-24. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior.
- Floyd, M.F., Gramann, J.H., & Saenz, R. (1993). Ethnic factors and the use of public outdoor recreation areas: The case of Mexican Americans. *Leisure Sciences, 15*, 83-98.
- Floyd, M.F. & Gramann, J.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.
- Franklin, J.H. (2001). Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century. Retrieved April 23, 2002, from <http://www.nps.gov/policy/futurereport.htm>
- Gobster, P.H. (2002). Managing urban parks for a racially and ethnically diverse clientele. *Leisure Sciences, 24*, 143-159.
- Gobster, P. H., & Delgado, A. (1993). Ethnicity and recreation use in Chicago's Lincoln Park. In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing Urban and High-Use Recreation Settings* (pp. 75-81). General Technical Report NC-163. St Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Gobster, P.H. (Ed.). (1993). *Managing Urban and High-Use Recreation Settings*. North American Symposium on Society and Resource Management GTR, NC-163. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Gómez, E. (2002). The ethnicity and public recreation model ©. *Leisure Sciences, 24*, 123-142.
- Gómez, E. (1999). Reconceptualizing the relationship between ethnicity and public recreation. A proposed model (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*, 10A.
- Gramann, J. H. (1996). Ethnicity, race, and outdoor recreation: A review of trends, policy, and research (Miscellaneous Paper R-96-1). Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.
- Gramann, J, Shaull, S. & Saenz, R. (1995). Cultural assimilation and the importance of family-related and nature-related recreation experiences among Hispanic Americans in California [Abstract]. *NRPA Symposium on Leisure Research*, National Recreation & Park Association.

- Henderson, K.A. & Bialeschki, M.D (2002). Evaluating leisure services: Making enlightened decisions, 2nd ed. State College, PA: Venture.
- Henderson, K.A. (1991). Dimensions of choice: A qualitative approach to recreation, parks, and leisure research. State College, PA: Venture.
- Henderson, K.A. (1989). The need for a critical theory in the study of leisure and minority groups. *Leisure Information Quarterly*, 15(3), 1-3.
- Hilton, S.C. (2002). Cultural factors of visitors' understanding of U.S. National Park Service natural resource messages. Unpublished dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Hutchison, R. (2000). Race and ethnicity in leisure studies. In W.C. Gartner and D.W. Lime (Eds.), *Trends in Outdoor Recreation, Leisure and Tourism*. Cambridge, MA: CAB International.
- Hutchison, R. (1988). A critique of race, ethnicity, and social class in recent leisure-recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(1), 10-30.
- Jackson, E. L. (2000). Will research on leisure constraints still be relevant in the twenty-first century? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1): 62-68.
- Jackson, E.L. & Scott, D. (1999). Constraints to leisure. In E.L. Jackson & T.L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the Twenty-First century*, pp. 299-321. State College, PA: Venture.
- Jackson, E.L. & Henderson, K.A. (1995). Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 17, 31-51.
- Jackson, E.L. (1993). Recognizing patterns of leisure constraints: Results from alternative analyses. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 129-149.
- Jenkins, R. (1997). *Rethinking ethnicity: Arguments and explorations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Johnson, C.Y. Bowker, J.M., English, D.B.K., Worthen, D. (1997). Theoretical perspectives of ethnicity and outdoor recreation: A review and synthesis of African and European-American participation. USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, GTR-SRS 11, 1-16.
- Johnson, C. Y., Horan, P. M., & Pepper, W. (1997). Race, rural residence, and wildland visitation: Examining the influence of socio-cultural meaning. *Rural Sociology*, 62, 89-110.

- Kotkin, J. & Tseng, T. (2003, June 8). Happy to mix it all up: For young America old ethnic labels no longer apply. *The Washington Post*, pp. B1, B4
- Lustig, L. and Koester (1999). *Intercultural communication: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Machlis, G.E. & Field, D.R. (2000). *National Parks and rural development: Practice and policy in the United States*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Machlis, G. E. (1996, February). *Usable knowledge: A plan for furthering social science and the national parks*. U.S. Department of the Interior. Washington, DC: National Park Service.
- Marín, G. & VanOss Marín, B. (1991). *Research with Hispanic populations*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Marks, C.C. (1993). Demography and race. In J.H. Stanfield and R.M. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in research methods*, pp. 159-171. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Marsh, H.W. & Hocevar, D. (1985). Application of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First- and higher order factor models and their invariance across groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(3), 562-582.
- Martin, J.N. & Nakayama, T.K. (2000). *Intercultural communication in contexts, 2nd ed.* Mountainview, CA: Mayfield.
- McAvoy, L., Winter, P.L., Wilson-Outley, C., McDonald, D., & Chavez, D. (2000). Conducting research with communities of color. *Society & Natural Resources*, 13, 479-488.
- McDonald, M.N. (1999). Understanding diversity in the National Park Service: Point of view. *Cultural Resources Management*, 8, 45-46.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). An expanded sourcebook of qualitative data analysis, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Morgan, D.L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- NPS Office of Policy & Regulations (2003). Draft Director's Order #75A: Civic Engagement and Public Involvement. Washington, DC: National Park Service.
- NPS Advisory Board Report (2001). Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, April 23, 2002, www.nps.gov/policy/report.htm

- NPS Social Science Program (2001, December). *Guidelines and approval form for expedited approval for NPS-Sponsored Public Surveys*. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior.
- NSRE (2000). Outdoor learning and the public's outdoor interest: Using the National Survey for Recreation and the Environment. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, March 18, 2003, www.srs.fs.fed.us/trends.
- ORCA (2000). *Human powered outdoor recreation: State of the industry report*. Boulder, CO: Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America.
- Parker, J.D. & McDonough, M. (1999). Environmentalism of African Americans: An analysis of the subculture and barrier theories. *Environment and Behavior*, 31(2), 155-177.
- Parry, D., Shinew, K.J, Arnold, M. (2001). *Broadening the understanding of race and constraint*. Paper presented at the NRPA Leisure Research Symposium. Denver, CO.
- Philipp, S.F. (1995). Race and leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 17, 109-120.
- Pickering, K.A. (2000a). *Lakota culture, World economy*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Pickering, K.A. (2000b). Alternative economic strategies in low-income rural communities: TANF, labor migration, and the case of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. *Rural Sociology*, 65(1), 148-167.
- Richey, J.S., Mar, B.W. & Horner, R.R. (1985). The Delphi technique in environmental assessment: Implementation and effectiveness, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 21, 135-146.
- Roberts, N.S. (2000). Visitor use and community interest study: Attitudes, perceptions and experiences across cultures. Unpublished manuscript. Estes Park, CO: Rocky Mountain National Park, National Park Service.
- Rodriguez, D.A. & Roberts, N.S. (2002a). "State of the Knowledge Report: The association of race/ethnicity, gender, and social class in outdoor recreation experiences." National Park Service, Social Science Program, General Technical Report, Colorado State University at Fort Collins.
- Rodriguez, D.A. & Roberts, N.S. (2002b). ORRRC at 40! Diversity in America's parks and outdoors. *Parks and Recreation*, 37(4), 108-110.

- Rodriguez, D.A. (1996). An assessment of factors influencing natural resource career aspirations among Hispanic high school students. (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 9710078).
- Roundtable Associates (2002). *A Draft Blue Print: Improving the quality of parks, recreation, and conservation for minority populations*. Durham, NC: Brown Enterprises.
- Samdahl, D.M. & Jekubovich, N.J. (1997). A critique of leisure constraints: Comparative analyses and understandings. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(4), 430-452.
- Sasidharan, V. (2002). Special issue introduction: Understanding recreation & the environment within the context of culture. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 1-11.
- Scott, J. (1999). Rational Choice Theory. In, G. Browning, A. Halcli, N. Hewlett, and F. Webster (Eds.), *Theory and society: Understanding the present*. Retrieved December 1, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/rc45.htm>
- Shaull, S.L. & Gramann, J.H. (1998). The effect of cultural assimilation on the importance of family-related and nature-related recreation among Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research* 30(1): 47-63.
- Shaw, S.M. (1994). Gender, leisure, and constraint: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1), 8-22.
- Shinew, K.J., Floyd, M.F., McGuire, F.A. & Noe, F.P. (1995). Gender, race, and subjective social class and their association with leisure preferences. *Leisure Sciences*, 17, 75-89.
- Stanfield, J.H. & Dennis, R.M. (1993). *Race and ethnicity in research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Stanfield, J.H. (1993). Epistemological considerations. In *Race and ethnicity in research methods*, J.H. Stanfield & R.M. Dennis (Eds.), pp. 16-36. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Taylor, D.E. (1989). Blacks and the environment: Toward an explanation of the concern and action gap between Blacks and Whites. *Environment and Behavior*, 21(2), 175-205.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2003). Effects of the Census 2000 population controls on educational attainment. Retrieved July 5, 2003, from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/education/educ-sample.html>

- U.S. Census Bureau (2000a). *Colorado quick facts from the US Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts*. Retrieved January 8, 2003, from <http://www.census.gov>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2000b). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: Census 2000 Brief*. Retrieved September 3, 2001, from <http://www.census.gov>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2000c). *Projections of the total population of states: 1995 to 2025*. Retrieved May 7, 2003, <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/state>
- U.S. Department of Commerce (1996). *Population projections of the United States by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1995 to 2050*. General Technical Report, P25-1130, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Viriden, R.J. & Walker, G.J. (1999). Ethnic/racial and gender variations among meanings given to, and preferences for, the natural environment. *Leisure Sciences, 21*, 219-239.
- Wade Smith, A. (1993). Survey research on African Americans: Methodological innovations. In J.H. Stanfield and R.M. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in research methods*, pp. 217-229. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Wernert, S.J. (1989). *Our National Parks: America's spectacular wilderness heritage*. Pleasantville, NY: Reader's Digest Association.
- West, C. (1994). *Race matters*. New York: Vintage.
- West, P. C. (1989). Urban region parks and black minorities: Subculture, marginality, and inter-racial relations in park use in the Detroit metropolitan area. *Leisure Sciences, 11*, 11-28.
- Weatherman, R. & Swenson, K. (1974). Delphi technique. In S.P. Hencley & J.R. Yates (Eds.), *Futurism in Education: Methodologies*, (pp. 97-114). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen.
- Wicks, B.E. & Norman, K.A. (1996). Improving African American survey response rates for leisure marketing and planning studies. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 14*(2), 1-15.
- Williams, D.R. & Carr, D.S. (1993). The sociocultural meanings of outdoor recreation places. In A.W. Ewert, D.J. Chavez, & A.W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface*, pp. 209-219. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Woodard, M. D. (1988). Class, regionality, and leisure among urban Black Americans: The Post-Civil Rights era. *Journal of Leisure Research, 20*(2), 87-105.


