

PREFERENCES OF HISPANIC AND ANGLO CAMPERS: A COMPARISON  
OF MANAGERIAL ELEMENTS, ATTRIBUTES, AND MOTIVATION  
PREFERENCES OF CAMPING, BARRIERS TO CAMPING,  
AND THE EFFECT OF ACCULTURATION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate College of  
Southwest Texas State University  
in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements

For the Degree

Master of SCIENCE

By

Leah R. Huth, B.S.R.A.

San Marcos, Texas  
August, 2003

COPYRIGHT

by

Leah R. Huth

2003

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my husband, Joe Huth, for his constant support through out this entire project. My thanks to Barbara Cristler, Lorraine Dean, Monique Uhlenhaker, Lee Golaz, Chrissy Huth, and Anna Huth for supporting me with your special talents.

The support of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department has made this project possible. My thanks to Kevin Good, Jim Wilson, Terry Rodgers, Mark Abolafia-Rosenzweig, and Russell Fishbeck for the time they contributed to the project. A special thanks goes to Jimmy Swaim for believing in me and providing constant encouragement.

I am thankful to Larry Price and Steve Awoniyi for their patience and hours of consultation. I appreciate the members of my thesis committee, Tinker Murray and Robert Pankey, for the hours of reading and rereading. A special thanks to Tom Gustafson, thesis chair, who enabled me to complete this project because of his ability to keep me focused on the end product and not become mired in details.

This manuscript was submitted on July 4, 2003.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<b>Page</b>
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I	INTRODUCTION .....	1
	Purpose of the Study .....	3
	Hypotheses .....	3
	Operational Definitions .....	3
	Delimitations .....	5
	Significance of Study .....	5
II	METHODS .....	7
	Subjects .....	7
	Tests and Instruments .....	7
	Procedures .....	8
	Design and Analysis .....	9
III	RESULTS .....	11
	Ethnicity .....	14
	Managerial Elements .....	14
	Attributes and Motivation .....	17
	Barriers to Camping .....	19
	Acculturation .....	20
	Managerial Elements .....	20
	Attributes and Motivation .....	27
	Barriers to Camping .....	32
III	CONCLUSION .....	40
	Ethnicity .....	40
	Managerial Elements .....	40
	Attributes and Motivation .....	43
	Barriers to Camping .....	45
	Acculturation .....	47
	Managerial Elements .....	47
	Attributes and Motivation .....	53
	Barriers to Camping .....	57
	Further Research .....	62
APPENDIX A	Literature Review .....	64
APPENDIX B	Survey Instrument .....	72
APPENDIX C	Tables of Significant Findings .....	80
REFERENCES	.....	96

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I      Frequency of Ethnicity .....	12
II     Frequency of Averaged Acculturation .....	13
III    Distribution of Significant Items .....	14
IV    Top Three Responses for Item 8 .....	16
V     Distribution of Significant Findings of Ethnicity by Acculturation Level .....	21
VI    Distribution of Close Seconds .....	22

## **ABSTRACT**

**PREFERENCES OF HISPANIC AND ANGLO CAMPERS: A COMPARISON  
OF MANAGERIAL ELEMENTS, ATTRIBUTES, AND MOTIVATION  
PREFERENCES OF CAMPING, BARRIERS TO CAMPING,  
AND THE EFFECT OF ACCULTURATION**

by

LEAH R. HUTH, B.S.R.A.

Southwest Texas State University

August 2003

**SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: THOMAS GUSTAFSON**

Preferences of Hispanic and Anglo campers (N=729) were studied regarding managerial elements, attributes, motivations, and barriers to camping, along with the effect of acculturation. The Short Acculturation Scale by Marin and Marin (1991), the Attribute Preference, Motivation, and Barrier Scales by Phelan (1991), the Perceptions of Site Features Scale by Baas, Ewert, and Chavez (1993), and managerial elements were combined on a survey instrument. Comparative research provides current information indicating emerging trends that allow managers to plan programs and budgets.

Preferences were affected by ethnicity and acculturation levels, although more significant findings occurred after averaging for acculturation. Making changes in managerial elements and park design will allow for inclusion of all while avoiding user conflict and removing barriers to camping.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Outdoor recreation has traditionally experienced high participation rates from the middle-class, white segment of the population (Stamps & Stamps, 1985). Texas is experiencing a shrinking of this target market with white males 40+ age ranges becoming a minority (Schmidly, 2001). Based on current trends, Hispanics are projected to comprise 59% of the population in Texas in 2040, thus placing a large portion in the target market for outdoor recreation (Murdock, 2003). The population shift of markedly fewer middle-class whites may require changes in physical and managerial elements in order to remain viable in a market characterized by increased competition and scarce fiscal resources (Cottrell & Graefe, 1993; Texas Parks & Wildlife, 1990). Research is needed to establish the leisure preferences of current customers in order to determine possible changes recreation professionals could initiate to encourage participation from low and non-users of outdoor recreation (Chavez, 2000).

Comparative studies have been conducted in several states to determine the preferences of ethnic groups (Baas, Ewert, & Chavez, 1993; Blahna, Toch, Erickson & Phelan, 1990; Gramann, Floyd & Saenz, 1993; Phelan, 1991; Responsive Management, 2001). In addition to race, ethnicity, class, age, and gender, researchers also took into account the effects of education (Jackson, 1973), social composition (Hutchison, 1988),

levels of acculturation (Carr & Williams, 1993), discrimination (Dwyer, 1994), and institutional discrimination (Blahna & Black, 1993) on the preferences provided by the respondents. Abreu (1987) stated, “to meet their needs effectively and equitably, recreation professionals must be well informed about the participants with whom they are working and plan the programs for and with them” (p. 75).

Comparative research should be conducted in all fields on a regular basis in order to maintain a contemporary profile of current and potential customer preferences (Allison, 1988; Baas, 1992; Blahna, 1992a; Chavez, 2000; Dwyer & Gobster, 1997). Gobster and Delgado (1993) recommended research as a method of avoiding charges of discrimination, as well as highlighting interests of occasional users indicating changes in market trends. Dwyer (1994) suggested exploring the various attributes that make one site attractive and another unattractive. It is possible that the design of a campground may be discouraging the very customers a park is trying to attract. Dahl (1993) indicated a user group’s cultural value system might create conflict with current management policies and intended land usages. Comparative research can illuminate changing user trends, unrecognized negative attributes, and sources of unintentional institutional discrimination.

The recreation profession has the ability to meet the needs of ethnic groups if one embraces the complex issues associated with cultural diversity, seeks to understand the effects of ethnic identity on leisure preferences, and applies this knowledge and understanding to park designs, facilities, and programs (Carr & Williams, 1993; Chase & Cheek, 1979; Chavez & Magill, 1993; Simcox, 1993; West, 1989). Baas (1992)



determined, “to the extent that this occurs, ‘quality’ in recreation management is achieved” (p. 40). See appendix A for a review of the literature.

*Purpose of the study.* The purpose of this study was to compare the preferences of Hispanic and Anglo campers regarding the managerial elements, attributes, and motivation preferences of camping, possible barriers to participation in camping, and the effect of acculturation on preferences and barriers.

*Hypotheses.* It is hypothesized that:

1. The distribution of respondent’s camping preferences is independent of ethnicity.
2. The distribution of respondent’s perceived barriers to camping is independent of ethnicity.
3. The distribution of respondent’s camping preferences is independent of level of acculturation.
4. The distribution of respondent’s perceived barriers to camping is independent of level of acculturation.

*Operational definitions.* The following definitions were used in this study:

1. **Acculturation** is defined as accepting new cultural traits and traditions while rejecting or not practicing old cultural traits and traditions (Carr & Williams, 1993).
2. **Culture** is defined as the mode of living, traditions, beliefs, and ideology a group possesses that are distinctive from other groups (Bullock & Stallybrass, 1977).
3. **Cultural Awareness** is the understanding and acceptance of another culture as it relates to individual action, expression, and values (Dolce, 1973).
4. **Discrimination** is defined as an act of disqualifying or mistreating people based on

their membership in an equally qualified group (Chavez, 1993a; Chavez, 2000).

5. **Ethnicity** is defined as having a combination of a common ancestry; and/or a common country of origin; and/or a perception of cultural differences; and/or share common language, food, religion, and cultural traditions (Baas et al., 1993; Carr & Williams, 1993; Chavez, 2000; Dahl, 1993).
6. **Hispanic** is used in reference to the global community of persons of Spanish origin as termed in the US Census (Moore, 1985).
7. **Institutional Discrimination** is defined as policies, procedure, rules, and regulations that, intentional or unintentional, limit, or prohibit opportunities to particular groups (Chavez, 2000).
8. **Mexican American** is defined as individuals of Mexican origin born in the United States and traditionally living in the Southwest (Moore, 1985).
9. **Multiculturalism** demonstrates a value system stemming from various cultures with equal support of all (Dolce, 1973).
10. **Perceived Discrimination** is defined as a perception that discrimination does exist or could occur in a given setting, (not necessarily that it has occurred), causing the group or individual to feel unwelcome (Chavez, 2000).
11. **Prejudice** is defined as a predisposition to liking or disliking people for real or imagined social characteristics, often used negatively to indicate an attitude of aversion or hostility (Chavez, 1993a; Chavez, 2000).
12. **Race** is defined as a group of people possessing certain distinctive and hereditary physical traits; a perception of physical differences (Chavez, 2000).
13. **Racism** is defined as a belief that one or some ethnic groups are superior or inferior

to others, becoming apparent through prejudicial or discriminatory actions that favor one group over another (Blahna & Black, 1993; Chavez, 2000).

14. **Selective Acculturation** is defined as an ethnic group intentionally adopting certain traditions or traits of the dominant group in order to efficiently function, while maintaining their own traditions or traits in other arenas (Chavez, 2000; Moore, 1976).

15. **Values** are defined as a system of beliefs, actions, and ethics that guide and direct the actions of an individual (Monroe, 1995).

*Delimitations.* The delimitations of this study include:

1. The use of the Short Acculturation Scale by Marin and Marin (1991), the Attribute Preference, Motivation, and Barrier Scales by Phelan (1991), and the Perceptions of Site Features Scale by Baas et al. (1993).
2. This study is delimited to individuals camping at a state park.
3. This study is delimited to parks of similar size with water recreation.

*Significance of study.* Rapid changes in population and economics require managers to make informed decisions to remain viable in the highly competitive leisure field. Comparative research provides current information that highlights changes and indicates emerging trends. To avoid negative reactions and possible charges of inequities, managers can use the results of surveys to integrate preferences into planning, programs, and budgets (Gobster & Delgado, 1993). Research in this area will provide understanding of minority preferences and allow for sensitivity in designing parks (Gobster, 1993a). Application of current information will allow managers to apply scarce

resources in critical areas, accommodate new users, and modify or eliminate institutional discrimination.

The cause for minority underparticipation in camping has not been fully explored, even though documented in general participation studies (Phelan, 1991). Research on minority preferences has been conducted in other states though not in Texas. Items for the preference attributes, motivations, and barrier scales were based on these studies; therefore, completion of this study provides a point of comparison and builds upon other research. Dwyer and Gobster (1997) noted the correlation between cultural diversity and recreation changes with location so it would be inappropriate to extend research findings to all situations.

It is important that researchers, managers, and planners remain aware of users and user trends (Dwyer, 1994). Ewert (1993) asserted, "Failure to discover ways to manage these areas through the proper application of research will create a missed opportunity from which natural resource management will become increasingly irrelevant to a substantial portion of our population" (p. 12-13).

## CHAPTER 2

### METHODS

The purpose of this study was to compare the preferences of Hispanic and Anglo campers regarding the managerial elements, attributes, and motivations preferences of camping, possible barriers to participation in camping, and the effect of acculturation on preferences and barriers. This chapter contains information about the subjects, the survey instrument, the procedures, the design, and intended analysis of the study.

*Subjects.* Individuals camping at a state park were asked to participate in the survey. Males and females that were at least 18 years of age completed the survey. Information on the demographics of the subjects was collected within the survey. The subjects were informed that participation was voluntary, they could stop at any point in the interview, and that responses were anonymous and confidential.

*Tests and instruments.* Permission was obtained from Blahna et al. (1990) for use of the Attribute Preference, Motivation, and Barrier Scales, from Baas et al. (1993) for use of the Perceptions of Site Features Scale, and Marin and Marin (1991) for use of the Short Acculturation Scale.

The survey contained 40 items for the Attribute and Motivation scale, 19 items for the Barriers scale, and 29 questions pertaining to the following categories: (a) background to include primary wage earner status, age, gender, place of birth, race, and

ethnicity; (b) acculturation to include the language respondents read, speak, think, use at home, and use with friends; and (c) use of site to include size and age of group members, number of sites, number of vehicles, camping companions, size of parking space, camping equipment, camp location, proximity to amenities, frequency of trips, time spent traveling, education, and number of years lived in the United States . See appendix B for a copy of the survey.

*Procedures.* A bilingual survey team was utilized for collection of the data. The team was briefed on the goals of the project, and then methods of approaching subjects and encouraging participation were discussed. While the survey was designed for self-administration, the team member was available for questions and to increase the number of responses. The survey was printed in both English and Spanish. Two bilingual Mexican-Americans completed the Spanish translation independently, and then compared results. Next, a third individual fluent in Spanish translated the Spanish survey back into English. Vijver and Leung (1997) recommended a backwards/forwards method of translation.

Three parks were selected and data collected at each park for one week. The parks were randomized to determine order of soliciting survey responses each week. Then, each park was divided into sections and the sections were randomized each day to determine order of soliciting survey responses. The number of sites in each section was randomized each day. According to the randomized section/site list, team members solicited responses in each section for up to one hour. After an hour, the team member continued to the next section. The team continued in this manner until at least 600

responses were received. In order to maintain confidentiality and anonymity, an envelope was provided to the respondents for sealing the completed survey.

*Design and analysis.* The dependent variables in this study are the frequency of item responses within each category of preferences of Hispanic and Anglo campers at a state park as they relate to the managerial elements, attributes, and motivation preferences of camping, the barriers to participating in camping, and the level of acculturation.

Two scales are in this part of the survey. First, an Attribute Preference, Motivation, and Perceptions of Site Features scale determines preferences for physical and managerial elements. The attributes are categorized as natural environment, resource, facility, social, and psychological factors. Second, a Barrier Scale identifies reasons for not camping. The Barrier scale was designed by Blahna et al. (1990) to test the underparticipation hypotheses and consisted of five groups. The categories are general lifestyle, social/cultural, psychological/fears, and racial. Nonparametric tests were employed to analyze the data due to tabulating the frequency of responses of each item by category. Nonparametric tests are designed for variables that may not land in precise intervals. Thomas and Nelson (1996) suggested, "Data from qualitative research are often numerical counts of events that can be effectively analyzed with nonparametric statistics" (p. 194).

The Short Acculturation Scale by Marin and Marin (1991) tested for level of acculturation. The respondent's answers to the four questions were averaged. The interval scale begins with 1 indicating low acculturation and ends with 5 indicating high acculturation.

Chi-square tests were used to determine differences for the managerial elements found in questions one through seventeen. A log linear multi-way contingency table was used to study the interrelationships among the categorical variables. This analysis was beneficial in highlighting relationships between factors that are significant.

The variables of level of acculturation and ethnicity of the respondents acted as the independent variables in this study.



## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

Hierarchical loglinear modeling was used to conduct a five-way frequency analysis of managerial elements, preferences, and barriers of campers. Level of acculturation and ethnicity served as independent variables in the analyses while responses to items served as the dependent measures.

Seven hundred and seventy-eight campers completed surveys. Questionnaires that had uncompleted ethnicity (item 29) and acculturation (item 18 – 21) portions of the survey were removed from the data set. Seven hundred and twenty-nine responses were available for data analysis. Originally, 39 categories existed for the ethnicity response. All categories with less than five responses were collated into a category labeled Others, resulting in a total of seven ethnicity categories. Table 1 illustrates the ethnic categories used in the statistical analyses and the frequency of the responses.

The acculturation level was determined by averaging the responses to items 18 through 21. Scores of 2.99 and below indicate less acculturated individuals while scores of 3.00 and above indicated more acculturated individuals (Marin & Marin, 1991). Table 2 itemizes the results of acculturation on each category of ethnicity.

Table 1

*Frequency of Ethnicity*

Item 29, Ethnicity	n (% total)
Latino/a	8(1.1%)
Mexican American	80(11.0%)
European	98(13.4%)
American	450(61.7%)
Mexican	19(2.6%)
Canadian	27(3.7%)
Others	47(6.4%)
Total	729(100%)

Stepwise selection by simple deletion of effects using SPSS HILOGLINEAR, version 11.5, produced a model that identified first, second, and third-order effects (George & Mallery, 2003). The model generated a likelihood ratio indicating a good fit between the observed frequencies and expected frequencies (Hurlburt, 1998). Within the loglinear model framework, rejection of the null hypotheses means rejection of independence and that the effects are dependent on each other. Non-significant results support the null hypotheses. The results of the K-way test of effects are listed according to each analytic model in appendix C.

Analyses revealed 20 significant findings related to ethnicity. The Latino/a and Mexican ethnic groups had the highest number of significant findings. Table 3

summarizes the distribution of significant results by ethnicity. Within the significant findings, the number of times an ethnic group provided the highest number of responses for an answer was tallied. The results of the tally are listed in the *Most* column of Table 3. The Latino/a ethnic group ranked highest. Also listed is the number of times an

Table 2

*Frequency of Averaged Acculturation*

Ethnicity	<u>Averaged Acculturation</u>	
	Low (0-2.99)	High (3-5)
Latino/a	-	8(1.1%)
Mexican American	7(1.0%)	73(10.0%)
European	4(0.5%)	94(12.9%)
American	4(0.5%)	446(61.2%)
Mexican	12(1.6%)	7(1.0%)
Canadian	5(0.7%)	22(3.0%)
Others	5(0.7%)	42(5.8%)
Total	37(5.1%)	692(94.9%)

Notes  $\underline{n}$  = 729 (% of total) Dash indicates no data.

ethnic group was ranked in second place yet close to the first placed group. These results are listed in the *2nd* column of Table 3. The Mexican ethnic group had the highest number of items that an ethnicity had a close second.

The significant findings were grouped into managerial elements, attributes and motivation, and barriers to camping categories. A complete list of the numerical results of the tests of significance for the ethnic groups can be found in appendix C.

## Ethnicity

### *Ethnicity with Managerial Elements*

Of the 19 managerial elements, 4 items resulted in statistically significant findings. The statistically significant findings were represented by the Latino/a, Mexican, Canadian, and Others ethnic groups.

Table 3

#### *Distribution of Significant Items*

Ethnicity	Significant Findings	Most	Tie	Ethnicity Tied With	2nd
Latino/a	6	11	1	Canadian	-
Mexican American	-	1	-	-	-
European	1	5	-	-	1
American	-	2	-	-	-
Mexican	6	8	1	Canadian/Others	2
Canadian	5	10	2	Latino/a, Mexican/Others	1
Others	2	4	1	Canadian/Mexican	-

*Notes* Dashes indicate no data.

In Item 5, respondents compared the number of people in their group with the number of campsites required. The Latino/a ethnic group respondents were most likely to indicate *Too Few*,  $X^2(12) = 24.08$ ,  $p = .02$ . Although not statistically significant, 86% of the Latino/a ethnic group indicated *About Right*, even though they were the least likely

to do so compared to other ethnic groups. The Canadian, American, European, Others, Mexican, and Mexican American ethnic groups indicated *About Right*, in numerical order. The Mexican American and Mexican ethnic groups were most likely to respond *Too Many*.

In Item 7, respondents compared size and location of the parking space to the campsite. The Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Too Big* and the Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Too Close*,  $X^2 (24) = 64.41$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Mexican and Latino/a ethnic groups were least likely to respond *About Right*. The Canadian, European, American, Mexican American, and Others ethnic groups responded *About Right*, in numerical order. The Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to indicate *Too Far* while the Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Too Small*.

In Item 8, respondents indicated with whom they were camping. Three responses reached statistical significance. The Mexican ethnic group was most likely to indicate *Close Friends* and *Scouts*, while the Canadian ethnic group was most likely to indicate *Alone*,  $X^2 (19) = 7385.23$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Latino/a, Canadian, Mexican American, European, and American ethnic groups were most likely to respond *Family/Relatives*, while the Others ethnic group responded *Close Friends*. The American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Church*. Table 4 lists the top three responses for each ethnic group.

In Item 13, respondents identified who they were with when they first began camping. Statistical significance,  $X^2 (72) = 114.63$ ,  $p = .001$ , was reached in five

categories. The Mexican ethnic group was most likely to indicate *Close Friends*, Others ethnic group was most likely to select *three or more responses*, while the Canadian ethnic

Table 4

*Top Three Responses for Item 8*

Ethnicity	Family/Relatives	Close Friends	Close Friends/ Family/Relative	Alone
Latino/a	1 – 5(62.5%)	2 – 2(25.0%)	-	3- 1(12.5%)
Mexican Am.	1 – 39(50.0%)	2-16(20.5%)	2-16(20.5%)	-
European	1-46(47.4%)	2-19(19.6%)	-	3-10(10.3%)
American	1-199(47.4%)	2-92(20.6%)	3-4(14.5%)	-
Mexican	3-3(15.8%)	1-10(52.6%)	2-4(21.1%)	-
Canadian	1-15(55.6%)	3-2(7.4%)	3-2(7.4%)	2-6(22.2%)
Other	2-13(27.7%)	1-16(34.0%)	3-12(25.5%)	-

*Notes* Dashes indicate less than third rank. Figures = Rank - # of Responses (% within Ethnicity) See table in appendix C for complete figures

group was most likely to indicate *Alone*, *Alone/Family/Relative*, and *Family/Relatives/Church*. Although not statistically significant, the Latino/a, American, Mexican American, European, Canadian, and Others ethnic groups were most likely to respond *Family/Relatives*, in numerical order. The European ethnic group was most likely to respond with *Scouts*, while the Latino/a, Mexican, and Canadian ethnic groups were the least likely. The Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Church*.

### *Ethnicity with Attributes and Motivation*

Of the 40 attributes and motivations, 7 items resulted in statistically significant findings. The attributes were divided into five sections: Natural Environment, six questions; Facilities, seventeen questions; Social, six questions; Psychological, eight questions; and Resource, three questions. The statistically significant findings were divided into Natural Environment, four findings; Psychological, two findings; and Resource, one finding.

*Natural Environment.* The four Natural Environment statistically significant findings were represented by the Latino/a, Mexican, and Others ethnic groups. In Item 30a, respondents identified if *enjoying natural surroundings* was important. Almost all (98%) responded with *Yes*, however, 2% of the Others ethnic group responded *No*, resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 15.32, p = .02$ .

When the respondents considered an attribute or motivation important, they identified the degree by indicating *Slightly* or *Very*. In Item 30b, respondents identified the degree that *enjoying natural surroundings* was important. The Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 14.96, p = .02$ . Although not statistically significant, the Mexican ethnic group was second most likely to respond *Slightly*. The European, American, Mexican American, Others, and Canadian ethnic groups had more than 90% of their responses in the *Very* category.

In Item 50a, respondents designated if *not seeing litter* was important. The Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *No*, resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (7) = 3099.78, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Canadian and

Latino/a ethnic groups responded with 100% *Yes*, while the Others, American, Mexican American, and European ethnic groups had 95% or more responding *Yes*.

In Item 55b, respondents indicated the degree to which they thought *enjoying the sights and sounds of nature* were important. The Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 15.90$ ,  $p = .01$ . This result represented the majority of the Latino/a ethnic group's responses. Although not statistically significant, the European ethnic group was most likely to respond *Very*. While responding with *Very*, the other ethnic groups distribution of responses began at 80% level indicating a broader range of preferences.

*Psychological.* The Mexican and Latino/a ethnic groups represented the two statistically significant findings in the Psychological category. In Item 45b, respondents indicated the degree to which they thought *enjoying peace and quiet* was important. The Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (7) = 2287.35$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Very*, while the remaining ethnic groups responded *Very* beginning with the 80% range.

In Item 52a, respondents designated if *mentally unwinding or relaxing* was important. The Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *No* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (7) = 3380.40$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Canadian, Mexican, and Others ethnic groups responded 100% with *Yes*, while the other ethnic groups responded *Yes* beginning with 97% and above.

*Resource.* The one Resource statistically significant finding was represented by the European ethnicity. In Item 34a, respondents identified if *having a lake or river*



*nearby* was important. The European ethnic group was most likely to respond *No* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (7) = 3024.24$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Canadian ethnic group was second most likely to respond *No*. The Latino/a ethnic group responded 100% *Yes*, while the other ethnic groups responded *Yes* with a majority of 95% and above.

### *Ethnicity with Barriers to Camping*

The 19 items on the Barriers to Camping scale were divided into the following sections: General Lifestyle, four questions; Social/Cultural, nine questions; Psychological/Fears, five questions; Racism, one question. The statistically significant findings were only in the General Lifestyle section and represented the Latino/a and Canadian ethnic groups.

*General Lifestyle.* In Item 72a, respondents indicated if *too expensive* would be a reason to keep them from camping more often. The Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 12.94$ ,  $p = .04$ . Although not statistically significant, the Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *No*, followed by the European ethnic group. The other ethnic groups responded *No*, but only with a majority in the 60% range.

In Item 73b, respondents identified the degree that *too far to go* would keep them from camping more often. The Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *Very* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 12.92$ ,  $p = .04$ . Although not statistically significant, the Mexican ethnic group was second most likely to respond *Very*. The European ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly*, followed by the Mexican American, Others, American, and Latino/a ethnic groups.

## Acculturation

### *Acculturation Levels and Ethnicity*

Analyses of the ethnic groups divided into acculturation levels revealed 74 significant findings related to acculturation levels. The Low American ethnic group had the highest number of significant findings, followed by the Low Others, Low European, Low Mexican, Low Canadian, Low Mexican American, High Latino/a, High Canadian, High Mexican American, High Others, High Mexican, and High European ethnic groups. The High American ethnic group did not have any significant findings. The Low Others ethnic group had the highest number of items in the *Most* column. The Low European ethnic group had the highest number of items that were a close second to the first-place ethnic group. Table 5 illustrates the distribution of significant findings and *most* rankings by acculturation level and ethnicity. Table 6 illustrates the distribution of close seconds by acculturation level and ethnicity. The significant findings are divided into managerial elements, attributes and motivation, and barriers to camping. A complete list of the numerical results of the tests of significance for ethnic groups and acculturation levels can be found in appendix C.

### *Acculturation Levels with Ethnicity and Managerial Elements*

Of the 19 managerial elements, 10 items resulted in statistically significant findings. All Low acculturated ethnicities, High Latino/a, High Mexican American, High Mexican, High Canadian, and High Others represented the statistically significant items.

In Item 1, respondents identified the number of people in the group, both adults and children. Five responses reached statistical significance,  $X^2(153) = 1953.11, p = .00$ .

Table 5

*Distribution of Significant Findings of Ethnicity by Acculturation Level*

Ethnicity by Acculturation		Significant Finding	Most	Ties	Ethnicity Tied With
Latino/a	Low	-	-	-	-
	High	6	9	1	L Mexican American
Mexican Am.	Low	6	8	2	H Latino/a, L American
	High	4	4	1	L Canadian
European	Low	10	11	6	L Canadian (2), L Mexican, L American, L Mexican American, 4-way: L Canadian/H Canadian/H European
	High	1	7	2	H American, 4-way: L Canadian/H Canadian/L European
American	Low	13	8	2	L European, Low Mexican American
	High	-	2	-	-
Mexican	Low	8	8	1	L European
	High	1	3	1	L European
Canadian	Low	6	11	4	L European (3), 4-way: L European /H Canadian/H European
	High	5	9	2	H Mexican American, 4-way: L Canadian/L European / H European
Others	Low	11	13	1	H Mexican
	High	3	4	-	-

Notes Dashes indicate no data. L = Low H= High

The Low Mexican American and Low American ethnic groups were more likely to have *12 people* in the group; Low American ethnic group was the only Low acculturated ethnic group to have *1 person* in the group, all others with this response were High

acculturated ethnic groups; and Low Others ethnic group was most likely to have 7 and 9 *people* in the group. Although not statistically significant, it is notable that the High Mexican American, European, American, and Others ethnic groups were most likely to

Table 6

*Distribution of Close Seconds*

Ethnicity by Acculturation		2nd	Ties	Ethnicity Tied With
Latino/a	Low	-	-	-
	High	-	-	-
Mexican Am.	Low	2	1	H Mexican
	High	-	-	-
European	Low	2	-	-
	High	1	-	-
American	Low	1	-	-
	High	1	-	-
Mexican	Low	1	1	L Others
	High	2	1	L Mexican American
Canadian	Low	-	-	-
	High	-	-	-
Others	Low	2	1	L Mexican
	High	1	-	-

*Notes* Dashes indicate no data L = Low H= High

have 20+ *people* in the group. The High ethnic groups were more likely than Low ethnic groups to have 3 to 4 *people* in a group. The Low Mexican ethnic group had the majority of responses after 10 *people* in the group.

In Item 5, respondents compared the number of people in the group to the number of campsites used. Four responses reached statistical significance,  $X^2(20) = 219.82$ ,  $p = .00$ . The High Latino/a and High Others ethnic groups were the first and second most likely to respond *Too Few*. The Low American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Too Many*, while the High Mexican American ethnic group also responded *Too Many*. Although not statistically significant, the Low acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to respond with 100% *About Right* than High acculturated ethnic groups. The Low American ethnic group was least likely to respond *About Right*. The majority of High Mexican American, High Latino/a, and High Others ethnic groups responded *About Right*.

In Item 7, respondents compared the parking space to the campsite. The High Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Too Big*, resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2(34) = 415.80$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to respond *About Right*, followed by *Too Close*. No Low acculturated ethnic groups and only two High acculturated ethnic groups (Latino/a, Mexican American) responded *Too Big*. After *About Right*, High acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to respond *Too Small* and *Too Far*. The High Latino/a ethnic group responded equally with *Too Far* and *Too Big* while the High Canadian ethnic group responded equally with *Too Far* and *Too Close*.