Appendix A
 Projected Colorado Populations Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995-2025

Note: Numbers rounded to nearest thousand. Resident population. Series A projections. For more details, see PPL #47, "Population Projections for States, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2025."

	1995	2000	2005	2015	2025
WHITE TOTAL	3,465	3,823	4,068	4,350	4,621
WHITE FEMALES	1,747	1,927	2,050	2,191	2,323
BLACK TOTAL	164	196	224	265	309
BLACK FEMALES	80	97	112	134	157
TOTAL	507	594	682	859	1,067
HISPANIC FEMALES	253	296	341	433	539
NON-HISPANIC WHITE – TOTAL	2,989	3,268	3,434	3,557	3,642
NON-HISPANIC WHITE – FEMALES	1,510	1,650	1,733	1,792	1,829
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT TOTAL	35	41	46	53	61
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER TOTAL	82	108	129	162	199

Source – US Census Bureau: Retrieved: 6/2/03
<http://www.census.gov/population/projections/state/stpjrace.txt>

Appendix B
Colorado County Map



Counties in the study:

African American/Black

Adams
Arapahoe
Denver

Hispanic/Latino

Adams
Arapahoe
Boulder
Denver
Jefferson
Larimer
Weld

Appendix C
Delphi Method – Invitation

June 2001

To: Attendees of the conference entitled “Black, Brown, and Green - - Seeking Common Ground: A Dialogue by Hispanic and African American Leaders on Natural Resource Issues.” This conference was sponsored by the National Hispanic Environmental Council (NHEC), and the Round Table Associates (RTA).

Invitation to Participate

As an attendee of the dialogue funded by Region II of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in McAllen Texas on October 15-17, 1999, we would like to invite you to participate in a Delphi Process designed to provide insight into minority use of National Parks. You will be asked to provide what you feel are the most compelling reasons for minorities’ apparent lack of interest in and/or use of National Parks.

The level of experience and dialogue that took place in McAllen Texas two years ago was impressive. The collective experiences and insight that this group might offer to the National Park Service is considerable.

If you are interested in being part of the Delphi process please acknowledge our email and let us know of your willingness to participate. After we receive your acknowledgement we will send you one open-ended question involving barriers and constraints to minority park visitation.

How Will You Benefit From This Research?

By participating in this research you will have an opportunity to articulate many of the concerns you might have regarding minority involvement in National Parks. As a recognized authority in the area of minority involvement in outdoor recreation and/or park management issues, the perspective you would provide will strengthen the research results. You will also receive a summary of the Delphi results regarding barriers and constraints of minority populations to visiting National Parks.

The Process

As other researchers have shown, compared to other measures of soliciting group consensus, the Delphi process is less expensive, more reliable, and more versatile (Richey, et. al., 1985). Using this process it is possible to obtain a reliable consensus of a group of experts regarding specific issues (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). Reliability is obtained through a series of email messages sent to participants at selected time intervals. The general process is as follows: 1) the research team designs a questionnaire focused on a selected issue, 2) the Delphi participants respond, 3) the research team interprets and summarizes the responses and sends this back to the panelists (with subsequent questions) allowing them to concur with other participants or modify their responses. These rounds will continue until the team determines a consensus has been reached.

In the first questionnaire, you will be asked to identify what you think are key barriers and constraints associated with minority visitation to National Parks. This will be done using a single open-ended question as follows:

“From your point of view, what are the barriers and constraints experienced by minorities which limit their visitation to National Parks?”

Upon return of the email request, responses will be analyzed using a content analysis. Based on keyword associations, responses will be grouped into categories. The second email message will ask respondents to rate the top ten barriers and constraints, according to their relative importance, related to the diversity management objectives listed by the National Park Service. These will then be returned to participants for their comments and suggestions.

Confidentiality

Please be assured that informant responses will not be associated with individuals. Group responses will be reported for further distillation. And, in any report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a specific panel member with a specific response. While a group distribution list will be created for the research process, all names will be suppressed on all email messages. This panel of experts will only be known to the Principal Investigators. Once email responses are recorded, original emails will be deleted.

We look forward to your participation as a key informant for this process, and we thank you for your willingness to provide us with your unique perspective regarding minority use of the National Parks.

Sincerely,

Donald Rodriguez, CSU Assistant Professor
Alan Bright, CSU Assistant Professor
Nina Roberts, CSU Graduate Research Assistant
Roger Rivera, NHEC President and Founder

Appendix D
Delphi Method: Original Top 10 Categories
Final rank order of importance as constraint item

1. **Socialization as a child into outdoor recreation and exploring natural areas** (e.g., parental/family involvement; early exposure as youth lacking; peer pressure not to participate; lack of adequate role models; not part of personal culture).
Safety concerns (e.g., fear of the "unknown"; personal safety; out of "comfort zone").
2. **Lack of marketing efforts towards minority communities** (e.g., National Park Service not influential in travel decisions/vacation destinations for minorities; lack of adequate messages as to benefits for people of color).
3. **Culture of the National Park Service** (e.g., geared toward traditional visitors/middle to upper class whites; lack of minority representation of park employees; no "invitation" to participate/lack of feeling welcome).
4. **Education about the outdoors** (e.g., lack of environmental education in schools; minimal outreach by the parks).
5. **Marginalized nature of ethnic minority groups** (e.g., economics/income constraints; time; transportation issues; single-headed households; lower levels of education).
6. **Safety concerns** (e.g., fear of the "unknown"; personal safety; out of "comfort zone").
7. **Lack of a range of opportunities for minority groups** (e.g., facilities, group camping, picnic areas, programs/interpretation, culturally-specific interests).
8. **Perception among minority groups** (e.g., "it's a white thing"; not part of the urban minority culture / "just not something we do").
9. **Historical context** (e.g., our view of natural areas and participation in outdoor activities is influenced and/or negatively effected by historical effects such as migrant labor, indentured servitude, slavery, share croppers, etc).
10. **Perceptions by whites that perceive these areas are "their place"** (e.g., lack of social acceptance by the dominant white visitors).



Appendix E
Colorado State University
Department of Natural Resource Recreation & Tourism
Informed Consent for Participation in Research
“Minority Visitor Use Patterns at Rocky Mountain National Park: An Examination of
Barriers and Constraints Among Visitors and Non-Visitors”

Why am I being asked?

You are being asked to be a subject in a research study about outdoor recreation participation of minority residents of Colorado, particularly as it relates to visitation to Rocky Mountain National Park conducted by faculty and graduate students at the Colorado State University. We appreciate your potential involvement and, if interested in participating, we ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University or Rocky Mountain National Park. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.

Why is this research being done?

Rocky Mountain National Park reaches over 3.4 million visitors annually. Although various diversity initiatives have achieved some notable success, people of color, and individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds continue to be underrepresented in outdoor recreation participation in RMNP. This study will obtain information about participation and nonparticipation in recreation activities in RMNP from minority residents of Colorado. As a result, outreach programs may be tailored so they have a greater impact for a broader group of visitors, and may include alternative ideas for how to cultivate certain ethnic groups. This study will determine what outdoor recreation patterns exist and what patterns may look like in the future over the next ten years so the park can plan accordingly. We will be interviewing people interested in sharing their experiences and contributing ideas.

What procedures are involved?

If you agree to be in this research, we would ask you to do the following things:

→ *Plan to attend an informal meeting to be approximately 1.5 hours long. This may very well be held during a lunch period or possibly dinner in the early evening where a meal will be provided. Another good option is to get together first thing in the morning (beverages and snacks would be provided).*

→ *This will be a one-time occurrence and a location of the specific meeting will be determined at a later date. We request that you confirm your participation with us in order to avoid misunderstanding about your attendance.*

→ *A focus group is to collect information only. We will ask you to respond to a series of questions relating to your interest and participation, or non-participation, in outdoor recreation in general and specifically related to any experience you may have with Rocky Mountain National Park.*

→ If there is a potential for you to be participating in more than one research study exploring the same topic, at the same time, please inform us if you are currently participating in a research protocol.

Approximately 4 focus groups consisting of 6-8 people each may be involved in this research at the Colorado State University. Each session will be audio taped to capture the conversation and no names will be used during the taping.

Are there benefits to taking part in the research?

There are no known direct benefits to you, the participant. The benefits from this study are of particular importance to National Park managers. The information should be helpful in terms of enhancing their education and outreach efforts and be helpful in potentially identifying new marketing strategies to diverse user groups. Also, the information will help managers at Rocky Mountain Nat'l Park learn what constraints and barriers may exist in diversifying park visitors.

What are the potential risks and discomforts?

It is not possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researchers have taken reasonable safeguards to minimize any known and potential, but unknown, risks. For an interview situation, subjects are particularly at no risk; discomfort may, however, be an issue:

- Psychological risks to participation may be that you are in touch with your reasons and your feelings about outdoor recreation, but can't express them. You may not have the language, or language may appear to be inappropriate. If at any time you do have thoughts and comments about a particular question or experience, you do not have to tell us if you are not comfortable.
- You will be given the opportunity to express afterthoughts, or miscellaneous comments you did not want to bring up in the group. We are open to private comments you may find important that may be of value to our research.

Will I be told about new information that may affect my decision to participate?

During the course of the study, you will be informed of any significant new findings (either good or bad), such as changes in the risks or benefits resulting from participation in the research or new alternatives to participation, that might cause you to change your mind about continuing in the study. If new information is provided to you, your consent to continue participating in this study will be re-obtained.

What about privacy and confidentiality?

The only people who will know that you are a research subject are members of the research team. No information about you, or provided by you during the research, will be disclosed to others without your written permission, except:

- If necessary to protect your rights or welfare (for example, if you are injured and need emergency care or when the CSU Institutional Review Board monitors the research or consent process); or
- if required by law.

When the results of the research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that would reveal your identity. The audiotape recordings of you will be used for educational purposes only; your identity will be protected or disguised.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law.

→ Personal identities will be shielded and disguised by use of a number. Each person in the session will be given a personal number that will be used by that person only to precede each comment being made. This process helps keep transcripts organized.

→ All personal information, research data, and related records will be coded and stored by the researchers only to prevent access by unauthorized personnel.

What are the costs for participating in this research?

Your only costs for participating may relate to providing your own transportation to the actual focus group location. No reimbursement is available for transportation, parking, bus/taxi, etc.

Will I be paid for my participation in this research?

→ Participants will be paid \$20.00 cash for their involvement. This will be distributed upon completion of the interview. No payment will be made for decisions to withdraw or if participants are withdrawn by the researcher.

Can I withdraw or be removed from the study?

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

→ Decisions for you to withdraw from the research, or be withdrawn by the researcher must be explicitly stated. This is important for potentially improving future research using similar procedures.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

The researchers conducting this study are Dr. Donald Rodriguez, Assistant Professor, Dr. Alan Bright, Assistant Professor, and Nina Roberts, Graduate Research Assistant.

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact the researchers at Colorado State University: 970-491-6591.

What are my rights as a research subject?

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Office for Regulatory Compliance at 970-491-1563.

What if I am a CSU student?

You may choose not to participate or to stop your participation in this research at any time. This will not affect your class standing or grades at CSU. The investigator may also end your participation in the research. If this happens, your class standing or grades will not be affected. You will not be offered or receive any special consideration if you participate in this research.

What if I am a CSU employee?

Your participation in this research is in no way a part of your university duties, and your refusal to participate will not in any way affect your employment with the university, or the benefits, privileges, or opportunities associated with your employment at CSU. You will not be offered or receive any special consideration if you participate in this research.

Remember: Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University or Rocky Mountain National Park. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship. You will be given a copy of this form for your information and to keep for your records.

Signature of Subject or Legally Authorized Representative

You have read and understand the above information. You have been given an opportunity to ask questions and any questions you have had were answered to your satisfaction. You agree to participate in this research. You have been given a copy of this form.

Appendix F
Focus Group Questions

1. What kinds of things do you like to do for fun/for recreation when you're not at work or school or taking care of other obligations such as general family commitments? What activities do you enjoy doing?
2. How do you feel about NATURE? Do you value nature? When people speak about the "natural environment" what does that mean to you?
3. Have you been to any National Park(s)? Which park/where, and what did you like or dislike about these areas? What kinds of things did you do there? (to the best of your recollection)
4. Regarding this general question about "national parks" what does it **mean** to you? Does it symbolize anything?
5. What was it that "invited" you (or enticed you) to visit? And, what if anything, felt uncomfortable for you?
6. Have you ever been to Rocky Mountain National Park?
 - * If YES, when? In what capacity (reason)? Who did you go with? What kinds of activities did you do there? What did you like/dislike?
 - * If NO, why not? Can you give reason why you have never been to RMNP?
7. If yes, have you participated in any of the ranger-led programs? Explored the visitor centers? If so, please tell a bit about this experience.
8. Is there anything that prevents you from visiting RMNP? If you told us that you have been there, have you ever NOT enjoyed your time there? (If there was a time you did not enjoy yourself/have fun, why?)
9. If you were talking about your friends/colleagues who represent your community, what do you think would attract those individuals to a National Park? In contrast, what do you think would keep them away from visiting these parks? (any thoughts about RMNP in particular?)
10. Do you have any fears about going to RMNP? Is there anything you are afraid of? (maybe, maybe not)
11. If you have been to RMNP, did you ever feel discrimination in any way? If yes, I invite you to share how you felt or what happened? (e.g., seeking explanation and depth). Same question regarding any other NP you may have been to?
12. How would NPS marketing differently provide you with more appealing or enticing reasons to go and visit the park?
13. What could Rocky Mountain NP (or any NP) do better in order to help make you feel more comfortable and welcome at the park?
14. There are very few people of color who work for the park. If they had more ethnic minorities employed, how would this impact you (during your visits)? Would it matter to you one way or another?
15. If you would like to receive information about RMNP, what kind of information would you want to see and what is the best way for you to obtain that information? (What sources do you best receive info about recreational activities and places you might want to go/visit?).

Appendix G
Focus Group Results from Coding Process

Blacks/African Americans

SIMILARITIES within group

- Common fears of wildlife (dangers, being chased or attacked, uncertainty...)
- Perceptions of white visitors (discomfort with “stares and glares”; they feel assumptions are made about Black visitors – e.g., what they might be doing there; feel that white visitors don’t want them around)
- Comfort Zone: Lies within urban/city boundaries. Strong feelings of being more vulnerable when outside of their city/urban limits. Critical component.
- “Lookin’ Good” syndrome effects livelihood and recreation choices and behaviors
- Outdoor recreation in national parks “is a white thing” / RMNP no exception (Estes: “nothin’ but a white town”).
- Preference for recreation activities locally and visiting local city parks. Factors: Convenience and comfort.

DIFFERENCES within group

- Value of nature/natural resources for different reasons: tranquility/peace, new sense of adventure; exploration; opportunity for their children to learn to appreciate and enjoy; nature as reinvigorating; some merely go to parks for fresh air not activity; some don’t seek it out (means little); sense of appreciation for nature, but need amenities.
- Cost/economic factors an issue for some, not others.
- Transportation an issue for some people not others (e.g., distance factor)
- Stereotype of being “lazy” – Several participants alluded to “black people are just too lazy to go up there.”
- Crowding: In the park (and/or traffic congestion) is an issue for some not others.
- Socialization factors: experiences in outdoors as youth varied (some spent a lot of time in backyard areas, local parks, some traveled nationally with families, others never experienced natural environment in any in depth way).
- Radar screen: RMNP just not on the radar screen of things to do or places to go.
- Continuum of Blackness: (a) Participation (re: based on lack of minorities outdoors and perceptions of blacks [doing outdoor things] by other blacks → “does it make me less black?”); (b) Employees/Black rangers → “are they *really* black?” (re: based on cultural awareness ... or...?).

Latinos/Hispanics/Hispanos(as)

SIMILARITIES within group

- Values nature as tranquility/place to be in peace, to be quiet; natural environment and parks as opportunity to spend time together with family/picnics/games/sports, and places for children to play; “existence of God” in nature.
- Language – not having materials/signs in Spanish or bilingual interpretation programs is a barrier. Barrier, in general, to communication, comfort and feeling welcome.
- Fears of wildlife (dangers, being attacked, uncertainty ...)
- Safety issues (personal safety, relating to language/communication issues)
- Lack of knowledge about RMNP and opportunities

DIFFERENCES within group

- Cost/economics an issue for some people/families, not others.
- Transportation an issue for some, not others (distance factor).
- Concerns about white visitors (e.g., being harassed, threat to personal property, threat of kidnapping their children).

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN BLACKS and LATINOS (n=14 categories total)

Top Nine Themes

- Safety issues: Such as park security/law enforcement, adequate lighting in facilities, personal safety. In Latino community, language was brought up as a “safety” issue also.
- Marketing/PR: What are the issues? What would appeal/entice/increase visitation?
[a] Lack of representation of ethnic minorities in photographs is huge issue/concern (e.g., general brochures, park newspapers, touch screen monitors, visitor centers, etc);
[b] Share similar sentiments about dissemination of information and public relations efforts of RMNP – Need to tap into media/forums utilized by Black and Latino communities (mainstream efforts perpetuate dominant visitor interests); [c] Historical events and programs; educational information about the park and relationship to “our people”.
- Lack of knowledge: Information about the park? opportunities there? benefits of visiting?
- Cost and Transportation: Issues around cost/economics (e.g., “class issues”) and transportation are constraints for some individuals or families and not others. “Distance” – too far to travel to RMNP.
- Discrimination: Nobody expressed experiencing overt/blatant discrimination. All experiences and perceptions revolved around discomfort with other visitors (e.g., examples provided about white visitors); displacement (e.g., moving from one location to another) or avoidance (e.g., not visiting certain areas because of preconceived fears, stories they’ve heard from elders, things they’ve read).

- Trust issues within the community: “Social permission” to explore and venture out into areas/activities uncommon for their “people”; peer influences (youth and adults) is ubiquitous (ever-present/widespread).
- Preferences: Neighborhood parks/local city parks: Are “part of our lifestyle” – (a) Provides sense of community to residents; (b) Predilection for outdoor recreation opportunities and visits to local parks as factors of “convenience”
- Historical perspectives: Several participants noted some facet of “history” as being important. From being a constraint to aspects of desired educational information.
- Early exposure: Both groups agree/support fact that early exposure for youth/children to national parks (and RMNP specific) is key to education about the parks and increased interest and support in future.

Five themes relating to general issues/concerns

- Cleanliness of park and facilities: Good park maintenance and cleanliness of facilities (e.g., restrooms, picnic areas) is huge aspect of comfort.
- Nature: Appreciation for natural environment – high/strong value overall
- Gender: Gender roles seem to play large part in opinions/way-of-thinking about the outdoors and natural resources (e.g., involvement because of husband or male companion or male children; concerns about daughters being in outdoors – re: issues with hair, activities where they would get dirty; activity specific interests in some cases; seeking companionship (F) versus this as less important (M)).
- Park staff: Majority comments supported increase in ethnic diversity of park staff/rangers (i.e., 62% in favor). RE: Need to educate the park/to help park understand reasons for promoting minorities in employment. Minority role models and “people like me” in leadership positions very important to these participants.
- Overall park experiences: Very positive, strongly favorable for desired outdoor recreation opportunities.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BLACKS and LATINOS

- Language barriers: Issue in Latino community, not with Blacks.
- Racial reminders: Blacks felt they were constantly reminded they were Black by virtue of stares/glances, possibly how they were treated, based on certain level of discomfort (e.g., lead to displacement or avoidance) – Latinos never mentioned this.
- Awareness/knowledge of Rocky Mountain National Park: Black community more familiar with RMNP as a national park – More Blacks than Latinos (in this sample) have visited RMNP.
- “Looking Good” Syndrome: Black community boasts about this “looking good” factor that dictates much of their attitudes, place within their community, decisions relating to recreation preferences and ultimately recreation behaviors. Latinos do not seem to place high value on this as an issue in their community and choices. Their focus is on survival by any means and pursuit of recreational opportunities that will

- bring enjoyment to their children and whole family (e.g., “if the children are happy, everyone’s happy”).
- Family structure: More single-heads of household in Black community than in the Latino community. Idea of planning recreational pursuits/activities may sometimes be a “burden” and family priorities are different. Blacks in this set up live on “what happens day to day and not what they’re going to do tomorrow.” [Note: Census stats support this]. Large group activity preferences/Latino.
 - Cultural stereotypes: In Black community, common attitude is that outdoor recreation activities in national parks is “a white thing; Blacks just don’t do that...” – Not mentioned/discussed among Latino participants.
 - Perceptions of whites: Notable in Black community (verbalized), not as much (if at all really) with Latinos (could have been implied – e.g., concepts of “oppression”).

NOTE: Much fewer “differences” between groups relating to variety of questions.

Appendix H
Focus Group Sample Quotations

“You see, I’m a city girl and the first time I went to the mountains, I was like ‘oh my God’ because there was no buildings, no smog, nothing like that! I was amazed. I thought it was going to be like little house on the prairie or something...”