In Item 8, respondents indicated with whom they were camping. Seven responses reached statistical significance,  $X^2(90) = 608.79$ ,  $p = .00$ . The Low Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Scouts*. The Low Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *Alone*. The Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond

*Church* and 3+ *Responses*. The High Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Close Friends*. The High Canadian ethnic group was least likely to respond *Close Friends*. The High Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Close Friends / Family/ Relatives*. Although not statistically significant, except for the Low Mexican ethnic group, all other responses for *Scouts* were from High acculturated ethnic groups. The High Latino/a and High European ethnic groups both chose *Family/Relatives*, *Close Friends*, and *Alone*, in this order, as the top three responses. The Mexican American, European, and American ethnic groups responded *Family/Relatives* for both Low and High acculturation, however, the percentage rate for the Low acculturation ethnic groups was higher than the High acculturation ethnic groups. The High acculturation ethnic groups were divided between more categories than the Low acculturation ethnic groups.

In Item 12, respondents identified the number of times they had camped within the last 12 months. Two responses reached statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (41) = 453.16, p = .00$ . The Low American ethnic group was most likely to camp *Frequently* while the Low European ethnic group was second most likely to camp *Regularly*. Although not statistically significant, *Frequently* responses were all from High acculturated ethnic groups, with the addition of the Low American ethnic group that had a 50% *Frequently* response rate. The other 50% of the Low American ethnic group responded *Seldom*. The Low Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *Regularly*. The High European and High American ethnic groups were the only ethnic groups to respond to *Almost Full Time*. The High European ethnic group was most likely to respond *Infrequently*. The Low Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *Full Time*. The High Latino/a,

Low Mexican American, High Mexican, and Low Others ethnic groups had 100% of responses in *Seldom*.

In Item 13, respondents identified who they were with when they first began camping. Statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (90) = 737.80$ ,  $p = .00$ , was reached in eight categories. The Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond with *3+ Responses*. The Low Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Scout/Family/Relatives*. The Low Mexican American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Church*. The Low Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Close Friends*. The Low Canadian and the Low European ethnic groups were first and second most likely to respond *Alone*. The High Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond in two categories, *Family/Relatives/Church* and *Alone/Family/Relatives*. Although not statistically significant, the Low Canadian ethnic group responded equally to *Alone* and *Family/Relatives*. The Low American and High Latino/a ethnic groups responded in only two categories - *Family/Relatives* and *Close Friends*. The majority of the Low European and Low Mexican ethnic groups responded *Close Friends*. Only High acculturated ethnic groups responded *Scouts*, with the High European group most likely to respond *Scouts*.

In Item 15, respondents identified whom they usually camp with now. The Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond with *3+ Responses*, resulting in statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (62) = 849.87$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Mexican American ethnic group was the only respondent for *Church*. The Low Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Scouts* followed the High European and High American ethnic groups. The Low European ethnic group responded evenly to only two

categories - *Family/Relatives* and *Close Friends*. Majority of the responses were in *Family/Relatives* for the High Latino/a, High Mexican American, High European, High American, High Canadian, High Others, Low Mexican American, and Low American ethnic groups. The majority of responses were in *Close Friends* for the Low Mexican, High Mexican, and Low Others ethnic groups.

In Items 17, respondents identified the number of hours it took to drive to the park. Reaching statistical significance,  $X^2 (62) = 541.53$ ,  $p = .00$ , the Low Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *four hours*, while the Low American ethnic group was most likely to respond *seven hours*. It is notable that most High acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to travel longer hours (High Others, High Canadian, High American, High European, and 25% of High Mexican American). 100% of High Latino/a, High Mexican and 75% of High Mexican American ethnic groups traveled no more than five hours. The majority of Low acculturated ethnic groups responded by the fourth or less hour (Low Mexican American, Low Mexican, Low Canadian, and Low Others). The Low American and Low European ethnic groups reached a majority by the sixth hour.

In Item 22, respondents identified the last year of school they attended. Reaching statistical significance,  $X^2 (83) = 737.76$ ,  $p = .00$ , the Low Canadian ethnic group was the second most likely to complete the *Junior year of college* while *Associates Degree* was the highest year of college for the Low Mexican American ethnic group. Although not statistically significant, the Low American ethnic group was least likely to complete years of school beyond High School. Of the Low acculturated ethnic groups, the Mexican ethnic group was most likely to complete *College*, Others ethnic group was



most likely to complete a *Masters*, and European ethnic group was most likely to complete a *Doctorate*. Most of Low acculturated ethnic groups had the majority of their responses at the High School level, with the Others ethnic group at the Elementary level and the Canadian ethnic group being evenly divided between five categories. Most of the High acculturated ethnic groups had the majority of their responses at the High School level, with the European and Canadian ethnic groups at the college level and the Mexican ethnic group being evenly divided between three categories. The High European ethnic group was most likely to complete school beyond the level of college.

In Item 27, respondents identified the number of years they have lived in the United States. Two responses reached statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (48) = 1321.21, p = .00$ . The Low European ethnic group was most likely to respond in the *1-17 years* category, while the Low Mexican ethnic group responded in the *30-39 years* category. Although not statistically significant, the High acculturated ethnic groups most often had responses in all categories, while Low acculturated ethnicities were least likely to respond in the *60+ years* categories. Following the Low European ethnic group, Low Others and Low Mexican ethnic groups were most likely to have lived in the United States less than 17 years.

#### *Acculturation Levels with Ethnicity, Attributes, and Motivation*

Of the 40 attributes and motivations, 13 items resulted in statistically significant findings. The statistically significant findings were divided into Natural Environment, four; Facilities, four; Social, one; Psychological, three; and Resource, one.

*Natural environment.* The High Latino/a, Low American, and High Others ethnic groups represented the four Natural Environment statistically significant findings. In

Item 30a, respondents identified if *enjoying natural surroundings* was important.

Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 171.33$ ,  $p = .00$ , the High Others ethnic group responded *No*. All remaining groups responded *Yes*.

In Item 30b, respondents indicated the degree to which they thought *enjoying natural surroundings* was important. The High Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 132.45$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Mexican ethnic group was the only Low acculturated ethnicity to respond *Slightly*, all the rest responded 100% *Very*. The High acculturated ethnic groups responded in both categories with a majority of responses in *Very*, while the High Mexican ethnic group had 100% of responses in *Very*.

In Item 49a, respondents identified if *playing radios from cars* was important. A *Yes* response would indicate that playing radios was acceptable while a *No* response indicates playing radios was unacceptable. Of the Low American ethnic group, 50% responded *Yes* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 289.80$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the High Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes*. The High Latino/a ethnic group was evenly divided. All remaining groups with a majority responding *Yes* were from Low acculturated ethnic groups (Mexican American, American, and Others). The Low European and Canadian ethnic groups responded 100% *No*.

In Item 55b, respondents identified the degree that *enjoying the sights and sounds of nature* was important. The High Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 98.00$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Others ethnic group responses were evenly divided. All

High acculturated ethnic groups responded *Very*, and the High Latino/a ethnic group responded 100% *Very*. The Low Mexican American, European, and American ethnic groups had 100% *Very*, while the remaining two Low acculturated ethnic groups had a majority of responses in *Very*.

*Facilities.* The Low Mexican American, Low American, High Canadian, and Low Others ethnic groups represented the four Facilities statistically significant findings. In Item 64a, respondents identified if having *well-cared-for facilities* was important. The Low Others ethnic group was the second most likely to respond *No* resulting in statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (13) = 515.30, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low acculturated ethnic groups responded 100% *Yes* except for the Low Mexican, 83% *Yes*, and Low Others, 80% *Yes*, ethnic groups. Most High acculturated ethnic groups responded 100% *Yes*, with the following exceptions: High Latino/a, 75% *Yes*, High Mexican American, 99% *Yes*, and High American, 99% *Yes*.

In Item 64b, respondents identified the degree that *having well-cared-for facilities* was important. The Low American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (13) = 64.99, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the remaining Low acculturated ethnic groups responded 100% *Very*. The High Latino/a and Canadian ethnic groups responded 100% *Very*, while all the rest of the High acculturated ethnic groups had a majority of the responses in *Very*.

In Item 65a, respondents indicated if *having signs* was important. The High Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *No* resulting in statistical significance,  $\chi^2 (13) = 180.78, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, most of the Low acculturated ethnic groups responded 100% *Yes*, with the Low Mexican ethnic group

responding 92% *Yes*. The High acculturated ethnic groups were most likely to divide the responses although the majority was in the *Yes* category. The High Latino/a and Mexican ethnic groups responded 100% *Yes*.

In Item 69b, respondents designated the degree that *being able to rent equipment was important*. Reaching statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 153.58$ ,  $p = .00$ , 50% of the Low Mexican American ethnic group responded *Slightly*. Although not statistically significant, only two other Low acculturated ethnic groups responded and did so with 100% *Very*. Most of the High acculturated ethnic groups responded 100% *Slightly* while the High American and Others ethnic groups had a majority respond *Slightly* at 85% and 75% respectively. The majority of the High Mexican American ethnic group responded *Very* at 52%.

*Social*. The High Mexican American ethnic group represented the Social statistically significant finding. In Item 46a, respondents identified if *being with people that are like you* was important. Reaching statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 204.07$ ,  $p = .00$ , 27% of the High Mexican American ethnic group responded *No*. Although not statistically significant, the Low European and Low Mexican ethnic groups responded 100% *Yes*. The rest of the Low acculturated ethnic groups responded *Yes*: Mexican American, 86%, Canadian, 80%, American, 75%, and Others, 50%. While the High acculturated ethnicities responded with a majority for *Yes*, the percentages that ranged from 73 to 91.

*Psychological*. The Low Mexican American, High Latino/a, and High Mexican ethnic groups represented the three Psychological statistically significant findings. In Item 45b, the respondents designated the degree that *enjoying peace and quiet* was

important. The High Mexican ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* and the Low Mexican American ethnic group was second most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 139.78, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Others ethnic group tied with the Low Mexican American ethnic group since both had 50% of the responses in *Slightly*. The Low European and American ethnic groups responded 100% *Very* while the Low Mexican and Canadian ethnic group had a majority of responses in *Very*. Most of the High acculturated ethnic groups responded with a majority for *Very*, with the percentages ranking from 80 to 91.

In Item 52a, respondents identified if *mentally unwinding or relaxing* was important. The High Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to say *No* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 182.86, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, all Low acculturated ethnic groups responded with 100% *Yes*. Most High acculturated ethnic groups had a majority responding *Yes* while the High Mexican, Canadian, and Others ethnic groups responded with 100% *Yes*.

In Item 52b, respondents indicated the degree that *mentally unwinding or relaxing* was important. The Low Mexican American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 121.33, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the same amount of Low Mexican American responded *Very*. The Low Canadian and Mexican ethnic groups had a majority of responses in *Very*, 67% and 80% respectively, while the rest of the Low acculturated ethnic groups responded with 100% *Very*. Most High acculturated ethnic groups responded with a majority for *Very* while the High Mexican and Others ethnic groups responded 100% *Very*.

*Resource.* The High European ethnic group represented the Resource statistically significant finding. In Item 34a, respondents designated if *having a lake or river nearby* was important. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 179.52, p = .00$ , 12% of the High European ethnic group responded *No*. Although not statistically significant, the majority of High acculturated ethnic groups responded *Yes*, but were more likely to have responses in both categories. Yet, Low acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to say 100% *Yes*. The High Others ethnic group was most likely to say *Yes* while the Low Mexican American ethnic group was most likely to say *No*.

#### *Acculturation Levels with Ethnicity and Barriers to Camping*

From the 19 barriers to camping, 21 items resulted in statistical significance. The statistically significant findings were divided into General Life Style, four findings, Social/Cultural, ten findings, and Psychological/Fears, seven findings.

*General Lifestyle.* The Low American, Low Others, High Latino/a, and High Canadian ethnic groups represented the four General Lifestyle statistically significant findings. In Item 71b, respondents indicated the degree that *being too difficult to get here* would keep them from camping more often. The Low American ethnic group responded 100% *Very* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 64.13, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Mexican American ethnic group also responded 100% *Very*. The majority of the Low Mexican ethnic group responded *Very*; the Low Others group was evenly divided, and the Low European ethnic group was 100% *Slightly*. High-acculturated ethnic groups were most likely to respond *Slightly*, except for the High Canadian ethnic group.

In Item 72a, respondents identified if *too expensive* would keep them from camping more often. The High Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 198.90$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, most Low acculturated ethnic groups responded with a majority of responses being *No*. The majority of the Low Canadian ethnic group responded *Yes*. The High Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond with *No*, and the rest of the High acculturated ethnic groups responded with a majority of responses being *No*.

In Item 73a, respondents designated if *too far to go* would keep them from camping more often. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 190.98$ ,  $p = .00$ , the Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes*. Although not statistically significant, the High Latino/a ethnic group response was evenly divided, while all the rest of the High acculturated ethnic groups had a majority responded *No*. The Low European and Low Canadian ethnic groups responded 100% *No* while the majority of the Low American ethnic group responded with *Yes*. The Mexican ethnic group responded *Yes* but only with 58% for Low and 57% for High.

In Item 73b, respondents indicated the degree that *being too far to go* would keep them from camping more often. The High Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *Very* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 117.73$ ,  $p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Mexican ethnic group responded with a majority indicating *Very* while the rest of the Low acculturated ethnic groups responded with a majority in *Slightly*. The High European ethnic group was most likely to say *Slightly* and the other five High acculturated ethnic groups had a majority of responses in *Slightly*.

*Social/Cultural.* The 11 statistically significant findings for Social/Cultural occurred in the Low Mexican, Low American, Low European, and Low Others ethnic groups. In Item 74b, respondents identified the degree that *having no one to go with* would keep them from camping more often. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 43.87, p = .00$ , 100% of the Low Mexican ethnic group and 50% of the Low Others ethnic group responded *Very*. Although not statistically significant, all the Low Mexican American ethnic group responded *Very* also while 50% of the High Latino/a group responded *Very*. High Mexican and High Canadian ethnic groups responded with 100% *Slightly*, followed by the High European, 91%, and High Others, 83%, ethnic groups. The High Mexican American and High American ethnic groups responded *Slightly* with a smaller majority, 62% and 57% respectively.

In Item 78a, respondents designated if *never talked much about it as a kid* would keep them from camping more often. The Low American ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 192.30, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low American ethnic group was evenly divided between the two responses. All the rest of the ethnic groups had a majority respond *No*, and the Low European and Low Canadian ethnic groups responded 100% *No*.

In Item 78b, respondents identified the degree that *never talked much about it as a kid* would keep them from camping more often. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 42.07, p = .00$ , the Low Mexican ethnic group was the only Low acculturated ethnicity to respond *Slightly*. Although not statistically significant, the Low American ethnic group was the only Low acculturated ethnicity to respond *Very*. Both ethnic groups did so at 100%. The majority of High acculturated ethnic groups responded



*Slightly*, with the High Mexican American ethnic group evenly divided, while the High Latino/a group responded 100% *Very*.

In Item 80a, respondents indicated if *lack of experience* would keep them from camping more often. The Low European ethnic group was most likely to say *Yes* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 15.02, p = .02$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *No*. High-acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to respond *No*, with a majority of responses beginning at 80%, while the High Latino/a ethnic group was evenly divided.

In Item 80b, respondents identified the degree that *lack of experience* would keep them from camping more often. All Low acculturated ethnicities responded 100% *Slightly* with the Low Mexican ethnic group resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (8) = 98.29, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the High Canadian and High Mexican American ethnic groups were most likely to respond *Slightly* while the High Latino/a group was most likely to indicate *Very*.