~ 18 yr old female; Bi-racial college student (Black/Latina)

“As a kid, my family didn’t do any of that kind of stuff. I camped when I was a girl scout and that experience was enough to last me a lifetime! So now [as an adult] it was my husband who convinced me to go camping when we visited Sand Dunes National Monument – I said ‘all right, one night!’”

~ Black female, middle-aged, occupation: Learning Specialist

[Note: Gender issues]

“There was this little blurb in Backpacker magazine once about this brother who hiked the Appalachian Trail [Great Smokey Mtn NP. They said that while he was hiking, he was harassed and called the ‘N’ word. I mean people were basically just physically and verbally attacking this guy. Simply because he was out on the trail, hiking the trail, and because he was black. I was hesitant about going out there... You blend color and nature all of a sudden people go crazy...”

~ Black male, 39 years old, Researcher (Anthropologist)

[Note: He was intimidated; concept – avoidance]

“I don’t know, it depends on the capacity of each family...I think it is based on your income, if your income is substantial you don’t notice the price. But if your earnings are slim like the majority of people in this area, it will affect them.”

~ Latino male, 43 year old Teacher

[RE: \$15./per car entry fee at RMNP – affordable?]

“It is important [for parks] to consider the different ethnic groups that live locally in this area and provide a variety of information in their own languages.”

~ Latino male, 43 year old Teacher

“I didn’t know about this park [RMNP] and the majority of times we never ask! Now I know, and I’m planning to be there and bring my family.”

~ 30 yr old male, Hispano, employed with local nursery

“It is important to have information in Spanish because there are a lot of people like me and we don’t know a bit of English. Sometimes accidents happen because we don’t know what the signs indicate.”

~ Hispano male (38 yrs), works in a nursery

[Note: language barrier; safety issue]

“There are just no La-Z-Boys out there!” ~ 48 yr old Black woman (Collection Agent)

“I don’t mean to say nothing but it’s nothin’ but a white town and I wouldn’t connect with nobody up there... and then you like, why I’m gonna face the hour and a half drive way up there when I can just go to city park, be cool and let it be.”

~ 19 yr old female, Bi-racial (Black/Latina), Sophomore @ Community College of Aurora

“Most people I know have never been anywhere. So when you talk to them about going to RMNP it’s like going to Mars. You know, it’s like ‘yeah, when is the space shuttle, when does it leave and what century are we coming back?’ It’s just a question of getting them up there, and showing them around the park.”

~ Male, College Administrator, African/54 years old

“From my experience, it seems like a lot of people who don’t go [to the park/mountains] that I associate with or who I talk to say it’s not a black thing to do; it’s a white thing to do. I experienced that in childhood with skiing and everything else, this isn’t a black thing to do. SO how do we break that cycle?”

~ African American male, 44 year old Mortgage Broker

[Note: One or more people in every focus group in the black community mentioned this very statement in some context].

“A few black people are fearless out there basically because it’s something that was started early, and how many others are like that? So there’s a love for it, that if it’s not there, it has to be developed. I probably never would have gone out there if I didn’t have a son. If I had a daughter, I’d be dealing with her hair and nails so I probably would not have done outdoor things when I moved out here. I only did it because my son liked it.”

~ Black woman, Collection Agent, 48 yrs old

[Note: Early exposure, socialization, gender issue & stereotype]

“I’ve always wondered when I talk to my friends and family; there’s this kind of invisible class barrier about the outdoors. And then like a lot of people mentioned, it’s not ‘cool’ to be outdoors hiking and stuff. I mean it’s kind of strange because we’re talking about within black, within culture differences. Seems to me to be an obvious kind of class and political question...So does it make me less black because I like to spend time in the outdoors?”

~ Black male, Researcher (39 yrs old)

“Put it this way, take Michael Jordan or some famous athlete, put him on a hiking trail with NIKE’s all of a sudden there’s a whole new industry. Our folks’d be all over that in a matter of months...”

~ African American male, 44 yrs old/Mortgage Broker

“If their churches and school groups don’t take the inner city kids to have these experiences, they won’t have them. Because the parents don’t value them [national parks] as an experience that a child or family group should have... They don’t see that as a way to spend their discretionary funds.”

~ *Black woman, 36 yrs old, Librarian*

“So many people, economically, cannot afford to go... even if or when they get to the point that they can afford it, they have not built up that appreciation.”

~ *Black female, 63 yrs old, Artist and retired Nurse*

“I don’t think it is very often a part of their value system, and they don’t see parks advertised in their little realm of the world. So they don’t value what could be given them by visiting the parks.”

~ *Female/Black, 36 yrs old, Librarian*

“I think that blacks, generally, are very interested in nature and the environment. It is just a well-kept secret. People don’t really know much about us. Also, my mother was living with me for a while so I had to think in terms of traveling with her and providing a certain comfort level. That has to do with extended family members and what is needed to make them feel comfortable. But I don’t see a sense of reluctance.”

~ *Black woman, retired College Professor (age 61)*

“Hiking [for example] may not, in itself, be such a big deal but if you’re hiking for something, like to find herbs or to improve your circulation or to find this or that, maybe that’s an attraction as opposed to, you know, just hiking...”

~ *African male, College Administrator (Age 54)*

“I think it gets back to the deeper concern of the looking good thing. Everything our people seem to do all revolves around ‘looking good’. Whether it’s cars, clothes, activities, or whatever... Whatever is gonna have everyone else look at us, and have some kind of looking good perception, is kinda what we take on as a people. To do something that’s outside of that realm is just not attractive. So I think it involves something deeper than benefits. The root thinking into why we’re gonna do certain things, revolves around looking good...”

~ *Male/African American, 44 yr old Mortgage Broker*

“People from the city, in my neighborhood, don’t go [to RMNP] because they just don’t know about it. They could go down to the east side of Denver and take kids on free trips. Let them know what it is like and when they get back they will start telling people about it... Telling people in their neighborhood.”

~ *Male, age 18, Multiracial (Indian/African American/Anglo), high school senior*

[Note: Concept of word of mouth as marketing tool is prevalent theme]

“It’s about our comfort zone. In our community, there are lots of comfort zones. Outside of our community, it’s not quite as comfortable...”

~*African American male, Mortgage Broker (44 yrs old)*

“If you start with the kids in the neighborhoods, they’re going to like it...Even my mom went camping for the first time last year because nobody ever offered it to her before or gave her a chance to go. So I think if you do that with the kids and get them going, then they’ll continue to do it.”

~*Black male, age 19, student at Metro State College*

“You should get a base in each of the cities like Fort Collins, Denver, Boulder and get connected with people who are connected with the streets, because it’s true, talking does help a lot... You know one of us would say ‘we went up to RMNP and it was phat ya’ll; ya’ll gotta go up there...we was doin’ this and doin’ that, it’s not corny and you’re in nature.’ Then people are gonna sit back and be like – *okay, let me think about it...*”

~*Female, Biracial (Black/Latina), 18 yr old student at Community College of Aurora*

[Note: Community liaison component; “get a foundation in each city and keep your contacts in the neighborhoods”]

“Latinos like to enjoy a day at the park with some places to play sports, like volleyball or soccer, while we – the women – cook or prepare the food, the men can entertain themselves playing.”

~*Female/Hispana, 37 yrs old, ocupacion es en casa*

[Note: Gender roles as pervasive within culture]

“One of the important things I see visiting those places [national parks] is there is not a clear representation even on the advertising...If there is a specific model on pictures or ads they usually look Caucasian and that’s a very clear message to the population you are addressing...”

~*Latino male, 43 yr old teacher*

[Note: common theme among both ethnic groups – similar statements surfaced frequently]

[RE: Questions based on “comfort”; can relate to “fear”]

“For me, the whole question of vulnerability comes up. I mean, that’s something I think about when I’m out in the woods. I think I would go out more often and maybe stayin’ over sometimes, camping, but that’s a phobia. So I sometimes wonder how do you ignore that phobia?”

~*Black male, 39 yrs old, Researcher*

[Note: Concepts – avoidance; safety]

“I can remember camping out once, ‘bout 6 or 7 of us. There’s this biker gang, about 30 people came up one night into our spot and started partying. And we just didn’t feel very comfortable, you know? We packed up and got out of there first thing the next morning.

So the vulnerability really showed up there. Just seein' us black folks and a bunch of, you know, white folks pull up, it's just a bad feeling we got..."

~Black male, Mortgage Broker (Age 44)

[Note: No incidents occurred. He said they 'played it cool, hung out there and did our thing that night' and found another campsite the next day. Concepts: displacement; safety].

"A lot of us go outdoors; when we do go out, we definitely have a connection to the earth, if you know what I mean. We also have our radios and we have our cell phones (we all have this stuff nowadays)...but if something does come up, you know right, we can get in contact with someone."

~Black female, Learning Specialist (Age 50)

[Note: Historical perspective; safety issue]

"I spent a year and half in Louisiana. Whenever I went into the wood, I had something with me. You know, a Roscoe...There were stories of black people who hadn't been found in a long time by anyone. So whenever we went fishing, hunting, or hiking we always carried guns with us. One time we were stopped by this white guy and it took him about 15 seconds to realize that he shouldn't mess with us and he backed away from us. Louisiana might be a little different but we always had something with us when we were out there."

~African male, College Administrator (Age 54)

"When I first moved to Colorado a number of black folks here in Denver area told me they heard of negative experiences where the KKK was up there in the mountains somewhere; and other stories where their great-grandparents had problems up in the mountains. So some people don't understand why me or other black folks go up in the mountains with that fear factor of something's gonna happen to me...So there's a historic reason, where you would not see black people going up to the mountains on their own, from what their parents or grandparents used to tell them."

~Black male, Electrical Engineer, 53 years old

[Note: Historical perspective; perceived discrimination; avoidance]

"...Safety always pops into my head when I step outside of my apartment. You know, it's a reality. It's like I have to ask myself 'what are you getting into?' Not that I'm paranoid about it, I'm just conscious of it."

~ African American male, 44 yrs, Mortgage Broker

[Note: Safety issues]

"...We go and we don't understand the places we're in. We're in the woods and people are making comments about us. You know, the onus is always on us. We go in and are surprised there's one of us, two, three, four maybe five of us out there hiking. And, there's probably a thousand white folks. But we become the issue; we become the central focus point. But the problem is them, not us. Sometimes we *forget*, we actually forget we're black until somebody reminds us."

~Black male, Researcher (cultural anthropology), Age 39

“To ensure more security of parks, the presence of police or rangers is important. They should be very vigilant in the parks so you feel more secure. You never know the other people’s intentions, maybe kidnap the little kids, because when you have little kids and let them play while you spend time with your compadre, the kidnapper maybe pick them up.”