In Item 81a, respondents designated if *don't enjoy the out-of-doors much* would keep them from camping more often. The Low European ethnic group was second most likely to respond *Yes* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (6) = 14.41, p = .03$ . Although not statistically significant, the High Latino/a ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* while the High European ethnic group was most likely to respond *No*. The High Mexican ethnic group had the lowest majority (57%) that responded *No*. Most Low acculturated ethnic groups had a majority, beginning at 70%, that responded *No*.

In Item 81b, the respondents indicated the degrees that *don't enjoy the out-of-doors very much* would keep them from camping more often. One hundred percent of the

Low European *Yes* respondents indicated *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 25.73, p = .02$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Mexican American, High European, and High Others ethnic groups responded 100% *Slightly*. The High Latino/a and High Mexican ethnic groups were evenly divided on the responses. The majority of the High Mexican American ethnic group responded *Slightly* while the majority (54%) of the High American ethnic group responded *Very*.

In Item 82a, respondents designated if *don't know where to go* would keep them from camping more often. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 229.65, p = .00$ , 50% of the Low American ethnic group responded *Yes*. Although not statistically significant, 50% of the Low Others ethnic group responded *Yes*. These were the only two Low acculturated ethnic groups to respond *Yes* while the High Latino/a ethnic group was the only High acculturated ethnic group with a majority (62%) to respond *Yes*. Low Mexican American and High Mexican groups responded *No* with a small majority (57%).

In Item 86a, respondents identified if *feel uncomfortable or out of place* would keep them from camping more often. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 279.87, p = .00$ , 25% of the Low American ethnic group responded *Yes*. Although not statistically significant, the Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* followed by the High Mexican ethnic group. Both High and Low categories of European and Canadian ethnic groups responded 100% *No*. All the rest of the ethnic groups had a majority that responded *No*.

In Item 88a, respondents indicated if *my family/friends would think I'm crazy* would keep them from camping more often. Resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 240.06, p = .00$ , 25% of the Low American ethnic group responded *Yes*. Although not

statistically significant, the Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* followed jointly by High Mexican and Low Mexican American ethnic groups. Both categories of the Canadian ethnic group responded 100% *No* along with the Low European and Low Mexican groups. Except for Low Others, all the rest of the ethnic groups had a majority that responded *No*.

*Psychological/Fears.* The 11 statistically significant findings for Psychological/Fears occurred in the Low Mexican American, Low American, Low European, Low Mexican, Low Canadian, Low Others, and High Mexican American ethnic groups. In Item 75b, respondents indicated the degrees that *don't like snakes* would keep them from camping more often. Reaching statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 40.14$ ,  $p = .00$ , the Low Mexican ethnic group responded 100% *Slightly* and the Low European group responded 100% *Very*. Although not statistically significant, the Low American and Low Mexican American ethnic groups also responded 100% *Very* while Low Others was evenly divided. The High Mexican American ethnic group was evenly divided while the High European and American ethnic groups had a majority respond *Very*. The High Canadian and High Others ethnic groups had a majority respond *Slightly*.

In Item 76b, respondents identified the degrees that *don't like other animals in the woods* would keep them from camping more often. The High Mexican American ethnic group, with 100%, was most likely to respond *Very* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 25.57$ ,  $p = .02$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Mexican American ethnic group was evenly divided while all the rest of the Low acculturated ethnicities responded 100% *Slightly*. Most High acculturated ethnicities responded with 100%

*Slightly*. A majority of the High European and American ethnic groups responded with *Slightly*.

In Item 77a, respondents designated if *feel uncomfortable in the country* would keep them from camping more often. The Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Yes* resulting statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 239.76, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, all the rest of the High and Low acculturated ethnic groups responded *No*, with a majority of 80% or more.

In Item 77b, respondents indicated the degree that *feels uncomfortable in the country* would keep them from camping more often. One hundred percent of the Low Canadian respondents selected *Slightly* resulting statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 32.62, p = .002$ . Although not statistically significant, the High American ethnic group was the only ethnicity to respond *Very* and did so with a majority.

In Item 79b, respondents indicated the degrees that *don't like to be out in the dark* would keep them from camping more often. The Low European ethnic group responded 100% *Slightly* resulting in statistical significance,  $X^2 (8) = 60.86, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Others ethnic group was most likely to respond *Very* and was the only Low acculturated ethnicity to do so. The High acculturated ethnicities had a majority of responses in *Slightly*.

In Item 84a, respondents designated if *don't like insects* would keep them from camping more often. Low European, most likely, and Low American, second most likely, responded *Yes* resulting statistical significance,  $X^2 (13) = 191.54, p = .00$ . Although not statistically significant, 50% of Low American, being the only ethnic group

to be evenly divided, responded *No*. The High Canadian ethnic group was most likely to respond *No*.

In Item 84b, respondents identified the degrees that *don't like insects* would keep them from camping more often. Representing 100% of their *Yes* respondents, the Low European and Low Canadian ethnic group responded *Slightly* while Low Others responded *Very*. All three reached statistical significance,  $X^2(13) = 24.89$ ,  $p = .02$ . Although not statistically significant, the Low Mexican American ethnic group, the only other Low ethnic group to respond, had 100% *Very*. Five High acculturated ethnic groups responded with a majority in *Slightly*, but the High Latino/a and Canadian ethnic groups were 100% *Very*.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION

Ethnicity and acculturation levels affected the responses to the managerial elements, attributes, and motivation preferences, and barriers to camping. Discussion of each area highlights the similarities and distinctions created by the categorical responses, and contains suggestions for application of the results to management practices.

#### Ethnicity

It was hypothesized that the distribution of respondent's camping preferences were independent of ethnicity. The results indicate this hypothesis may be rejected based on the following discussion and conclusions.

##### *Ethnicity with Managerial Elements*

*Conclusion:* Evaluation of group limitations required since managerial elements preferences are affected by ethnicity.

Park management developed policy and set rules that placed restrictions on visitors in order to control the impact on the facilities and resources. The possibility exists that a policy or rule may be inconsistent with an ethnicity's culture and could actually discourage use of the park. Analyses of the managerial elements indicated the responses to four of nineteen items were based on the respondent's ethnicity.

Park management limits the number of people (children and adults) per campsite to eight. Consistent with other studies, the Mexican and Mexican American ethnic groups indicated they had too many sites for the number of people in the group, and the Mexican ethnic group considered the parking area too close to the table. The Mexican ethnic group averaged 9 people per group, with 68% of the groups indicating more than 8 people, and the Mexican American ethnic group averaged 7 and 22%. These two ethnic groups can be compared to the American, 4.5, 9%; European, 4, 7%; and Canadian, 3, 0% ethnic groups, who indicated about right for both number of sites and the parking space; the impact on the Mexican and Mexican American ethnic groups was greater since they were required to obtain a second campsite. While similar to the Mexican ethnic group with averages of 9 and 31%, the Others ethnic group considered the number of campsites to be about right but were evenly divided between about right and too small on the parking space. Abreu (1987) indicated the importance of not stereotyping individuals based on race, and the Latino/a ethnic group's response provided an excellent example. While similar to the Mexican American ethnic group with averages of 7 and 25%, the Latino/a ethnic group considered the number of sites to be too few and had the same amount of responses for too big and too far on the parking space.

Other studies indicate that Hispanics were more likely to camp with children and extended family thus explaining the desire to be close together (Chavez, 1993b). However, this study indicated different results. The Mexican American ethnic group had a slight majority (54%) of respondents with children under 13, followed by the Latino/a (50%), Others (47%), American (37%), European (36%), Mexican (21%), and Canadian (7%) ethnic groups. Only 25% of the Others ethnic group indicated seniors (65+) were

part of their group while the rest of the ethnic groups responded with less. This study indicated that the majority of the individuals camping were of the age to be independent of supervision and care, thus indicating a preference for closeness or separateness independent of physical needs and provides support for the indication that ethnicity is the underlying cause for the preference. The findings for the number of people, children, and seniors per group were consistent with the responses to Item 8, *who they were camping with*, given by each ethnic group. Ethnic groups that camped with *Close Friends* are more likely to have a larger number of people and vehicles since the campers would be arriving at the park at different times and from different locations.

Careful evaluation of the impact on facilities and resources of various group sizes, using current methods and standards, can determine the optimum number of people per group in order to meet management objectives. If the number remains the same or less, providing information and education to the ethnic groups with larger group sizes can mitigate feelings of discrimination or being unwelcome. In order to accommodate larger groups, park design can be modified to create the feeling of closeness, yet remain true to carrying capacity required to protect the resources.

*Conclusion:* Recognition of transitions that occur during the life cycle of campers increases efficient and effective marketing, design, and budgetary decisions while decreasing user conflict.

When the responses to *whom they were camping with* on this trip were compared with the responses to *whom they first went camping with*, most ethnic groups stated the same category for both items, with the exception of the Canadian and Others ethnic groups. The Canadian ethnic group moved from *Alone* to *Family/Relatives* and the



Others ethnic group moved from *Family/Relatives* to *Close Friends*, thus widening their choice of camping companions.

Consistent with other studies, the Mexican ethnic group was most likely to begin camping with a church group (Abreu, 1987). The Latino/a, Mexican, and Canadian ethnic groups were least likely to begin camping with a scout group, while the European ethnic group was most likely. With whom an ethnic group camps correlates to the campsite preferences. Smaller family units would be more apt to travel together, while larger family units and close friends would be more apt to travel separately.

Knowing the initial preferences and later transitions of the various ethnic groups will allow park managers to focus education and outreach efforts efficiently and employ various marketing strategies effectively. Designing a park with enough variety to acclimatize the transition stages provides the tools required for management to succeed in accommodating visitor preferences and group sizes, thereby decreasing user conflict. Knowing the market and properly setting expectations prior to the actual experience increases the chance of the actual experience being positive. Marketing techniques combined with outreach prior to arrival provides the information and education necessary to achieve this objective.

#### *Ethnicity with Attributes and Motivations*

*Conclusion:* Park design can encourage park use by facilitating ethnic group preferences and alleviating user conflict based on ethnic preferences.

The Mexican American, European, American, Canadian, and Others ethnic groups had similar responses for the Natural Environment and Psychological attributes and motivations.

*Natural environment.* While the majority (98%) of respondents thought *enjoying natural surroundings* was important, more of the Latino/a and Mexican ethnic groups were likely to consider it only *Slightly* important instead of *Very* important. Also, the Latino/a ethnic group considered *enjoying sights and sounds of nature* only *Slightly* important. Even though the strength of the preference for these two Natural Environment items was less than the rest of the ethnic groups, the finding that the Natural Environment is important is consistent with other studies (Responsive Management, 2001). In contrast to the other ethnic groups, the Mexican ethnic group did not consider *not seeing litter* important. Baas (1993) suggested Hispanic recreationists have more tolerance for crowding and environmental degradation; however, the Latino/a (100%) and Mexican American ethnic groups responded that *not seeing litter* was important. The trend of a Latino/a and Mexican ethnic groups distinctions, as compared to the rest, continues with two Psychological items.

*Psychological.* The Latino/a ethnic group did not consider *mentally unwinding or relaxing* important, and the Mexican ethnic group considered *enjoying peace and quiet* only *Slightly* important. These preferences are consistent with other studies, whose findings indicate that emphasis is placed on social aspects of recreational benefits (Chavez, 2000; Gramann et al., 1993). This trend of a Latino/a and Mexican ethnic groups distinctions are altered with respect to the Resource item.

*Resource.* The European and Canadian ethnic groups regarded *having a lake or river nearby* as not important. The rest of the ethnic groups indicated it was important with 100% of the Latino/a ethnic group stating that preference. Dwyer (1993) found Hispanic activity participation to be higher than Anglos, while Blahna (1992b) found

camping and swimming to have the highest participation rates for Hispanics. While these results have met the expectations based on previous studies, other results were unexpected.

*Facility.* The lack of any Facility items reaching statistical significance is surprising since numerous studies indicate that tangible design features are a high priority for Hispanics (Baas, 1992a; Blahna, 1992a; Carr & Williams, 1993; Dwyer & Gobster, 1997; Irwin, Gartner & Phelps, 1990; Phelan, 1991). Tangible design features such as cooking grills, fire pits, showers, telephone and park stores can also be considered convenience features. This type of items was equally important to all ethnic groups.

When taking only ethnicity into account, the similarities are more striking than the distinctions in the way the ethnic groups responded to the preferences. However, parks need to be designed for a variety of preferences and cultural expressions because ethnic groups come to parks with different preferences based on their attributes and motivations. Rather than one large homogeneous camping loop, Park Designers could include several smaller camping loops that provide variety to avoid conflict created by opposing user preferences.

#### *Ethnicity with Barriers to Camping*

It was hypothesized that the distribution of respondent's perceived barriers to camping were independent of ethnicity. The results indicate this hypothesis may be rejected based on the following discussion and conclusions.

*Conclusion:* Since ethnicity affects perceived barriers, the depth of a barrier would be lessened to the extent that preferences, based on ethnicity, are met.

The General Lifestyle section played a larger role in creating barriers to camping than the Social/Cultural, Psychological/Fears, or Racism sections since all the significant findings were generated from this category.

*General Lifestyle.* Time and money summarizes the two General Lifestyle items that resulted in significant finding. Most ethnic groups did not consider expense or distance to be a barrier to camping. The ethnic groups are willing to go the distance and pay the price for the experience received.

However, the Latino/a ethnic group (75%) indicated that expense was a barrier to camping, and 50% considered distance to be a barrier to camping. 75% of the Canadian ethnic group that perceived distance to be a barrier responded that it was *Very* important while the majority of the Latino/a ethnic group considered it only *Slightly* important. So, while some of the Canadian ethnic group is concerned about the distance they travel in order to camp, they are willing to pay for the experience.

The Latino/a ethnic group would be more apt to weigh the distance and the cost versus the experience received and would perceive more barriers. A compilation of the responses to the managerial elements, attributes and motivations indicates the type of experience the majority of the Latino/a ethnic group expects to receive. Camps with family, most are in the 18 – 40 age range, wants space between campers, enjoying sights and sounds of the natural environment is only slightly important, do not want to see litter, peace and quiet is very important, and being near a river or lake is important but mentally unwinding is not. If the majority of the elements above are met, then the expense and distance will be less a barrier. Blahna (1992a) suggested that agencies do not meet the preferred experiences of ethnic groups, and deciphering the type of experience an ethnic

group prefers is the first step in overcoming the barriers to camping. In addition to ethnicity, acculturation levels need to be taken into consideration.

## Acculturation

### *Acculturation Levels and Ethnicity*

Since selective acculturation is often found in areas with a constant source of new immigrants, a consistent distinction between high and low acculturated ethnic groups for every element would not be expected. However, within each of the items that resulted in significant findings, there exist characteristics pertaining only to the high or low acculturated ethnic groups. When the ethnic groups are divided into acculturation levels, the number of significant findings increases. Furthermore, every ethnic group had one or more significant findings except the High acculturated American ethnic group. The Low acculturated ethnic groups had more significant findings than the High acculturated ethnic groups. It was hypothesized that the distribution of respondent's camping preferences were independent of level of acculturation. The results indicate this hypothesis may be rejected based on the following conclusions and discussion.

### *Acculturation Levels and Ethnicity with Managerial Elements*

*Conclusion:* High acculturated ethnic groups expect more options than Low acculturated ethnic groups.

Analyses of the managerial elements indicated the responses to ten of nineteen items were based on the respondent's acculturation level and ethnicity. Certain patterns of responses became evident with the addition of acculturation. One pattern was responses that were limited to only one of the acculturation levels. For example, the High Mexican American, High European, High American, and High Others acculturated ethnic

groups responded identically to all of the categories. None of the Low acculturated ethnic groups had identical responses for all of the categories.

The following responses were particular to the High acculturated ethnic groups, as they were the only groups to camp with *20+ people* and to consider the number of sites to be *too few*. They were the only groups to consider the parking space *too big*, *too small* and *too far away from the table*. In addition, the High acculturated ethnic groups are the only groups to list *scouts* as a group that they first went camping with, to respond in the *Almost Full Time* category for number of times they have camped in the last 12 months, and to have traveled *9+ hours* to get to the park. The Low acculturated ethnic groups had only one response that pertained only to the Low acculturated groups. The Low acculturated Mexican American ethnic group was the only group to identify *Church* as with whom they first camped.

A second pattern of responses that emerged was the difference in the range of responses between High and Low acculturation levels. The High acculturated ethnic groups responded with a broader range of answers, whereas the Low acculturated ethnic groups tended to respond using fewer categories. Often the Low acculturated ethnic groups responses would fall evenly in just two categories, with three groups in one category and three in another. This response pattern differs from the High acculturated ethnic groups, in which all ethnic groups were likely to respond across the spectrum of categories. Examples of this pattern exist in the number of people in the group, number of times camped in the last 12 months, and number of sites items as described below.

The majority of the High acculturated ethnic groups had reached a majority of the number of people in their group by the fourth person. The Low acculturated ethnic

groups were divided between 2 (European, Canadian, and 50% American) and 6 to 9 (Mexican, Others, Mexican American, 50% American) for the majority of the number of people in their group.

A similar pattern exists for the number of times a respondent camped in the last 12 months. The majority of the High acculturated ethnic groups had camped with a majority of responses in the *Seldom* category and then had fewer responses in many of the other categories. The Low acculturated ethnic groups either had a majority in the *Seldom* category or were divided between two amounts. For example the Low acculturated American ethnic group was 50% *Seldom*, 50% *Frequently*; the Low acculturated European ethnic group was 50% *Seldom*, 50% *Regularly*; and the Low acculturated Canadian ethnic group was 60% *Regularly*, 20% *Seldom* and 20 % *Fulltime*.

The majority of both High and Low acculturated ethnic groups considered the number of sites for the number of people to be *About Right*. However, Low acculturated ethnic groups only chose *Too Many* as a second response while High acculturated ethnic groups responded in both additional categories. A similar pattern exists for comparison of the parking space to the site. After *About Right*, Low acculturated ethnic groups only choose *Too Close* as a second response while High acculturated ethnic groups responded in two or more of the other categories.

Acculturation makes a difference beyond ethnicity in managerial items. When planning a park that may be heavily used by High acculturated ethnic groups, more options will be expected by the park user in order to meet their preferences and expectations. While initially, Low acculturated ethnic groups may not expect as many options, their preferences will be clear and will expand if they become more acculturated.

The pattern associated with identifying with whom the ethnic groups will camp was affected by acculturation as well.

*Conclusion:* The swiftness of the transition of camping companions for High acculturated ethnic groups effects the life cycle of programs.

In order to design effective programs, it is important to know with whom people camped when they first began camping and with whom they usually camp now. As a snapshot in time, also included was with whom the respondents were camping at the time of the survey. Carr and Williams (1993) noted that less acculturated individuals were more likely to be in organized groups. However, this study found that a greater nuance existed in the responses as demonstrated by the following examples.

The Low acculturated Mexican American ethnic group was the only ethnic group to indicate *Church* as a group they usually camp with now. The same percent indicated they were with a church group when they first camped, although none of the Low acculturated Mexican American ethnic group was currently camping with a church group but rather with *Family/Relatives* and *Close Friends*. The Low acculturated Mexican American ethnic group responded with only these three categories while the High acculturated Mexican American ethnic group responded with these three categories, but also included *Alone* and *Scouts*.

While only the High acculturated ethnic groups listed *Scouts* as with whom they first camped, a small percentage (8%) of the Low acculturated Mexican ethnic group selected *Scouts/Family/Relatives* as with whom they first camped. The percentage doubled and was listed only as *Scouts* for who the Low acculturated Mexican ethnic group camped with in both the currently and usually items. The Low acculturated



Mexican ethnic group moved away from *Church* and *Family/Relatives* and into *Scouts* and *Close Friends*. The High acculturated Mexican ethnic group first camped only with *Family/Relatives* and *Close Friends* and has divided *Family/Relatives* into equal parts of *Alone/Family/Relatives* and *Family/Relatives*. Currently, the majority of the High acculturated Mexican ethnic group was camping with *Close Friends*.

The Low acculturated Canadian ethnic group first camped equally with *Family/Relatives* and *Alone*. Currently, the Low acculturated Canadian ethnic group responded equally with *Alone* and *Close Friends*; however, the majority of them responded *Alone* for with whom they usually camp. Contrast these results with the High acculturated Canadian ethnic group, the majority of who indicated *Family/Relatives* for all three categories.

The Low acculturated American ethnic group first camped with *Family/Relatives* and *Close Friends* and then split 25% off from *Family/Relatives* and moved to *Alone* for whom they camped with in both the currently and usually items. The High acculturated American ethnic group moved from *Family/Relatives*, *Scouts*, and *Church* to *Close Friends* and *Alone*.

Both the High and Low acculturated Latino/a and Others ethnic groups, along with the High acculturated European ethnic group displayed the same trend of moving from the family then to friends and alone. The Low acculturated European ethnic group was most likely to indicate they first camped alone, and is the only ethnic group to move away from alone and toward family.

As shown, the Low acculturated ethnic groups began camping with the family, moved toward organized groups outside the family, next to close friends, and then toward

alone. The High acculturated ethnic groups were more likely to begin camping with organized groups along with the family, moved toward close friends and then toward alone. Understanding this movement can assist park managers in identifying changes occurring in park users and respond with changes in programs in a timely manner.

Tracking the movement of park users will enable managers to recognize marketing and programming life cycle trends and make adjustments in order to effectively meet user expectations and budget constraints.

*Conclusion:* Education and length of exposure to another culture effect acculturation level.

In addition to identity of groups, Carr and Williams (1993) noted that individuals with more education were more highly acculturated. There was a distinction between High and Low acculturated ethnic groups pertaining to education in this study, also. The High acculturated ethnic groups averaged 61% of responses for each group in a category above High School while the Low acculturated ethnic groups averaged 41%. The High school category was chosen as the line of demarcation since all groups indicated they had obtained this level. The Low acculturated American ethnic group was the only group not to obtain any schooling beyond High School. While the High acculturated European ethnic group had the most education, the Low acculturated European ethnic group was distinguished in another item.

Reaching statistical significance, the entire Low acculturated European ethnic group had lived in the U.S. 17 or less years, and none of the Low acculturated Canadian ethnic group had lived in the U.S. at all. Of the Low acculturated ethnic groups, 83% had lived in the U.S. below 40 years while the High acculturated ethnic groups had responses

in every category, and 53% had lived in the U.S. 40+ years. The responses to *number of years lived in the U.S.* illuminated the trends that have emerged between the two levels of acculturation. The number of years a respondent has lived in the U.S. affects the process of acculturation. Being exposed to other cultures for longer lengths of time provides the respondent with the opportunity to selectively acculturate, to become multicultural, or to completely assimilate into another culture.

#### *Acculturation and Ethnicity with Attributes and Motivations*

*Conclusion:* Diametric attributes and motivations illuminated by acculturation between and within ethnic groups must be managed in order to prevent user conflict.

Analyses of the attributes and motivation indicated the responses to 13 of 40 items were based on the respondent's acculturation level and ethnicity. All but two of the items had at least one ethnic group that was distinguished from the rest s either by a majority of responses or a significant number of responses. Responses to *playing radios from cars*, part of the Natural Environment category, was the only item that demonstrated the split preferences by Low acculturated ethnic groups seen in the managerial elements.

*Natural Environment.* Consistent with other studies (Carr & Williams, 1993), *playing radios from cars* was not important to the majority of High acculturated ethnic groups while *enjoying the sight and sounds of nature* and *the natural surroundings* was *Very* important. The High acculturated Mexican ethnic group was distinguished since *playing radios from cars* was important. The High acculturated Latino/a ethnic group was distinctive since 50% maintained the same preference about radios while a significant number considered *enjoying the sight and sounds of nature* and *the natural surroundings* only *Slightly* important.

The majority of Low acculturated ethnic groups considered *enjoying the sight and sounds of nature* and *the natural surroundings* as *Very* important but were split in their preference for *playing radios from cars*. The Low acculturated European, American (50%), and Canadian ethnic groups indicated it was not important while the Low acculturated Mexican American, Mexican, Others, and American (50%) ethnic groups indicated it was important. The Low acculturated Mexican and Others (50%) ethnic groups were distinguished since they preferred *the natural surroundings* and *the sight and sounds of nature* only *Slightly*. In addition to preferences for the Natural Environment section, acculturation level also impacted the results for the Facilities section.

*Facilities.* When only ethnicity was considered, none of the Facility items reached statistical significance. However, when acculturation is combined with ethnicity, four items reached statistical significance. The majority of each ethnic group considered *well cared for facilities* to be *Very* important and having *signs* to be important. Three points of distinction exist: the Low acculturated Others ethnic group not considering *well cared for facilities* important, the Low acculturated American (50%) ethnic group considering it only *Slightly* important, and the High acculturated Canadian ethnic group considered having *Signs* as not important. The last Facility item has an inverse response.

*Being able to rent equipment* was *Very* important to the Low acculturated Mexican and Others ethnic groups while the Low acculturated Mexican American (50%) and Canadian ethnic groups considered it only *Slightly* important; European and American ethnic groups did not indicate a preference. Inversely, the High acculturated ethnic groups considered it only *Slightly* important except the High acculturated Mexican

American considered it *Very* important. Since the majority of Low acculturated ethnic groups seldom camp, the likelihood of not owning a lot of recreational equipment exists and may explain why being able to rent equipment is so important. The more often one camps, as in the case with High acculturated ethnic groups, the more likely one owns more equipment.

*Social.* No significant differences exist for the Social items except for *being with people that are like you*. Consistent with other studies (Carr & Williams, 1993), the majority of all respondents thought it was important. However, a statistically significant number of the High acculturated Mexican American ethnic group and 50% of the Low acculturated Others ethnic group did not consider *being with people that are like you* important. This may be an indication that these ethnic groups perceive the park as a place they feel comfortable in even without large numbers of people that are like them. Diversity of the workforce, sensitivity to ethnic preferences by managers and employees, and specific strategies to make programs available and relevant to a diverse population can contribute to the creation of an open and inviting environment (Allison, 1992; Chavez, 2000).

*Psychological.* The majority of respondents considered *enjoying peace and quiet* and *mentally unwinding or relaxing* as *Very* important in the Psychological category. The Low Mexican American ethnic group was distinctive since a significant number considered the two items only *Slightly* important. The High acculturated Mexican ethnic group was distinguished since a significant number considered *enjoying peace and quiet* only *Slightly* important while a significant number of the High acculturated Latino/a ethnic group did not consider *mentally unwinding or relaxing* important. The preferences

of these two ethnic groups are consistent with their preferences stated for the Natural Environment category. Blahna (1992b) noted that, for Hispanics, nature is where relaxation and socialization occurs but is not necessarily an end in itself. To have peace and quiet enough to mentally unwind and relax implies the respondent would need to be alone, and to be alone is inconsistent with most of the preferences that these three ethnic groups had already indicated.

*Resource.* Consistent with other studies (Responsive Management, 2001), the majority of the respondents considered *having a lake or river nearby* to be important. However, a significant number of the High acculturated European ethnic group indicated it was not important, and they were also the most likely of the High acculturated ethnic groups to indicate so. This was the only statistically significant finding for this acculturation group. This finding supports the pattern of selective acculturation; as Gramann et al., (1993) noted, “leisure is often subject to fewer perceived pressures to conform to the expectations of others than is behavior in the workplace or at school” (p. 71). A significant number of the High acculturated European ethnic group chose a different response than the majority even though that majority usually had the same responses as the High American, High Canadian, and High Others to all of the categories.

The full variety of distinctions, discernable through considering acculturation as well as ethnicity, reinforces the importance of designing parks in ways that accommodate a variety of preferences as previously discussed. Failure to provide enough space between groups practicing opposite preferences can lead to dissatisfaction and disillusion at best and overt conflict at worst. If the opposing groups are from different ethnic background, the conflict may lead to the perception of racism rather than just opposite preferences.

The conflict can quickly escalate due to the lack of understanding of the effects of acculturation on preferences, even when the opposing groups are from the same ethnic group. Management can train personnel to diffuse situations by including information about acculturation in conflict management training classes.

### *Acculturation and Ethnicity with Barriers to Camping*

Analyses of the barriers to camping indicated that all but three of the significant findings were in the responses of the Low acculturated ethnic groups. The High Mexican American, High European, High American, and High Others ethnic groups responded identically to the same categories for the General Lifestyle barriers. This was reduced to High European and High Others ethnic groups for Social/Cultural barriers, and reduced further to none of the ethnic groups responding identically to the same categories for Psychological/Fears. While the majority of respondents did not consider these items to be important barriers to camping, for 10 items at least, one acculturated ethnic group perceived them as important barriers to camping. It was hypothesized that the distribution of respondent's perceived barriers to camping were independent of level of acculturation. The results indicate this hypothesis may be rejected based on the following discussion and conclusions.

*General Lifestyle.* Distance, expense, and difficulty in getting to the park were barriers to camping in the General Lifestyle section.

*Conclusion:* Barriers affected by acculturation levels require the development of non-homogenous methods of providing information and assistance.

A significant number of the High acculturated Latino/a ethnic group responded that expense would be a barrier to camping while 50% indicated distance was a barrier.

*Very* important was the response of the majority of the High acculturated Canadian ethnic group that considered distance and difficulty in getting to the park a barrier.

Distance was *Slightly* a barrier to a significant number of the Low acculturated Others ethnic group, with the Low acculturated American ethnic group in agreement, while the majority of the Low acculturated Mexican ethnic group considered distance a *Very* important barrier. Only the Low Canadian ethnic group considered expense a barrier. In contrast to the High acculturated ethnic groups, most of the Low acculturated ethnic groups considered difficulty getting to the park a *Very* important barrier to camping. Since Low acculturated ethnic groups are less likely to read or understand the English language, traditional methods such as a brochure or telephone number for providing directions to a park may be underutilized. Baas et. al (1993) noted that Hispanics used informal communication channels and may have anxiety about asking for directions due to the language barrier. A respondent's acculturation level may have more impact on the barrier *too difficult to get here* than ethnicity since all but one of the Low acculturated ethnic groups had respondents that considered difficulty in getting to the park either *Slightly* or *Very* important as a barrier. Managers will need to explore nontraditional methods of communicating information and providing directions in order to remove this barrier for Low acculturated ethnic groups. As previously noted, having signs was important to the ethnic groups, so park managers should consider increasing the distance from the park that signage occurs and paying particular attention to intersections that may be difficult to follow.



*Social/Cultural.* The Social/Cultural section generated the most number of items that were perceived as barriers to camping. All of the statistically significant findings that occurred in this section were in the Low acculturated ethnic groups.