~Hispana/38 yrs old, ocupacion es en casa

“I always pay attention when I visit parks, ‘specially for those annoying people that give us a hard time as a family. I also watch that people don’t do anything to my car.”

~Latino male, age 33, Laborer (agriculture)

“I was a Boy Scout all my life and I have serious fears about the wild animals, ‘specially the bears. But there are always ways or forms to educate and bring understanding about the bear behavior but there is not information in Spanish...”

~Latino male, 43 yr old teacher

“I personally never received any discrimination from Americans. But locally in some stores and miscellaneous conversations with people from your own ethnicity, they sometimes mistreat you and make you feel bad or talk bad to you if you don’t know English. They say they don’t know Spanish and I know that they know my own language. To me, that is a form of discrimination, because Americans try to communicate more with you than your own ethnic group.”

~Hispana/Female, 37 yrs old, ocupacion es en casa

“...The parks, they have rules, and we are not aware to attend to the rules. If somebody prohibits us to do something, we don’t agree. We Hispanos think that is a form of discrimination, but it isn’t true; it’s because of the rules and regulations.”

~Hispano/Male, 30 years old, trabajo en floreria (works in a nursery)

“I’m comfortable in city park and every other park because I know my crowd... When I went up there though [to RMNP], it was weird because we were the only minorities there so it was like we already got the looks like ‘what they doin’ up here, they just lookin’ for some weed or somethin’...’ – We automatically had these barriers and all we were tryin’ to do was what ya’ll were doing...”

~Female, 18 yr old college student, Black/Latina (Biracial)

[Note: Lack of comfort, constraints to enjoyment, assumptions/perceptions by whites, assumptions by minorities on what whites are thinking – re: stares/glares].

[same young female continues]

“I kinda had my own perception that black folks don’t do this and I went up there anyway. When I got up there [RMNP] it was cool, but then we still got the looks. I don’t want to say it was discrimination but we were surrounded by white people and it was like shock to them that we were there...”

~Female, 18 yr old college student, Black/Latina (Biracial)

“One time, we brought kids from the city down to one of the national parks in Gunnison to camp out for a couple of weeks and do a service project, too. We used to have problems with the park staff there. They thought we couldn’t do anything. We were digging culverts, clearing trails and all that stuff. They had this perception that, since we were from the city, not only had we never seen any of these tools, but we didn’t know which end to use! I thought it was funny at one point because one guy with us was about 6’5”, 240lbs and he just took it upon himself to show them they were wrong...”

~African male, 54 yr old College Administrator

“I am not totally comfortable [in RMNP] because I am used to my lifestyle in the city. So I don’t think I could ever be *totally* comfortable in nature, but I am comfortable enough to enjoy myself.”

~18 year old male, high school senior, multiracial (Indian/African American/Anglo)

“We had this huge family gathering at one of the state parks recently. A bus of 100 people from Japan came through. The guides, who could speak English, thought this was the most unusual thing they had seen in their lives. A diverse group of African Americans, all ages, grandmas, aunts, uncles, cousins, brothers and sisters, moms and dads. They were just fascinated! They came by and wanted to know what we were doing and what was going on. Kids were fishing, playing with toys, others were climbing rocks; they were just astounded...”

~Black female, 60 yrs old, retired school teacher

[Note: The next few quotes relate to whether more ethnically diverse park staff is important? Does it matter to you?]

“I would feel a little more comfortable. I don’t know why. It’s just a feeling that somebody got my back here if things go down, you know what I’m sayin’?”

~Multiracial, male/age 18, high school senior

“In the Latin American context, there have been generations of a lot of suffering in different communities. After hundreds of years of oppression from different systems including the American system, it is about time to give more employment opportunities because historically enough is enough and we don’t want to be fighting about it anymore...It is very important to see Hispanics in positions of leadership. I have a lot of respect for leadership at any level, but one of the things in our Latino community that you don’t find much of is leadership. That’s why we live the way we live.”

~Latino male, School Teacher (age 43)

“It doesn’t matter what color you are as long as you are treated respectfully...It’s always great to see Latinos in positions of power, however, it’s not going to prevent me from visiting the park. The thing to do is get involved with this to help the park understand that there are important reasons to promote Latinos in the ranks of employment, also as visitors.”

~Female/Hispana, Age 45, Social Worker

“I met a couple of black guys who were backcountry rangers [at RMNP] and they enjoyed bringing me outdoors. It was a good thing to see that up there. It also shows a lot of the younger kids that it is possible to do that. It’s not something that’s impossible. You can do this.”

~ *African male, middle-aged, College Administrator*

[Note: Concept of minority park staff as role models and in positions of leadership for youth/kids surfaced as prevalent theme for both Blacks/Latinos]

“Sometimes, do we question if we see a black face in a place it’s not supposed to be? Yeah. And then we say ‘oh wow, I wonder if s/he can do the job?’... There is a sense of comfort should I see a black person [working at the park], but you know when I see that black person, immediately what goes through my mind is this person *really* black?... Yeah, is this someone I can really identify with, or are they really just black skin, you know?”

~ *shared conversation between two professional black men in late 30s/early 40s*

“Having more minorities work in the park would open eyes for new profession that lots of times young adults in the black community do not even think about...”

~ *Black female, Librarian (Age 36)*

“It just provides a comfort zone even if rangers were any minority. White people take things differently than blacks, Hispanics and Latinos, etc. They take everything differently so it’s like I can’t relate to nobody... It’s not like we don’t like white people, but we already live in Denver and Denver is predominantly white so we already see ya’ll anyway. You know what I’m sayin’? Why go on a vacation to the mountains trying to find peace of mind and there you are again? Minorities are part of our comfort zone...”

~ *Biracial female (Black/Latina), College Student*

“I’d like to know more about the history of the park. You know, about the black people that were there like black explorers? What happened? Maybe even a map pointing me to places ‘A and B’, I’d like that. Other than that, where’s the nearest hotel and are there any hot showers!?”

~ *Middle-age Black woman (Collection Agent)*

“As far as technology and use of media, those kinds of things can include representation of diversity and be used as a teaching tool... Things like videos, presentations, exhibit photos, as well as those touch monitors. When our kids go into the visitor centers or exhibit areas, they should see themselves.”

~ *Black female, Age 36 (Librarian)*

Appendix I
Expedited Approval Form for Mail Back Survey

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
EXPEDITED APPROVAL FOR VISITOR SURVEYS

1. **Project Title** | Minority Visitor Use Patterns at Rocky Mountain National Park
Submission Date: November 20, 2002 (Revised: 12/2/02, 12/16/02, 12/27/02, 1/7/03)

2. **Abstract:** This study will obtain information about participation and non-participation in recreation activities in Rocky Mountain National Park from ethnic minority residents in Colorado. Targeted minority groups will be African Americans and Hispanics in the Denver Metro region. Barriers and constraints to park visitation were identified using a Delphi technique involving minority recreation professionals, and focus group interviews with members of the African American and Hispanic communities in the Denver region were explored. The survey will obtain information generalizable to the population of Hispanics and African Americans along the Front Range of Colorado. This information will contribute to a program of public outreach and community engagement designed to enhance recognition of both resource management issues and participation in outdoor recreation at Rocky Mountain National Park by Hispanics and African Americans living along the Front Range of Colorado.
Not to exceed 150 words: (n=136 words)

3. **Principal Investigator Contact Information**

First Name: Donald **Last Name:** Rodriguez
Title: Director of Environmental Studies/Assistant Professor
Affiliation: College of Natural Resources
Street Address: Colorado State University
City: Ft. Collins **State:** CO **Zip code:** 80523-1401
Phone: (970) 491-5629 **Fax:** (970) 491-0279
Email: Donald.Rodriguez@colostate.edu

4. **Park or Program Liaison Contact Information**

First Name: Terry **Last Name:** Terrell
Title: Research Administrator
Park: Rocky Mountain National Park
Park Office/Division: Research/Natural Resources
Street Address: 1000 U.S. Highway 36
City: Estes Park **State:** CO **Zip code:** 80517
Phone: (970) 586-1282 **Fax:** (970) 586-1359
Email: Terry_Terrell@nps.gov

Project Information

5. **Park(s) Where Research is Conducted:**

6. **Survey Dates:** (mm/dd/yyyy) to (mm/dd/yyyy)

7. **Type of Information Collection Instrument (Check all that Apply)**

Mail Survey **On-site Survey** **Interview** **Focus Groups**

Other (explain)

8. **Survey Justification: (Use as much space as needed; if necessary include additional explanation on a separate page.)**

9. **Survey Methodology: (Use as much space as needed; if necessary include additional explanation on a separate page.)**

- a) ***Respondent universe:*** The respondent universe for this study is Hispanics/Latinos and African Americans living in households along the Front Range region of Colorado during the study period. One objective of this study is to generalize results to the respondent universe.
- b) ***Sampling Plan Procedure:*** We will receive a random sample of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of households in the Hispanic and African American strata from Survey Sampling Inc. (SSI), a private survey research firm specializing in sampling. SSI will send us a random sample of 3,000 valid households representing deliverables within these two communities, all of which will be contacted in this study. SSI has the statistics for providing the number of total surveys this would require to ensure scientific accuracy.
- c) ***Instrument Administration:*** A modified tailored design method (Dillman, 2000) will be utilized to obtain the desired response rate. The 3,000 households sampled will first be sent a cover letter with the survey and business reply return envelope (initial mail-out). Approximately one week later a follow-up post card will be sent to all members of the sample (see last page of this approval form for sample content). The postcard will thank those that have already responded and remind those who have not yet responded to complete the survey in approximately a week. Approximately 2-3 weeks later, a follow-up mailing including an additional copy of the survey and return envelope will be mailed to households who still had not returned the first survey. In this mailing to Hispanic/Latino individuals within this strata that have still not returned the first survey, two versions will be mailed: one in the English language and one translated in Spanish language. The following statement will be indicated on the cover letter of each version: "If you receive two copies of this survey, please fill only one out and return it in the envelope provided." In cover letters to the survey mailings and post card reminder, respondents will be assured that completion of the survey is voluntary and their participation is strictly confidential.
- d) ***Expected response rate/confidence levels:*** Three-thousand households, from addresses that are valid and deliverable, obtained from SSI will be contacted (1,500 Hispanic and 1,500 African-American). Use of a modified tailored design method will achieve an expected 70% response rate or 2100 responses. Generalization to the respondent universe will be made at a 95% confidence level and a maximum error of +/- 5%. Again, SSI has the statistics for the number of surveys needed to over-sample residents in proportion to

their representation in the population. In reports which both sub-samples are combined and results analyzed together, cases will be weighted to correct for any disproportion. Weighting will not be a concern in analyses of each sub-sample separately.