*Conclusion:* Mitigation of these barriers will occur by using unconventional sources for education and outreach programs.

The Low American ethnic group had a significant number that indicated that *My family/friends would think I'm crazy, Feel uncomfortable or out of place, Don't know where to go*, and *Never talked much about it as a kid* were important barriers to camping, with the last item being *Very* important. A significant number of the Low acculturated Mexican ethnic group considered it a *Slightly* important barrier to camping that they did not talk about camping as a kid. The Low Others acculturated ethnic group identified with the Low American ethnic group for the items *My family/friends would think I'm crazy* and *Don't know where to go* while the majority of the rest of the ethnic groups did not perceive these items to be barriers.

A significant number of the Low acculturated European ethnic group considered *Lack of experience* to be an important barrier to camping and *Don't enjoy the out-of-doors much* to be *Slightly* important as a barrier to camping. In addition, a significant number of the Low acculturated Others and Mexican ethnic groups considered *No one to go with* a *Very* important barrier to camping. While the Low acculturated Mexican American ethnic group was in agreement, the rest of the Low acculturated ethnic groups did not perceive it as a barrier to camping. Although not significant, the majority of each High acculturated ethnic group did not perceive these items to be a barrier to camping either.

However, of the respondents that did perceive these items as a barrier, most considered it to be only *Slightly* important. The High acculturated European and Others ethnic groups responded identically to the same categories. The High acculturated Latino/a ethnic group considered *Don't know where to go*, *Don't enjoy the out-of-doors much*, and *Lack of experience* as important barriers to camping, with the last item being *Very* important. The part of the High acculturated Latino/a ethnic group that perceived *Never talked much about it as a kid* to be a barrier, did so to the *Very* degree.

All of these barriers can be reduced or removed through education and outreach efforts that provide practical hands-on type of instruction and information. Conducting workshops that teach basic camping skills will decrease the feeling of lack of experience, which in turn decreases the uncomfortable or out of place feeling, while increasing potential camping partners and the knowledge of where to go camping. No longer able to rely on family or scout groups to teach camping skills to all ethnic groups, Park management will need to partner with nontraditional sources such as childcare providers, youth athletic organizations, and municipal recreation organizations to increase knowledge and awareness of camping. Just as education and outreach is needed to help remove the Social/Cultural barriers, interpretation will be required to remove the Psychological/Fears barriers.

*Psychological/Fears.* The responses to the Psychological/Fears barriers did not contain any ethnic groups that responded identically to each category and the majority of respondents did not perceive the items in this section to be a barrier.

*Conclusion:* Creative interpretive programming that increases awareness of and ability to differentiate between lore and legend, facts and feelings, and provide tools for overcoming indoctrinated concepts will cause defection from these barriers.

Most of the significant findings related to the degree that the items were important to the non-majority; however, two significant findings resulted from the majority of respondents in the ethnic group perceiving the item to be a barrier. The responses of the High acculturated ethnic groups had only one significant finding, while all the rest of the significant findings occurred in the Low acculturated ethnic groups.

*Don't like insects* and *Feel uncomfortable in the country* were the two items where the significant findings resulted from the majority of respondents in the ethnic group perceiving the item to be a barrier. The *Don't like insects* barrier was considered to be important by a significant number of the Low acculturated European and American ethnic groups. While a significant number of the Low acculturated European and Canadian ethnic groups considered the barrier to be *Slightly* important and the Low acculturated Others ethnic group considered the barrier to be *Very* important. The majority of the Low acculturated Others ethnic group perceived *Feel uncomfortable in the country* to be a *Slightly* important barrier to camping. For the Low acculturated Canadian ethnic group that perceived this item as a barrier, a significant number considered it *Slightly* important.

The rest of the significant findings pertained to the degree of importance. The Low acculturated European ethnic group had a significant number respond that not liking to be out in the dark was a *Slightly* important barrier while not liking snakes was a *Very* important barrier to camping. The Low acculturated Mexican ethnic group considered not

liking snakes to be a *Slightly* important barrier to camping. The last significant finding pertained to a High acculturated ethnic group.

For the 33% of the High acculturated Mexican American ethnic group that perceived *Don't like other animals in the woods* to be a barrier to camping, it was significant that they considered it *Very* important while all the rest indicated *Slightly*.

Interpretation can increase the knowledge and understanding of these Psychological/Fears barriers to camping. Responsive Management (2001) noted there was not a significant difference pertaining to program priorities for ethnic groups, making interpretive programming an acceptable medium for instruction and exploration. Interpretive programming that explains the importance of snakes, insects and other animals in the woods, and demonstrates what actions to take upon encountering them, can help alleviate the fears. Knowing that darkness and the country can create fears that lead to barriers to camping, park interpreters can incorporate some information about these items into most of their programs even though the main subject may not be about the two items. Learning the basis of fears in a fun manner, as opposed to making fun of fears, will increase the ability of individuals to apply reason to an uncomfortable situation instead of succumbing to their feelings.

*Further research.* Regarding ethnicity, further research is suggested in order to determine the cause of an individual selecting one ethnic category over another and to discover how each ethnic group defines the selected category. Pertaining to acculturation, further research is suggested that targets Low acculturated ethnic groups to increase the cell size in order to increase the ability to generalize findings. Further research is suggested to test design recommendations of managerial elements.

Regarding attributes and motivations, further research is recommended to expand the available responses to a 5 or 7-point scale in order to evaluate the degree an item is not important as well as important. Pertaining to barrier to camping, further research is recommended to provide the barrier survey to individuals that visit the park on a daily basis to determine the reasons for not camping.

## APPENDIX A

### LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the Literature takes a natural progression through four areas. Demographic shifts, projection of future needs, comparative ethnicity studies, and selective acculturation are linked together with details of one area enjoining the others.

*Demographic shifts.* The U.S. Census reported in 1970, 11,196,733 people resided in Texas, and by 2000, the population was 20.8 million (Garcia, 2001). The 1970 U.S. Census (1973) did not separately categorize Spanish or Hispanic when reporting race. The 1980 U.S. Census (1983) indicated “Spanish origin (p. 1)” to be 21% of the Texas population. The 1990 U.S. Census (1992) reported 25% of the population in Texas was of “Hispanic origin (p. 29).” In 20 years, Hispanics went from not even being a category to being a quarter of the state’s population. Murdock, Hogue, and Pecotte (1999) suggested the trend will continue since a large part of the increase is primarily from natural causes as opposed to immigration. Research indicated Hispanics are the fastest growing minority in both the U.S. and Texas (Hutchison, 1988; Hutchison & Fidel, 1984; Murdock, Backman, Colberg, Hogue, & Hamm, 1990; U.S. Census, 1990; Ramos, 1999). The 2000 U.S. Census (2001) confirmed the predictions by reporting the biggest cities in Texas, Hispanics were the largest single ethnic group.

*Projection of future needs.* Studies were conducted to determine the physical needs of outdoor recreation for the future (Love, McGregor, & Crompton, 1993; Murdock, Backman, Hoque, & Ellis, 1991; Nichols, Goldbloom, & Deloney, 1989; Murdock et al., 1990; Responsive Management, 2001; Schmidly, 2001; Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 1984). Projections of land area needs are difficult due to the inability to accurately project how long current demands will be sustained (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966; Dwyer, 1994). Future facilities are dependent on the type of activity planned for the area, number of visitors, and location. While Clawson and Knetsch (1966) contended no standard method of forecasting is ideal for all applications, Murdock et al. (1990) found the use of demographic detail in future demand projection models is important for a thorough analysis of leisure behavior. However, agencies must make long range plans and acquire land because timing is paramount for obtaining the best price and location (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966). Schmidly (2001) projected Texas would need to acquire 1.4 million acres of parkland by 2030, in order to provide 55 acres per 1000 people. Demographic changes may impact design and management of settings and facilities, requiring responsiveness and flexibility to determine the needs of current users (Chavez, 2000; Dwyer, 1994). Decisions made by managers will affect the recreation impact in a given area for years (Bammel & Burris-Bammel, 1996; Walsh, 1986).

*Comparative ethnicity studies.* Researchers noted a difference in participation rates between ethnic groups (Baas et al., 1993; Blahna, 1992b; Carr & Williams, 1993; Chavez, 1995; Chavez, 1993b; Chavez, 1993a; Dwyer, 1994; Dwyer, 1993; Dwyer, 1992; Dziekan, 2001; Floyd & Noe, 1992; Gobster, 1993a; Gobster, 1993b; Gobster & Delgado, 1993; Hartman & Overdevest, 1990; Hutchison, 1987; Love et al., 1993;

Murdock et al., 1991; Nichols et al., 1989; Responsive Management, 2001; Stamps & Stamps, 1985). Mexican American campers place a higher priority on tangible design features and selected more closely spaced campsites than Anglo campers (Baas, 1993; Irwin et al., 1990). Social composition of Hispanic Americans in parks consisted of groups, larger than other ethnic groups, with a high proportion of adults in the group, emphasizing families and extended families (Carr & Williams, 1992; Chavez, 1993a; Gobster, 1991; Hutchinson, 1987, Irwin et al., 1990). Hutchinson and Fidel (1984) noted average participating size for Anglos was 2.5 with more than one half of activities requiring only a single individual. Meanwhile, the average group size for Hispanic Americans was 5.7 with choice of activity frequently requiring large numbers of mixed groups.

*Selected acculturation.* Monroe (1995) defined values as “system of beliefs, actions, and ethics that guide and direct the actions of an individual ” (p. 24). Bullock and Stallybrass (1977) described culture as the mode of living, traditions, beliefs, and ideology a group possesses that are distinctive from other groups. Cultural awareness is the understanding of another culture as it relates to individual action, expression, and values; while, multiculturalism demonstrates a value system stemming from various cultures with equal support of all (Dolce, 1973; Monroe, 1995). Researchers explored the relationship of acculturation, assimilation, and leisure constraints on ethnicity and outdoor recreation participation (Carr & Williams, 1993; Hutchinson, 1988; Shaul & Gramann, 1998; Stodolska, 1998). Selective acculturation means an ethnic group keeps core cultural traits while accepting other traits of the majority group; accepted traits are frequently tied to socioeconomic advancement. Affected by a continuing influx of new



immigrants, selective acculturation is often found in geographical concentrations of an ethnic group (Shaull & Gramann, 1998).

### Discussion

Changes in demographics have shifted the emphasis from growth and focused attention on the increasing diversity of the population. Differences in recreation participation, preference, and social patterns of use are an essential element of each culture. Practicing life skills teaches behaviors that allow successful integration into social and cultural structures. Environments that encourage multicultural values allow individuals to develop cultural awareness. With an increasingly diverse population, various ethnic, racial, and cultural groups will be deciding the future of outdoor recreation. Although currently surveyed respondents still think outdoor recreation is important, recreational priorities will shift as a culture changes (Love et al., 1993, Schmidly, 2001). The ability to be flexible and responsive to change will be an important factor in park and recreation planning (Allison, 1993; Chavez, 2000; Dwyer, 1994; Dwyer & Gobster, 1997; Holland, 1997; Monroe, 1995).

Abreu (1987) noted, "Recreation programmers must understand the culture, traditions, and social structure of the Hispanic population" (p. 52) in order to meet their recreational needs. Anglo colonists tried to separate from their European background by making new laws, developing new social concepts, and creating a new society. By contrast, Spanish colonists duplicated their society. Therefore, the Hispanic culture is influenced by Indian, Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo elements (Abreu, 1987; Floyd & Noe, 1992). The Spanish influence can be seen in the choice of stationary activities

requiring extensive use of park facilities. The park is a recreational setting that resembles the plaza in Mexican cities (Hutchison & Fidel, 1984; Irwin et al., 1990; Jackson, 1973).

Conforming to customs of the Spanish, the Church is a strong force in Hispanic society. This cultural background causes Hispanics to participate in family-oriented, church related activities. Abreu (1987) suggested, “church-related functions require a familial presence, the activities developed family orientation. Whole families and their extensions congregate for several days, bringing food and good will to share” (p. 53). Hispanics ranked highest in 6 of 26 activities that usually accommodate large numbers of people (Nichols et al., 1989). The traditional family and group oriented culture of Hispanics is demonstrated in the average participating group size of 5.7 as opposed to 2.5 for the Anglo culture (Hutchison & Fidel, 1984). Other researchers have found different averages but by comparison to other ethnic groups are always higher (Chavez, 1993b; Gobster, 1993b; Gobster & Delgado, 1993; Hutchison, 1987; Irwin et al., 1990)

The large concentration of Hispanics living in an area, combined with new arrivals from Mexico, enable the Hispanic Community to practice selected acculturation (Chavez, 1993b; Gramann et al., 1993). Television and mass communication have contributed to Hispanics learning games and activities, such as golf and tennis, typically considered Anglo sports (Abreu, 1987). This indicates a weakness of comparative studies, when variability within an ethnic group is not strongly documented, then inappropriate interpretation of data can cause stereotyping. It is also difficult to determine the extent to which recreational preferences change over time due to the acculturation process (Dwyer & Gobster, 1992). Even with this limitation, the strength of the population shifts indicates that park managers will benefit from becoming aware of

the Hispanic culture and continue to research and document participation patterns. The results of the research can be a guide for long-range planning, marketing, visitor programs, resource management, refurbishing older facilities and effecting changes in the planning and design of new parks (Allison, 1992; Baas, 1993; Blahna, 1992b; Chavez, 2000; Chavez & Magill, 1993; Cottrell & Graefe, 1993; Dahl, 1993; Dwyer, 1994; Dwyer & Gobster, 1993; Ewert, 1993; Hutchison, 1987).

It is possible to design a park that discourages use due to inappropriate location, size, and shape, with lack of facilities, access, and activity support. Applying comparative research to park design will require “the same sort of vision that animated the American parks movement 150 years ago” (Garvin, 1999, p. 26). Frederick Law Olmsted’s park designs have withstood time, economic, and political changes due to appropriate sizing of the components and arranging the components to be mutually supportive. Garvin (1999) indicated “a landscape that provides relief from the activities of urban life, includes actively used recreation facilities, [that] brings together ‘vast numbers of persons...poor and rich, young and old’,” (p. 28), would meet Olmsted’s criteria. Cramer (1999) reported that Olmstead encouraged landscape architects to carry a vision of land planners in order to design spaces that keep evolving and address urban social problems.

Park planners may be hesitant to apply research due to limited experience in serving minority groups, few minority employees, and low minority participation in the public involvement efforts of recreation planning (Blahna & Toch, 1993; Carr & Williams, 1993; Dahl, 1993; Dwyer & Gobster, 1997). Baas (1993) noted that involvement in public hearings is limited by economics, did not provide a representation

of the public as a whole, and often the most effective involvement was happening in the field. Providing quality customer service requires engaging in discussions, understanding the preferences of a diverse population and then applying the findings to design and management decisions (Allison, 1993; Baas 1992; Chase & Cheek, 1979; Dwyer, 1994). Chavez (2000a) identified the manager's task as accommodating as many desires as possible in order to make participants feel at home. With a declining market base and increased competition from commercial campgrounds, managers must find ways to entice ethnic groups with programming that recognizes the diversity and dynamics within the groups (Blahna, 1992b; Chavez, 2000; Cottrell & Graefe, 1993; Dwyer & Gobster, 1997). Allison (1988) cautioned that an apparent similarity of activity shared by groups did not necessarily mean the same thing to each member of the group. While several studies encouraged managers to determine the preferences of their clientele to avoid creating stereotyped, homogenous ethnic groups (Carr & Williams, 1992; Chavez, 2000; Dwyer & Gobster, 1993). Allison (1992) stated, "Variability within a particular ethnic group may be as much a function of age, gender, income, and education as a function of culture" (p. 23). Heavy sampling of racial and ethnic groups will highlight variations within the group. Combining ideas with the expertise of professionals will identify competing interests and allow for compromise (Disney, 1997; Dwyer & Gobster, 1997; Schmidly, 2001). This neighborly approach to problem solving emphasizes the importance of including local participants and results in increased accountability for maintaining the park and effective implementation of necessary modifications will be noticed (Chavez, 1993b; Disney, 1997). Local participation will minimize the negative effects of the comparative studies by identifying, considering, and including the variables

existing within the ethnic group, thus avoiding the *one size fits all* solution indigenous to government entities (Allison 1988; Baas, 1993; Carr & Williams, 1993; Dahl, 1993; Disney, 1997; Gobster & Delgado, 1993).

## APPENDIX B

### ENGLISH SURVEY

*Hello*

Thank you for visiting Garner State Park and may we ask for your help? We are trying to better understand what you prefer when you come camping. The questions will take about \_\_\_\_minutes to answer. Your responses will help us provide better service when you return in the future. Thank you for telling us how you feel.

#### THESE QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOUR GROUP

- 1) How many people are in your group today (adults and children)?
- 2) How many are less than 13 years of age?
- 3) Over 65 years of age?
- 4) How many campsites did you use?
- 5) For the number of people in your group, was the number of campsites:  
Too Many    About Right    Too Few
- 6) How many total vehicles did your group bring to the park?

#### THESE QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOU

- 7) What do you think about the parking space at your campsite(s)?  
Too big, Too close to table, About Right, Too far away from table, Too small
- 8) Who do you usually come camping with?  
Alone, Close Friends, Scout Groups, Family/Relatives, Church Groups

9) When you pick a campsite, do you prefer to be:

Next to other campers, Completely away from other campers, Away but within sight of other campers

10) When you pick a campsite, do you prefer to be:

Next to the park's restroom/showers, Close to the park's restroom/showers, Be able to walk to the park's restroom/ shower, Be able to drive to the park's restroom/shower, Do not use the park's restroom/shower

11) How many times in your life have you gone camping?

12) How many times in the last 12 months?

13) Who did you first go camping with?

Alone, Close Friends, Scout Groups, Family/Relatives, Church Groups

14) How did you usually camp? Tent, Trailer, Popup,

Motorhome, 5th Wheel, Shelter, Sleep in car, Cabin, Sleep out in the open

15) Who do you usually go camping with now?

Alone, Close Friends, Scout Groups, Family/Relatives, Church Groups

16) How do you usually camp today? Tent, Trailer, Popup,

Motorhome, 5th Wheel, Shelter, Sleep in car, Cabin, Sleep out in the open

17) How many hours did it take you to travel to Garner?

**In order to have a better understanding of our respondents, I'd like to ask a few questions about your background.**

18) In general, what language do you read and speak?

Only Spanish,

Spanish better than English, Both equally, English better than Spanish, Only English

19) What language do you usually speak at home?

Only Spanish,

Spanish better than English, Both equally, English better than Spanish, Only English

20) In which language do you usually think?

Only Spanish,

Spanish better than English, Both equally, English better than Spanish, Only English

21) What language do you usually speak with your friends?

Only Spanish,

Spanish better than English, Both equally, English better than Spanish, Only English

22) What is the last year of school that you have completed so far?

23) Are you the primary wage earner in you family?

24) How old are you?

25) Your gender is: Female, Male

26) Your place of birth: State & Country

27) Number of years you have lived in the United States?

28) Which of the following best describes your race?

Black, Hispanic, Asian, White, American Indian, Other

29) Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?

Latino/a, Mexican American, Chicano/a, Central American, Mexican, Cuban, Korean, Chinese, Filipino, European, Cambodian, Japanese, American, African American, Middle East, South American, Vietnamese, Canadian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

**Please tell me if each of the following is important to you when you go camping. If it is important, please tell me how much: Slightly Important or Very Important.**

	<i>Not Important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Slightly</i>	<i>Very</i>
	NO	YES	S	V
Enjoy natural surroundings				
Having hiking trails nearby	NO	YES	S	V
Cooking grills	NO	YES	S	V
Being away from crowds	NO	YES	S	V
Having a lake or river nearby	NO	YES	S	V
Fire pits/rings	NO	YES	S	V
Having recreational activities nearby	NO	YES	S	V
Showers and flush toilets	NO	YES	S	V
Having electricity at the campsite	NO	YES	S	V
Paved parking areas	NO	YES	S	V
Camping close to home or work	NO	YES	S	V
Having a store in the park	NO	YES	S	V
Water at each campsite	NO	YES	S	V
Being with family or friends	NO	YES	S	V
Group camping areas	NO	YES	S	V
Enjoying peace and quiet	NO	YES	S	V
Being with people that are like you	NO	YES	S	V
Park Ranger Security Patrols	NO	YES	S	V
Seeing wildlife	NO	YES	S	V
Radios playing from cars	NO	YES	S	V
Not seeing litter	NO	YES	S	V
Telephones	NO	YES	S	V
Mentally unwinding or relaxing	NO	YES	S	V
Trash Cans	NO	YES	S	V



Camping where other people are around	NO	YES	S	V
Enjoying the sights and sounds of nature	NO	YES	S	V
Being with people who share interests	NO	YES	S	V
Sharing your skill/knowledge with others	NO	YES	S	V
Park Ranger Talks/Programs	NO	YES	S	V
Equipment Rental	NO	YES	S	V
Dogs on a leash	NO	YES	S	V
Learn new skill or improving existing one	NO	YES	S	V
Radios played at campsites	NO	YES	S	V
Quiet hours enforced	NO	YES	S	V
Well-cared-for facilities	NO	YES	S	V
Signs	NO	YES	S	V
Free of rules and regulations	NO	YES	S	V
Low cost recreation area	NO	YES	S	V
A place easy to get to	NO	YES	S	V
A place easy to get to	NO	YES	S	V
Being able to rent equipment	NO	YES	S	V

**The following is a list of reasons people have given for not camping more often. Please tell me how you feel about each one.**

Not enough time	NO	YES	S	V
Too difficult to get here	NO	YES	S	V
Too expensive	NO	YES	S	V
Too far to go	NO	YES	S	V
No one to go with	NO	YES	S	V
Don't like snakes	NO	YES	S	V
Don't like other animals in the woods	NO	YES	S	V
Feel uncomfortable in the country	NO	YES	S	V
Never talked much about it as a kid	NO	YES	S	V
Don't like to be out in the dark	NO	YES	S	V
Lack of experience	NO	YES	S	V
Don't enjoy the out-of-doors much	NO	YES	S	V
Don't know where to go	NO	YES	S	V
Most of my friends are not interested	NO	YES	S	V
Don't like insects	NO	YES	S	V
Am concerned about racial problems	NO	YES	S	V
Feel uncomfortable or out of place	NO	YES	S	V
Not enough parking spaces	NO	YES	S	V
My family/friends would think I'm crazy	NO	YES	S	V

**Thank You!**

*Your thoughts and feelings are important to us and will be treated with care. Thank you for giving up part of your free time to help us.*

## SPANISH SURVEY

*Hola* Gracias por visitar el parque estatal Garner. ¿Podríamos pedirle ayuda? Estamos tratando de entender mejor lo que usted prefiere cuando viene a acampar. Las preguntas se tardan aproximadamente \_\_\_ minutos para contestar. Sus respuestas nos ayudaran a proveer mejor servicio cuando usted regrese en el futuro. Gracias por dejarnos saber qué opina.

**ESTAS PREGUNTAS SON SOBRE SU GRUPO**

1. ¿Cuántas personas hay en su grupo hoy (adultos y niños)?
2. ¿Cuántos son menores de 13 años de edad?
3. ¿Cuántos son mayores de 65 años de edad?
4. ¿Cuántos sitios de campamento usaron?
5. Para el número de personas en su grupo, el número de sitios de campamento fue:  
Demasiado, Casi lo justo, Muy poco
6. ¿Cuántos vehículos en total trajo su grupo al parque?

**ESTAS PREGUNTAS SON SOBRE USTED**

7. ¿Qué es lo que piensa sobre el espacio de estacionamiento en su sitio de campamento? Muy grande, Muy cerca a la mesa, Casi lo justo, Muy lejos de la mesa, Muy chico
8. ¿Con quién acostumbra venir a acampar? Solo, Con amigos cercanos, Grupos "scout"/exploradores, Familiares / parientes, Grupos de iglesia
9. Cuando usted escoge un sitio de campamento prefiere estar: Enseguida de los otros campistas, Completamente lejos de otros campistas, Lejos pero en vista de otros campistas
10. Cuando usted escoge un sitio de campamento prefiere estar: Enseguida de los baños / las duchas del parque, Cerca de los baños / las duchas del parque, Poder caminar a los baños / las duchas del parque, Poder manejar a los baños / las duchas del parque, No uso los baños / las duchas del parque
11. ¿Cuántas veces en su vida ha ido a acampar?

12. ¿Cuántas veces ha acampado en los últimos 12 meses?
13. ¿Con quién fue a acampar la primera vez? Solo, Con amigos cercanos, Grupos "scout" /exploradores, Familiares / parientes, Grupos de iglesia
14. ¿Cómo acostumbraba a acampar? Carpa, Remolque, Carpa con despliegue automático, Camioneta-casa, Camioneta-casa enganchada, Albergue, Duermo en el coche, Cabaña, Duermo al aire libre
15. ¿Con quién acostumbra a acampar ahora? Solo, Con amigos cercanos, Grupos "scout"/exploradores, Familiares / parientes, Grupos de iglesia
16. ¿Cómo acostumbra a acampar ahora? Carpa, Remolque, Carpa con despliegue automático, Camioneta-casa, Camioneta-casa enganchada, Albergue, Duermo en el coche, Cabaña, Duermo al aire libre
17. ¿Cuántas horas se tardó en viajar a Garner? \_\_\_\_\_ horas

**Para tener mejor conocimiento de los que responden, quisiera preguntar algunas preguntas sobre su historial.**

18. ¿En general, qué idioma lee y habla? Solamente Español, Español mejor que Inglés, Ambos Igualmente, Inglés mejor que Español, Solamente Inglés
19. ¿Qué idioma acostumbra hablar con sus amigos? Solamente Español, Español mejor que Inglés, Ambos igualmente, Inglés mejor que Español, Solamente Inglés
20. ¿En qué idioma acostumbra pensar? Solamente Español, Español mejor que Inglés, Ambos igualmente, Inglés mejor que Español, Solamente Inglés
21. ¿Qué idioma acostumbra hablar con sus amigos? Solamente Español, Español mejor que Inglés, Ambos igualmente, Inglés mejor que Español, Solamente Inglés
22. ¿Cuál es el último año de escuela que usted ha acabado hasta ahora? # de años o curso
23. ¿Es usted el ganador principal de ingreso en su familia? Sí/ No
24. ¿Cuántos años tiene? \_\_\_\_\_ años
25. Su género es: femenino, masculino
26. Su lugar de nacimiento: Estado y País

27. Número de años que usted ha vivido en los Estados Unidos: \_\_\_\_ años
28. ¿Cuál de los siguientes mejor describe su raza? Negro, Hispano, Asiático, Blanco, Amerindio, Otro
29. ¿Cuál de los siguientes mejor describe su etnicidad? Latino/a, México-Americano, Chicano/a, Centro-Americano, Mexicano, Cubano, Coreano, Chino, Filipino, Europeo, Camboyano, Japonés, Americano, Afro americano, Medio-oriental, Sudamericano, Vietnamita, Canadiense, Nativo de Alaska, Hawaiano nativo o isleño pacífico

**Por favor dígame si cada uno de los siguientes es importante para usted cuando acampa. Si es importante, por favor dígame cuanto: Ligeramente importante o Muy Importante**

	<i>No es Importante</i>	<i>Importante</i>	<i>Ligeramente</i>	<i>Muy</i>
Disfrutar del ambiente natural	No	Sí	L	M
Tener un sendero de caminata cerca	No	Sí	L	M
Parrillas de cocina	No	Sí	L	M
Estar lejos de la multitud	No	Sí	L	M
Tener un lago o río cerca	No	Sí	L	M
Fogatas/ anillos de fuego	No	Sí	L	M
Tener actividades recreativas cerca	No	Sí	L	M
Duchas y retretes de tira	No	Sí	L	M
Tener electricidad en el campamento	No	Sí	L	M
Zonas de estacionamiento pavimentadas	No	Sí	L	M
Acampar cerca del hogar o el trabajo	No	Sí	L	M
Tener una tienda en el parque	No	Sí	L	M
Agua en cada campamento	No	Sí	L	M
Estar con familia o amigos	No	Sí	L	M
Zonas de campamento para grupos	No	Sí	L	M
Disfrutar de la paz y tranquilidad	No	Sí	L	M
Estar con personas como usted	No	Sí	L	M
Patrullas guardabosques de seguridad	No	Sí	L	M
Ver la fauna	No	Sí	L	M
Radios tocando de los coches	No	Sí	L	M
No ver basura	No	Sí	L	M
Teléfonos	No	Sí	L	M
Desenvolverse mentalmente o relajarse	No	Sí	L	M
Basureros	No	Sí	L	M
Acampar rodeado de otras personas	No	Sí	L	M
Disfrutar las vistas y los sonidos de la naturaleza	No	Sí	L	M
Estar con personas que comparten intereses	No	Sí	L	M
Compartir su habilidad/ conocimiento con otros	No	Sí	L	M
Charlas/ programas con el guardabosques	No	Sí	L	M

Renta de equipo	No	Sí	L	M
Perros en trailla	No	Sí	L	M
Aprender una habilidad nueva/ mejorar una actual	No	Sí	L	M
Radios tocados en los campamentos	No	Sí	L	M
Aplicación de horas de silencio	No	Sí	L	M
Facilidades bien cuidadas	No	Sí	L	M
Letreros	No	Sí	L	M
Libre de leyes y reglamentos	No	Sí	L	M
Zonas recreativas de bajo costo	No	Sí	L	M
Un lugar fácil de llegar	No	Sí	L	M
Poder rentar equipo	No	Sí	L	M

**Lo siguiente es una lista de razones que personas han dado por no acampar más seguido. Por favor dígame qué opina sobre cada una.**

No hay suficiente tiempo	No	Sí	L	M
Es muy difícil llegar aquí	No	Sí	L	M
Es muy caro	No	Sí	L	M
Está muy lejos para ir	No	Sí	L	M
No hay nadie con quien ir	No	Sí	L	M
No me gustan las serpientes	No	Sí	L	M
No me gustan otros animales en el bosque	No	Sí	L	M
No me siento a gusto en el campo	No	Sí	L	M
Nunca hablábamos mucho sobre esto cuando era niño	No	Sí	L	M
No me gusta estar afuera en el oscuro	No	Sí	L	M
Falta de experiencia	No	Sí	L	M
No disfruto mucho de estar al aire libre	No	Sí	L	M
No sé a dónde ir	No	Sí	L	M
A la mayoría de mis amigos no les interesa	No	Sí	L	M
No me gustan los insectos	No	Sí	L	M
Estoy preocupado sobre problemas raciales	No	Sí	L	M
No me siento a gusto o me siento fuera de lugar	No	Sí	L	M
No hay suficientes lugares de estacionamiento	No	Sí	L	M
Mi familia / mis amigos pensarían que estoy loco	No	Sí	L	M