e) Strategies for dealing with non-response bias: To determine whether individuals not responding to the mail survey are systematically different than respondents, 25 non-respondents will be randomly selected and contacted by telephone. Inferential statistical analysis will determine if respondents to the larger survey are systematically different than non-respondents. Final results will be weighted based on systematic differences that may exist. That is, data will be weighted to ensure characteristics underrepresented in the sample will be reflected consistently with their representation in the population. This group of 25 non-respondents will be asked 11 key questions from the mail-back questionnaire, responses to which will be compared to those of respondents. The 11 questions to be asked are as follows:

1. Have you ever been to Rocky Mountain National Park?
2. I don't understand how I would benefit by visiting RMNP
3. I don't believe white/Anglo visitors accept me because of my ethnicity or race
4. Going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of my culture
5. Facilities are not adequate to meet the needs or interests for me and/or my family
6. I prefer to spend time with people that have a similar religious/spiritual background
7. Are you Hispanic or Latino?
8. What is your race?
9. Age: How old were you on your last birthday?
10. What was your total household income in 2001 before taxes?
11. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

f) Description of any pre-testing and peer review of the methods and/or instrument. The survey instrument was developed through the use of results from the Delphi process with minority experts in the parks and natural resources professions. Focus groups with members of the African American and Hispanic communities in the Denver Metro area were also conducted. An extensive literature review also contributed to the instrument design. A pretest of the survey with a small sample (n = 9) of the Hispanic and African American students at Colorado State University to clarify instructions and wording on survey items was conducted. Seven scholars across the country peer reviewed the survey. All provided written comments for enhancing the survey content and format. The panel consisted of: Professors from University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), University of Florida, University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), California State University (Long Beach), and Old Dominion University; Research Social Scientists at the US Forest Service; and recent doctoral graduate from Ohio State University. All individuals have research and/or teaching expertise in this subject area. In addition, this panel consisted of individuals of different races and genders.

10.	Total Number of Initial Contacts Expected Respondents:	3,000	2,100	11.	Estimated Time to Complete Initial Contact Instrument (mins.):	1 min.	20 min.	12.	Total Burden Hours:	750
-----	--	-------	-------	-----	--	--------	---------	-----	----------------------------	-----

13. **Reporting Plan:** The reporting plan for the data being collected includes the following: A final technical report for Rocky Mountain National Park and to the National Park Service, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science Directorate, and an article for *Park Science*. Park briefing will occur through the annual research symposium at Rocky Mountain National Park. A preliminary park briefing occurred during the spring 2002 that included an overview of Delphi and Focus Group components of the project. An additional park briefing will occur during spring 2003. We will consider submission to refereed journals such as the Journal of Leisure Research and Leisure Sciences so this research will be communicated and validated by peers. Copies of all reports will be archived with the National Park Service Social Science Program.

(continued)

Important Note to Reviewers / Justification and explanation for wording and use of certain questionnaire items

As indicated on various items of the survey, an essential component to this study relates to testing theories pertaining to *Discrimination* and *Constraints*. Based on an extensive literature review as well as results from the Delphi and Focus Groups, the questions asking respondents specifically about their experiences and/or perceptions relating to White/Anglo visitors is a critical component. Participants from these first two research phases did not communicate about “other visitors” rather results typically related to White/Anglo visitors and/or Park employees. As indicated by Floyd (1999) and Philip (1995), it has been recommended that future research develop measures of discrimination that correspond closely to visitation and/or potential visitation at specific parks and outdoor recreation areas. Additionally, Gramann (1996) specified that one of the major gaps in knowledge is uncertainty regarding “how widespread perceptions are of discrimination as a cause of underutilization of recreation areas by minority groups” (p. xiii). Consequently, these are other reasons why this RMNP study is a perfect opportunity to further explore perceived discrimination and constraints.

Second, the notion of “culture” as a variable beyond race/ethnicity is extremely important to the body of knowledge within the social sciences (Sasidharan, 2002). Similarly, information obtained based on racial and ethnic perspectives and cultural implications will benefit RMNP in several ways. For instance, results can inform Park managers regarding the fact race and ethnicity (in particular) have been identified as critical components of **cultural change** that impact the ways in which recreation resources and facilities are managed for the future (Ewert, Chavez, & Magill, 1993; Johnson, 1998; Sasidharan, 2002). According to Sasidharan, race and ethnicity are more valuable social constructs being measured when conceptualized with cultural factors such as values and belief systems, customs, practices/behaviors, symbolic forms of expression, and leisure socialization patterns. Race and ethnicity have been identified as critical components of cultural change that impact the ways in which recreation resources and facilities are both used and managed for future (p. 2). Similarly, Gramann (1996) summarizes a criticism in the field where researchers have confounded the use of *race and ethnicity* and encourages future research to also explore the cultural forces at play with respect to outdoor recreation behaviors, styles, and constraints.

Although various diversity initiatives have achieved some notable successes in RMNP, people of color and individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds continue to be underrepresented in outdoor recreation participation in the Park. If these marginalized groups continue to be underrepresented in the ranks of visitors, they will often be underrepresented in the ranks of those contributing to policies developed and decisions made on natural and cultural resources management issues crucial to “all Americans.” These specific race/ethnicity/culture questions on the survey can assist the Park with knowing how to tailor outreach programs so they have a greater impact for a broader target group of visitors, and may include alternatives for how to increase awareness of certain racial, ethnic and cultural groups - about the Park - depending on changing demographics of the Southern Rocky Mountain Region. RMNP managers need to know how that change will affect them and subsequently how to enhance program offerings and resource management.

Rocky Mountain National Park is in a unique situation because it is only an hour and a half from a major urban center (i.e., Denver). The Park is already seeing an increase in English-speaking and non-English speaking Hispanic/Latino visitors to the park and to Estes Park. By asking these questions on the survey (found in Section II, Part A and Part B, and Section IV) RMNP can learn whether there are institutional, physical, or other constraints that create barriers to the diversification of park visitors. RMNP managers can use results of the race/ethnicity items relating to perceived discrimination and constraints, in particular, because approaches and measures may be provided that recreation resource managers in the Park could adopt in opening the welcome mat in response to the cultural diversity both in the Denver metropolitan area and within racial, ethnic, and cultural minority communities across the Front Range.

Citation Examples for Methodology and Explanations

- Dillman, D.A. (2000). Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ewert, A. W., Chavez, D. J., & Magill, A. W. (Eds.). (1993). Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Floyd, M. (1999). Race, ethnicity and use of the National Park System (Social Science Research Review, Spring/Summer ed., Vol. 1, pp. 1-24). Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service.
- Floyd, M. F., & Gramann, J. H. (1995). Perceptions of discrimination in a recreation context. Journal of Leisure Research, 27(2), 192-199.
- Gramann, J. H. (1996). Ethnicity, race, and outdoor recreation: A review of trends, policy, and research (Miscellaneous Paper R-96-1). Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.
- Johnson, C. Y. (1998). A consideration of collective memory in African American attachment to wildland recreation places. Human Ecology Review, 5(1), 5-15.
- Philipp, S. F. (1995). Race and leisure constraints. Leisure Sciences, 17, 109-120.
- Sasidharan, V. (2002). Special issue introduction: Understanding recreation and the environment within the context of culture. Leisure Sciences, 24, 1-11.

#####

SAMPLE CONTENT FOR POST CARD TO FOLLOW FIRST MAILING:

Minority Visitor Use Patterns at Rocky Mountain National Park: An Examination of Barriers and Constraints	Colorado State University
Hello! Recently you should have received a special survey regarding how African Americans or Blacks, and Hispanics or Latinos experience National Parks and other outdoor recreation areas, in general, and Rocky Mountain National Park in particular. If you do not fall into either of these racial categories, please disregard this survey. If you have already returned your survey, please disregard this notice and know how much we appreciate your input.	
If you have not received your survey packet in the mail yet, or if you need a new copy, please leave a message at 970-491-6795 with your name and address and we will mail one out right away. Your comments are extremely important to the success of this project. The goal of this study is to learn about <u>your</u> participation or non-participation in outdoor recreation activities in Rocky Mountain National Park and other natural areas. This is a reminder that we need to receive your survey, if at all possible, by ___[date]___.	
Thank you for your time and support!	
Don A. Rodriguez Director of Environmental Studies Assistant Professor	Al Bright Assistant Professor
	Nina Roberts Research Assistant

Appendix J
Cover Letter for Mail Back Survey

February 2003

Greetings:

This survey was developed by Colorado State University (CSU) for the National Park Service to learn how Hispanics or Latinos and African Americans or Blacks, experience National Parks and other outdoor recreation areas, in general, and Rocky Mountain National Park in particular. Although we are trying to reach households for people of these backgrounds, based on the random sampling procedure necessary to represent our population, you may still be among a small sample of non-minorities receiving this survey. If you do not fall into either of these racial categories, please disregard this survey. We are asking these questions in order to better understand visitors and non-visitors to Rocky Mountain National Park and provide information to park managers in order to better serve people from these communities.

The purpose of this study is to learn about your participation or non-participation in outdoor recreation activities in Rocky Mountain National Park and other natural areas. When we use outdoor recreation in “natural areas” we are talking about places like National and State Parks and/or Forests where activities such as hiking, fishing, camping and backpacking usually occur.

IMPORTANT: Even if you have never been to Rocky Mountain National Park, we would like you to complete this survey. Your opinions and attitudes are important to us and will help us understand what you enjoy doing for fun in the outdoors.

The person whose name appears on the envelope should be the one filling out this survey. Completion of this survey is voluntary and all responses will be kept strictly confidential. Names will **not** be associated with responses. Please take your time and answer each question in a way that most closely expresses your own feelings and experiences. Since we are contacting a small number of people, your response is very important.

There is no risk in completing this survey; it should take approximately 20 minutes. When you are finished, fold the questionnaire once and place it in the envelope provided for you. You do not need to put a stamp on the envelope, simply drop it in the mail! If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may call the CSU Office for Regulatory Compliance at 970-491-1563.

*All answers will remain confidential.
Thank you for your participation in this survey!*

Donald A. Rodriguez, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Alan Bright, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Nina S. Roberts
Graduate Research Assistant

OMB # 1024-0224
Expiration date: 10/31/2003

Appendix K Mail Back Survey

Section I. This first set of questions has two parts. Part A relates to your general recreational interests and Part B relates to visits to Rocky Mountain National Park (also referred to as “the Park”). Please complete items in this section that apply to you *EVEN IF YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN* to the Park.

A. In Column A, place a check (3) next to the activities that you have done at least once in the past 2 years at any location.

Then, in Column B, indicate how interested you are in doing each of these activities at any location in the next 5 years *Circle the number of your response*

COLUMN A		COLUMN B (Interest in participation in the next 5 years?)					
Have you done this activity in the past 2 years? If <u>yes</u> , check (3) the activity in this column:		Very Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Neutral	Somewhat Interested	Very Interested	Don't Know
• Fishing	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Wildlife viewing	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Bird watching	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Cookout / BBQ	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Boating (any type)	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Hiking	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Camping	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Outdoor/nature photography	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Learn about protecting nature	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Horseback riding	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Scenic viewing	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Cross-country skiing	_____	1	2	3	4	5	DK

Rocky Mountain National Park (RMNP). Tell us how familiar you are with the following aspects relating to the Park (*Circle one number*)

	Very Unfamiliar	Somewhat Unfamiliar	Neutral	Somewhat Familiar	Very Familiar	Don't Know
• Location of RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• What you can do in the Park	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• How to get to the Park	1	2	3	4	5	DK

1. Have you ever been to Rocky Mountain National Park? Yes ___ No ___ (*IF NO, skip to question 6, next page*)

2. About how many visits did you make to RMNP during the past 12 months? ___ Number of visits

3. On average, about how often do you go to RMNP? ___ Number of times per year (approximately)

4. Who do you most often visit the park with? (*Check all that apply*):

Self Family Friends Church groups Other organized groups (describe): _____

5. What do you like to do when you go to RMNP? (Check all that apply)

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Going to visitor centers | <input type="checkbox"/> | Scenic driving for pleasure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Horseback riding | <input type="checkbox"/> | Participating in ranger-led programs | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hiking | <input type="checkbox"/> | Viewing and/or photographing wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Camping | <input type="checkbox"/> | Picnicking with family/friends | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Participating in general outdoor activities with family and/or friends | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Other? <input type="checkbox"/> Please list: _____ | | | |

6. Below are the logos of a few land management agencies that exist in Colorado. Do you know which one manages RMNP? (Circle one managing agency)



I DO NOT
KNOW

Section II. In this section, we want to know about your perceptions and reasons why you might not visit RMNP (or other outdoor/natural recreation areas) more often -- or at all if you've never been.

NOTE: There are TWO PARTS! Please circle one number for each Part A and B

For this first Part A, there are several statements listed below that could describe people and their perceptions or experiences of RMNP or other outdoor recreation areas. Circle the number that best describes you.

Characteristic	PART A					
	To what extent does each item describe YOU!?					
	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
• My <u>family</u> never participated or went to RMNP when I was a child	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I know a lot about RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• My <u>friends</u> never participated or went to the park when I was a child	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I am sometimes scared of the "unknown"	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not have enough money to visit	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not understand how I would benefit by visiting RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I've heard stories that in the past bad things have happened to people like me in some parks	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I don't believe white Anglo visitors (at parks) accept me because of my ethnicity or race	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I believe there are not enough park employees who are ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of the culture of my ethnicity or race	1	2	3	4	5	DK

(continued next page)

PART A (continued)

To what extent does each item describe YOU!?

<u>Characteristic</u>	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
• There are not enough opportunities or things to do at RMNP that interest me	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I would have trouble finding convenient or affordable transportation to the park.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I feel that people of my ethnicity or race are not very welcome at places like RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Facilities at RMNP <u>are</u> adequate to meet the needs or interests for me and/or my family	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• People of my ethnicity or race have been discriminated against when visiting some parks and other outdoor areas	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not like bugs or wild animals—they make me uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I believe places like RMNP are intended for middle to upper class white people	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• My decisions to visit are influenced by the history of slavery or migrant labor	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not/would not personally feel safe visiting the park	1	2	3	4	5	DK

PART B

Listed below are similar statements reflecting several reasons why people may not visit Rocky Mountain National Park (also, “RMNP” or “the park”). Please circle the number that tells us if that statement prevents YOU from visiting RMNP (at all or more often than you currently do).

To what extent does each item PREVENT YOU from visiting Rocky Mountain National Park?

<u>Characteristic</u>	Not at All	Slightly	Somewhat	Moderately	Very Much	Don't Know
• My family never participated or went to RMNP when I was a child	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not know much about RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• My friends never participated or went to the park when I was a child	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I am sometimes scared of the “unknown”	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not have enough money to visit	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I don't understand how I would benefit by visiting RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I've heard stories in the past that bad things happened to people like me, in some parks	1	2	3	4	5	DK

(continued next page)

PART B *continued*

To what extent does each item **PREVENT YOU** from visiting Rocky Mountain National Park?

Characteristic	To what extent does each item PREVENT YOU from visiting Rocky Mountain National Park?					
	Not at All	Slightly	Somewhat	Moderately	Very Much	Don't Know
• I believe there are not enough park employees who are ethnic or racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of my culture	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I don't like bugs, wild animals—they make me uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• There are not enough opportunities or things to do at RMNP that interest me	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I would have trouble finding convenient or affordable transportation to the Park	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I feel that people of my ethnicity or race are not very welcomed at places like RMNP	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Facilities are not adequate to meet the needs or interests for me and/or my family	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• People of my ethnicity or race have been discriminated against when visiting some parks and other outdoor areas	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I believe places like RMNP are intended for middle to upper class white people	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• My decisions to visit are influenced by the history of slavery or migrant labor	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I do not / would not personally feel safe visiting the Park (<i>safety continues with next question</i>):	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• If personal <u>safety</u> is an issue for you in visiting or deciding to visit, please explain _____						

Section III. This section includes a series of questions relating to how you see yourself ...

Please indicate how you feel about the following (*please circle only one*):

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
• I feel a great sense of attachment to my cultural group	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I strongly identify with myself based on my culture so to simply call myself an "American" does not fully describe me	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I prefer to spend time with people who have a similar religious/spiritual background to me	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I identify with other people of similar race or ethnicity to me, even if they are not close friends or relatives	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I feel a great sense of attachment/pride with my religious/spiritual identity	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Other groups of people that are not from my race or ethnicity make me feel uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I prefer to interact with people from my own ethnic group:						
- At home	1	2	3	4	5	DK
- During my favorite recreation activities	1	2	3	4	5	DK
- When with my friends	1	2	3	4	5	DK
- When with people from my place of worship	1	2	3	4	5	DK
- In my neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	DK

Please indicate how important the following statements are to you (*please circle only one*):

How important is it for you to:	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Neutral	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Don't Know
• Celebrate the holiday's specific to your culture?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Raise children in the values of your culture?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Maintain ties with your cultural roots?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Spend time with people of your cultural background even if they are not close friends or relatives?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Maintain the values of your cultural background?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• Understand the values your culture places on the natural environment?	1	2	3	4	5	DK

1. What is your first language? (*The language you feel most comfortable communicating in*)
 English Spanish Other, please list: _____
2. What language is spoken at your home (most of the time)? English Spanish Other _____
3. Are you Hispanic or Latino? Yes - Hispanic or Latino No – Not Hispanic or Latino
4. What is your race? (check one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be):
 Black or African American American Indian or Alaska Native Asian White
 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Do not wish to answer
5. Please describe yourself in terms of your religious/spiritual identity: _____
6. Is it important that the holidays celebrated specific to your culture be recognized by RMNP? Yes No

Section IV. Based on an individual's background and experiences, all people feel differently when visiting or deciding to visit parks and other outdoor/natural areas. We want to know about *your* perceptions and experiences.

Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following, regardless of your level of park visits

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
• I feel comfortable at outdoor areas regardless of my ethnicity or race	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• In outdoor recreation areas I have been to, police or law enforcement rangers often watch or stare closely at people who are of my ethnicity or race	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• When I do visit outdoor areas, if I feel uncomfortable because of my ethnicity or race, I leave that place and go to another location	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I prefer to recreate in outdoor settings where there is a visible presence of other groups different from my ethnicity or race	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• If I think I might not be comfortable or welcome in a specific outdoor area, because of my ethnicity or race, I usually decide not to go there at all	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• If I do not know where to go and what to do at places like RMNP or other natural areas, I usually just don't go	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• If I do not feel safe because of other people at an outdoor area that I want to visit, I will go to a different area	1	2	3	4	5	DK
• I participate or visit the park with friends from different ethnic or racial groups	1	2	3	4	5	DK

Section V. Rocky Mountain National Park (RMNP) is very interested in ways to better communicate with diverse communities, its visitors and potential visitors! Please respond to the following:

In **Part A**, check which types of media that you use, then circle the response regarding how often you receive information from that type. In **Part B**, for each of these types that apply to you, tell us what two sources you use the most.

Part A

Which of these do you like? <i>(check all that apply):</i>		How often do you use this type of media?		
		<u>Never</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>A Lot</u>
(a) Newspapers	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
(b) Magazines	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
(c) Radio	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
(d) Television	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
(e) Computers/Internet	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
(f) Reading flyers at the corner store	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3

Part B

- 1 (a) Which 2 newspapers do you read **the most**: _____
From the ones you listed, please CIRCLE the newspapers you subscribe to (delivered to your home)
- (b) Which 2 magazines do you read **the most**: _____
From the ones you listed, CIRCLE the magazines you subscribe to (delivered to your home)
- (c) Which 2 radio stations do you listen to **the most**? _____
- (d) Which 2 television stations do you watch **the most**? _____
- (e) What other sources do you like to get information from? (please provide examples):

2. Please tell us what types of park services and opportunities would increase your desire to visit RMNP:
- Organized and affordable bus tours from a metropolitan/city area to the Park
 - Greater variety of ethnic food service options in the Park
 - Park visitor center near my community / metro area
 - More ethnic minorities working at the Park
 - Expanded interpretation/education programs in the Park relating to people or events of my ethnicity or race
 - Other ideas? Please list: _____

3. Please **CIRCLE** your answer for the following question:

Whether you have ever visited or not, how interested are you in visiting RMNP in the future?

Very Uninterested
 Somewhat Uninterested
 Neutral
 Somewhat Interested
 Very Interested
 Don't Know

One more section to go!

Section VI. While this last set of questions is optional, your background is very important to us and the outcome of this study. Remember, all responses are completely confidential; thank you for telling us about your background –

1. Female Male
2. Age: How old were you on your last birthday? _____
3. Marital Status: Single Married Divorced Widowed Separated
 Living with Partner Other (describe) _____
4. Do you have any children? Yes No If yes, how many? _____ Ages: _____
 If yes, how many of these children currently live in your household: _____
5. Work Status (*check all that apply*): Employed Self-employed Unemployed
 Full-time homemaker Full-time student Retired Other (explain) _____
6. What is your occupation? _____
7. What type of residence do you live in?
 Own my own house or condo Rent (check what type?) → Apartment _____ House _____ Condo _____ Other _____
 Live with family members Live in someone else's home other (describe) _____
8. What was your **total household income** in 2001 before taxes? (Include income of **all** individuals living in your home employed last year) –
 Under \$10,000 \$10,000-24,999 \$25,000-49,999
 \$50,000-74,999 \$75,000-\$99,999 over \$100,000
9. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
 Some High School Bachelor's Degree
 High School Graduate/GED Some Graduate school
 Technical/Vocational degree (beyond HS) Advanced Degree **beyond** 4-year college completed (e.g., Graduate, M.D., J.D.)
 Some College/University

These next few questions will help the Park better understand the national heritage of visitors and potential visitors:

10. Were you born in the United States? Yes ___ No ____ . **If no**, where were you born? _____
11. If you were born in the USA, what state were **you** born in: _____
12. How long have **you** lived in Colorado? _____ Years _____ Months
13. In what state of the US or what country were your **parents** born?
 Mother _____ Don't Know _____ Father _____ Don't Know _____
14. In what state of the US or what country were your **grandparents** born?

<u>Mother's Side</u>		<u>Father's Side</u>	
Grandmother _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know	Grandmother _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know
Grandfather _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know	Grandfather _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know

Thanks very much for your time! Muchas gracias por su tiempo!


This questionnaire is the property of Colorado State University and Rocky Mountain National Park. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without written permission by the researchers. **PRIVACY ACT and PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT statement:** 16 U.S.C.1a-7 authorizes collection of this information. This information will be used by park managers to better serve the public. Response to this request is voluntary. No action may be taken against you for refusing to supply the information requested. Permanent data will be completely anonymous. Data collected through public surveys may be disclosed to the Department of Justice when relevant to litigation or anticipated litigation, or to appropriate Federal, State, local or foreign agencies responsible for investigating or prosecuting a violation of law. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. **Burden estimate statement:** Public reporting for this form is estimated to average 20 minutes per response. Direct comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this form to: Information Collection Clearance Officer/National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20240.

The National Park Service and Colorado State University thank you for your time. We welcome any additional input or comments from you about how park staff can improve programs, services and general communication with visitors and potential visitors from ethnically diverse backgrounds. Please feel free to write any additional comments below:



Beckwourth Mountain Club and Outdoor Education Center
Rocky Mountain National Park

Photographs by Nina S. Roberts



Denver City Skyline

Appendix L
Summary of Survey Respondents ¹

Demographic Characteristic	African American	Latino	Mixed Race	Total
<i>Gender</i>				
Females	19	14	4	37
Males	18	18	8	44
<i>Age</i>				
18 - 24 (young adults)	1	2	1	4
25 - 40 (mature adults)	5	12	6	23
41 - 60 (middle aged)	16	13	4	33
61 and older (elders)	14	4	1	19
<i>Education</i>				
6th grade	0	1	0	1
Some high school	4	5	1	10
High school graduate/GED	1	5	2	8
Technical/Vocational (beyond H.S.)	1	3	1	5
Some college/university	20	7	4	31
Bachelor's degree	6	5	2	13
Some graduate school	2	2	2	6
Advanced degree(beyond 4-yr)	2	3	0	5
<i>Income</i>				
Under \$10,000	5	2	1	8
\$10k to \$24,999	4	7	1	12
\$25k to \$49,999	11	9	6	26
\$50k to \$74,999	5	5	3	13
\$75k to \$99,999	3	2	1	6
Over \$100,000	4	3	0	7
<i>Work/Employment Status</i>				
Employed	13	19	10	42
Self-Employed	5	4	1	10
Unemployed	2	1	0	3
Full-time homemaker	1	1	0	2
Full-time student	2	2	1	5
Retired	14	4	1	19
<i>Children under 18 at home</i>				
Yes - have kids living at home	6	14	7	27
No - No kids living at home	24	11	4	39
Do not have children	7	8	1	16
<i>Type of Residence</i>				
Own house, condo or other	26	25	7	58
Rent house, apartment, or other	9	6	5	20
Live with family members	1	0	0	1
Live in someone else's home	1	1	0	2
<i>Born in the United States</i>				
YES	37	24	11	72
NO	0	8	1	9

¹ Format for table modeled after summary reported by Pickering (2000)

Appendix M
Tables A – E : Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Table A Measure of Culture ¹

Scale / Items	Factor Loadings	Alpha
Sense of Identity scale ²		.78
I feel a great sense of attachment to my cultural group.	.56	
I strongly identify with myself based on my culture so to simply call myself an "American" does not describe me.	.61	
I prefer to spend time with people who have a similar religious/spiritual background to me.	.46	
I identify with other people of similar race or ethnicity to me, even if they are not close friends or relatives.	.87	
I feel a great sense of attachment/pride with my religious/spiritual identity.	.67	
Ethnic Interaction Preferences scale ³		.90
I prefer to interact with people from my own ethnic group:		
At home	.85	
During my favorite recreation activities	.88	
When with my friends	.88	
When with people from my place of worship	.77	
In my neighborhood	.90	
Cultural Connections scale ⁴		.91
Celebrate the holidays specific to your culture	.77	
Raise children in the values of your culture	.79	
Maintain ties with your cultural roots	.84	
Spend time with people of your cultural background even if they are not close friends or relatives	.83	
Maintain the values of your cultural background	.83	
Understand the values your culture places on the natural environment	.71	

¹ CFA confirmed the model was a good fit of the data ($\chi^2 = 1418.36$, $\chi^2/df = 1.47$, CFI = .98, NFI = .96)

² Respondents were asked to indicate *how they feel*. Items were measured on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) with an option for "don't know" (6)

³ Measured on a 6-point scale of "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" with an option for "don't know" (6)

⁴ Respondents were asked *how important are statements* indicated. Items were measured on a Likert scale from "very unimportant" (1) to "very important" (5) with an option for "don't know" (6)

Table B. Items preventing you from visiting RMNP (at all or more often) ¹

Scale / Items	Factor Loadings	Alpha
<i>To what extent does each item prevent you from visiting Rocky Mountain National Park ²</i>		
Socialization & Early Exposure scale		.67
My family never participated or went to RMNP when I was a child	.76	
My friends never participated or went to the park when I was a child	.88	
Going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of my culture	.38	
I believe places like RMNP are intended for middle to upper class white people	.37	
Personal Discomfort/Safety scale		.71
I am sometimes scared of the "unknown"	.62	
I don't like bugs, wild animals - they make me uncomfortable	.65	
I do not/would not personally feel safe visiting the Park	.69	
Access Issues scale		.75
I do not have enough money to visit	.65	
I would have trouble finding convenient or affordable transportation to the park	.83	
Facilities are not adequate to meet the needs or interests for me and/or my family	.68	
Cultural Conflicts scale		.82
I've heard stories in the past that bad things happened to people like me, in some parks	.68	
I believe there are not enough park employees who are ethnic or racial minorities	.63	
I feel like people of my ethnicity or race are not very welcomed at places like RMNP	.85	
People of my ethnicity or race have been discriminated against when visiting some parks and other outdoor areas	.69	
My decisions to visit are influenced by the history of slavery or migrant labor	.65	
Lack of Knowledge/Awareness scale		.69
I do not know much about RMNP	.53	
I don't understand how I would benefit by visiting RMNP	.77	
There are not enough opportunities or things to do at RMNP that interest me	.70	

¹ CFA confirmed the model w as a good fit of the data ($\chi^2 = 376.30$, $\chi^2/df = 3.01$, CFI = .88, NFI = .84)

² All items w ere measured on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) w ith an option for "don't know " (6)

Table C. Constraints based on general perceptions & personal experiences ¹

Scale / Items	Factor Loadings	Alpha
Culture of the National Park Service scale ²		.62
I believe there are not enough park employees who are ethnic minorities	.56	
There are not enough opportunities or things to do at RMNP that interest me	.65	
Facilities at RMNP <u>are</u> adequate to meet the needs or interests for me and/or my family **	.48	
I believe places like RMNP are intended for middle to upper class white people	.63	
Marginalized Nature of Ethnic Minorities scale ³		.69
I do not have enough money to visit	.58	
I would have trouble finding convenient or affordable transportation to the park	.65	
My decisions to visit are influenced by the history of slavery or migrant labor	.76	
Safety Concerns scale ⁴		.73
I am sometimes scared of the "unknown"	.54	
I've heard stories in the past that bad things happened to people like me, in some parks	.75	
I do not like bugs or wild animals - they make me uncomfortable	.70	
I do not/would not personally feel safe visiting the park	.82	
Cultural Filters scale ⁵		.67
Going to RMNP or similar outdoor areas is not part of the culture of my ethnicity or race	.69	
I feel comfortable at outdoor areas regardless of my ethnicity/race	.47	
I participate or visit the park with friends from different ethnic or racial groups **	.62	

¹ CFA confirmed the model was a good fit of the data ($\chi^2 = 376.30$, $\chi^2/df = 3.01$, CFI = .88, NFI = .84)

^{2,3,4} Respondents were asked to *what extent each item describes you*. All items were measured on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) with an option for "don't know" (6).

⁵ This scale was a combination of one item asking the extent this describes you and two items inquiring about respondent perceptions and experiences. All were measured on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) with an option for "don't know" (6).

** These items were reverse coded first for analysis


Table D. Measure of Discrimination as a Constraint ¹

Scale / Items	Factor Loadings	Alpha
Perceived Discrimination scale ²		.70
In outdoor recreation areas I have been to, police or law enforcement rangers often watch or stare closely at people who are of my ethnicity or race	.30	
When I do visit outdoor areas, if I feel uncomfortable because of my ethnicity or race, I leave that place and go to another location	.27	
If I think I might not be comfortable or welcome in a specific outdoor area, because of my ethnicity or race, I usually decide not to go at all	.34	
If I do not feel safe because of other people at an outdoor area that I want to visit, I will go to a different area	.33	
I don't believe white Anglo visitors (at parks) accept me because of my ethnicity or race	.70	
I feel that people of my ethnicity or race are not very welcome at places like RMNP	.76	
People of my ethnicity or race have been discriminated against when visiting some parks and other outdoor areas	.60	

¹ CFA confirmed the model was a good fit of the data ($\chi^2 = 58.70$, $\chi^2/df = 4.19$, CFI = .95, NFI = .94)

² The first four items come from the general constraints perceptions/personal experiences section and the latter 3 items are from the how does each item describe you section. Each item is measured on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) with an option for "don't know" (6).

Appendix N
Cluster Groups with Constraint Dimension Means



3 Cluster Membership Groups