*Sus pensamientos y opiniones son importantes para nosotros y se tratarán con cuidado.  
Gracias por dedicar parte de su tiempo libre para ayudarnos.*

## APPENDIX C

### TABLES OF SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

Table 1

*Frequency of Ethnicity, Acculturation Level, and Demographic Information of Respondents*

Item	Description	Response	Ethnicity							Total
			Latino/a	Mexican American	European American	Mexican American	Mexican	Canadian	Others	
29	Ethnicity	<u>n</u>	8(1.1%)	80(11.0%)	98(13.4%)	450(61.7%)	19(2.6%)	27(3.7%)	47(6.4%)	729(100%)
18-21	Averaged Acculturation Level		<u>(n = 729)</u>							
	Low		-	7(1.0%)	4(0.5%)	4(0.5%)	12(1.6%)	5(0.7%)	5(0.7%)	37(5.1%)
	High		8(1.1%)	73(10.0%)	94(12.9%)	446(61.2%)	7(1.0%)	22(3.0%)	42(5.8%)	692(94.9%)
28	Race		<u>(n = 724)</u>							
	Black		-	-	3(0.4%)	6(0.8%)	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	14(1.9%)
	Hispanic		8(1.1%)	73(10.1%)	-	7(1.0%)	17(2.3%)	-	8(1.1%)	113(15.6%)
	Asian		-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)
	White		-	3(0.4%)	93(12.8%)	410(56.6%)	-	26(3.6%)	20(2.8%)	552(76.2%)
	American Indian		-	-	-	8(1.1%)	-	-	-	8(1.1%)
	White/American Indian		-	-	-	3(0.4%)	-	-	-	3(0.4%)
	Hispanic/White		-	2(0.3%)	-	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)
	Black/Asian		-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)
	Asian/White		-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)
	All		-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	1(0.1%)
	Hispanic/Asian/White		-	-	-	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)
	Hispanic/American Indian		-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	1(0.1%)
	Caucasian		-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	1(0.1%)
	Other Unspecified		-	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)	9(1.2%)	-	-	6(0.8%)	18(2.5%)

*Note* Dashes indicate no responses received

Table 1 *continued**Frequency of Ethnicity, Acculturation Level, and Demographic Information of Respondents*

Item	Description	Response	Ethnicity							Total
			Latino/a	Mexican American	European American	American	Mexican	Canadian	Others	
24	Age					(n = 722)				
		18 - 29	4(0.6%)	35(4.8%)	12(1.7%)	95(13.2%)	13(1.8%)	-	18(2.5%)	177(24.5%)
		30 - 39	3(0.4%)	21(2.9%)	12(1.7%)	71(9.8%)	4(0.6%)	4(0.6%)	9(1.2%)	124(17.2%)
		40 - 49	1(0.1%)	15(2.1%)	27(3.7%)	102(14.1%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	11(1.5%)	160(22.2%)
		50 - 59	-	7(1.0%)	15(2.1%)	71(9.8%)	-	9(1.2%)	2(0.3%)	104(14.4%)
		60 - 69	-	1(0.1%)	30(4.2%)	77(10.7%)	-	10(1.4%)	5(0.7%)	123(17.0%)
		70+	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	29(4.0%)	-	-	2(0.3%)	34(4.7%)
25	Gender					(n = 727)				
		Female	3(0.4%)	45(6.2%)	48(6.6%)	220(30.3%)	6(1.7%)	13(1.8%)	20(2.8%)	355(48.8%)
		Male	5(0.7%)	35(4.8%)	50(6.9%)	228(31.4%)	13(3.5%)	14(1.9%)	27(3.7%)	372(51.2%)

Note Dashes indicate no responses received



Table 2

*Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies & Percentages for Ethnicity x Managerial Items*

Item	Description	Response	Latino/a	Mexican American	Ethnicity		Mexican	Canadian	Others	X <sup>2</sup>
					American	American				
5	Comparison of number in group to number of sites <u>Ethnicity x Sites (interaction)</u>				(n = 712)					24.08*
		Too Many	-	4(0.6%)	1(0.1%)	9(1.3%)	1(0.1%)	-	-	
		About Right	6(0.8%)	71(10.0%)	94(13.2%)	427(60.0%)	18(2.5%)	27(3.8%)	45(6.3%)	
		Too Few	1(0.1%)*	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	-	-	2(0.3%)	
7	Comparison of parking space to site <u>Ethnicity x Parking (interaction)</u>				(n = 723)					64.41***
		Too Big	1(0.1%)*	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	-	-	
		Too Close	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	7(1.0%)	2(0.3%)*	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	
		About Right	6(0.8%)	68(9.4%)	85(11.8%)	388(53.7%)	14(1.9%)	25(3.5%)	38(5.3%)	
		Too Far	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	13(1.8%)	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	
		Too Small	-	7(1.0%)	7(1.0%)	39(5.4%)	2(0.3%)	-	5(0.7%)	
8	Who do you usually come camping with? <u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u> <u>Who (interaction)</u>				(n = 723)					7385.23***
		Alone	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	10(1.4%)	44(6.1%)	-	6(0.8%)*	1(0.1%)	
		Close Friends	2(0.3%)	16(2.2%)	19(2.6%)	92(12.7%)	10(1.4%)*	2(0.3%)	16(2.2%)	
		Scouts	-	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	8(1.1%)	2(0.3%)*	-	-	
		Family/Relatives	5(0.7%)	39(5.4%)	46(6.4%)	199(27.5%)	3(0.4%)	15(2.1%)	13(1.8%)	
		Church	-	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	-	-	1(0.1%)	
		Alone/Close Friends	-	-	3(0.4%)	8(1.1%)	-	1(0.1%)	-	
		Alone/Family/Relatives	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	4(0.6%)	-	-	-	
		Close Friends/Family/Relatives	-	16(2.2%)	9(1.2%)	65(9.0%)	4(0.6%)	2(0.3%)	12(1.7%)	
		Scouts/Church	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	
		Scouts/Family/Relatives	-	1(0.1%)	-	2(0.3%)	-	-	1(0.1%)	
		Family/Relatives/Church	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	-	-	-	
		3+ Responses	-	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	16(2.2%)	-	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	
		Close Friends/Church	-	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	-	-	-	
		Close Friends/Scouts	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	-	-	-	
13	Who did you first go camping with? <u>Ethnicity x Before (interaction)</u>		(n = 722)		(n = 722)					114.63**
		Alone	-	2(0.3%)	7(1.0%)	14(1.9%)	-	3(0.4%)*	-	
		Close Friends	1(0.1%)	12(1.7%)	15(2.1%)	52(7.2%)	10(1.4%)*	6(0.8%)	11(1.5%)	
		Scouts	-	7(1.0%)	10(1.4%)	35(4.8%)	-	-	4(0.6%)	
		Family/Relatives	7(1.0%)	52(7.2%)	56(7.8%)	306(42.4%)	7(1.0%)	15(2.1%)	25(3.5%)	
		Church	-	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	8(1.1%)	1(0.1%)	-	-	
		Alone/Close Friends	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	
		Alone/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	2(0.3%)*	-	
		Close Friends/Family/Relatives	-	6(0.8%)	4(0.6%)	14(1.9%)	-	-	4(0.6%)	
		Scouts/Church	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	
		3+ Responses	-	-	-	5(0.7%)	-	-	2(0.3%)*	
		Family/Relatives/Church	-	-	-	3(0.4%)	-	1(0.1%)*	-	
		Close Friends/Scouts	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	
		Scouts/Family/Relatives	-	-	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	-	1(0.1%)	

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received.

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 3

*Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies & Percentages for Ethnicity x Camping Preferences*

Item	Description	Response	Ethnicity						$\chi^2$
			Latino/a	Mexican American	European American	Mexican	Canadian	Others	
<u>Natural Environment</u>									
30a	Is enjoying natural surroundings important?					( <u>n</u> = 701)			15.32*
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0.1%)*
		Yes	8(1.1%)	76(10.8%)	96(13.7%)	433(61.8%)	18(2.6%)	27(3.9%)	42(6.0%)
30b	If 30a is important, how much?					( <u>n</u> =552)			14.96*
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>	Slightly	2(0.4%)*	3(0.5%)	2(0.4%)	13(2.4%)	1(0.2%)	2(0.4%)	2(0.4%)
		Very	4(0.7%)	46(8.3%)	75(13.6%)	340(61.6%)	7(1.3%)	25(4.5%)	30(5.4%)
50a	Is not seeing litter important?					( <u>n</u> =720)			3099.78***
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	21(2.9%)	4(0.6%)*	-	2(0.3%)
	<u>Preference (Interaction)</u>	Yes	8(1.1%)	74(10.3%)	91(12.6%)	424(58.9%)	15(2.1%)	27(3.8%)	45(6.3%)
55a	Is enjoying the sights and sounds of nature important?					( <u>n</u> = 723)			3434.63
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	1(0.1%)	-	4(0.6%)	-	-	1(0.1%)
		Yes	8(1.1%)	78(10.8%)	96(13.3%)	443(61.3%)	19(2.6%)	27(3.7%)	46(6.4%)
55b	If 55a is important, how much?					( <u>n</u> = 554)			15.90*
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>	Slightly	4(0.7%)*	6(1.1%)	8(1.4%)	37(6.7%)	1(0.2%)	3(0.5%)	6(1.1%)
		Very	3(0.5%)	45(8.1%)	72(13.0%)	312(56.3%)	5(0.9%)	24(4.3%)	28(5.1%)

Note Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 3 *continued**Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies & Percentages for Ethnicity x Camping Preferences*

Item	Description	Response	Latino/a	Ethnicity					X <sup>2</sup>	
				Mexican American	European	American	Mexican	Canadian		Others
<u>Psychological</u>										
45a	Is enjoying peace and quiet important?					(n = 725)				44.87
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	1(0.1%)	5(0.7%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	4(0.6%)	-	2(0.3%)	
		Yes	7(1.0%)	75(10.3%)	95(13.1%)	444(61.2%)	15(2.1%)	27(3.7%)	45(6.2%)	
45b	If 45a is important, how much?					(n = 563)				2287.35***
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	1(0.2%)	7(1.2%)	13(2.3%)	32(5.7%)	3(0.5%)*	3(0.5%)	7(1.2%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>	Very	4(0.7%)	43(7.6%)	64(11.4%)	326(57.9%)	5(0.9%)	24(4.3%)	31(5.5%)	
52a	Is mentally unwinding or relaxing important?					(n = 717)				3380.40***
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	1(0.1%)*	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	4(0.6%)	-	-	-	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>	Yes	7(1.0%)	77(10.7%)	92(12.8%)	439(61.2%)	19(2.6%)	27(3.8%)	47(6.6%)	
<u>Resource</u>										
34a	Is having a lake or river nearby important?					(n = 721)				3024.24***
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	3(0.4%)	11(1.5%)*	24(3.3%)	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>	Yes	8(1.1%)	77(10.7%)	85(11.8%)	420(58.3%)	18(2.5%)	24(3.3%)	46(6.4%)	

Note Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 4

*Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies & Percentages for Ethnicity x Barriers to Camping*

Item	Description	Response	Ethnicity							$X^2$
			Latino/a	Mexican American	European	American	Mexican	Canadian	Others	
<u>General Lifestyle</u>										
72a	Too expensive					(n = 706)				12.94*
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	No	2(0.3%)	53(7.5%)	72(10.2%)	302(42.8)	11(1.6%)	21(3.0%)	28(4.0%)	
		Yes	6(0.8%)*	26(3.7%)	22(3.1%)	132(18.7%)	7(1.0%)	6(0.8%)	18(2.5%)	
73a	Too far to go					(n = 710)				1638.81
	<u>No Interaction</u>	No	4(0.6%)	55(7.7%)	71(10.0%)	300(42.3%)	11(1.5%)	22(3.1%)	28(3.9%)	
		Yes	4(0.6%)	24(3.4%)	23(3.2%)	136(19.2%)	8(1.1%)	5(0.7%)	19(2.7%)	
73b	If yes to 73a, how strong?					(n = 143)				12.92*
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Slightly	2(1.4%)	12(8.4%)	13(9.1%)	70(49.0%)	1(0.7%)	1(0.7%)	12(8.4%)	
		Very	1(0.7%)	2(1.4%)	1(0.7%)	21(14.7%)	2(1.4%)	3(2.1%)*	2(1.4%)	

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 5

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Managerial Items

Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		Ethnicity x Acculturation Level American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		X <sup>2</sup>
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
1	How many people are in your group today (adults and children)? <u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u> <u>Ethnicity x Group (interaction)</u>								(n = 725)								1953 11***
		1	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	3(0 4%)	1(0 1%)***	9(1 2%)	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	
		2	-	-	1(0 1%)	9(1 2%)	3(0 4%)	43(5 9%)	1(0 1%)	181(25 0%)	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	5(0 7%)	15(2 1%)	-	3(0 4%)	
		3	-	2(0 3%)	-	4(0 6%)	-	7(1 0%)	-	20(2 8%)	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	
		4	-	2(0 3%)	-	12(1 7%)	1(0 1%)	11(1 5%)	-	82(11 3%)	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	7(1 0%)	
		5	-	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	4(0 6%)	-	6(0 8%)	-	43(5 9%)	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	
		6	-	-	1(0 1%)	19(2 6%)	-	7(1 0%)	1(0 1%)	37(5 1%)	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	-	9(1 2%)	
		7	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	6(0 8%)	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)***	2(0 3%)	
		8	-	-	1(0 1%)	8(1 1%)	-	7(1 0%)	-	24(3 3%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	4(0 6%)	
		9	-	-	-	6(0 8%)	-	-	-	8(1 1%)	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)	-	-	2(0 3%)***	1(0 1%)	
		10	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	7(1 0%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	
		11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		12	-	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)***	2(0 3%)	-	-	1(0 1%)***	8(1 1%)	5(0 7%)	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	
		13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	
		14	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		15	-	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	5(0 7%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	
		17	-	1(0 1%)	-	3(0 4%)	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	
		19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3(0 4%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		20	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		24	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	3(0 4%)	-	-	-	-	-	7(1 0%)	
		40	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		45	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5	For the number of people in your group, was the number of campsites ? <u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u> <u>Sites (interaction)</u>								(n = 712)								219 82***
		Too Many	-	-	-	4(0 6%)***	-	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)***	8(1 1%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
		About Right	-	6(0 8%)	7(1 0%)	64(9 0%)	4(0 6%)	90(12 6%)	2(0 3%)	425(59 7%)	11(1 5%)	7(1 0%)	5(0 7%)	22(3 1%)	5(0 7%)	40(5 6%)	
		Too Few	-	1(0 1%)***	-	2(0 3%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)**	
7	What do you think about the parking space at your campsite? <u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u> <u>Acculturation x Parking (interaction)</u>								(n = 723)								415 80***
		Too Big	-	1(0 1%)***	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Too Close to Table	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	6(0 8%)	2(0 3%)	-	-	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	
		About Right	-	6(0 8%)	7(1 0%)	61(8 4%)	4(0 6%)	81(11 2%)	3(0 4%)	385(53 3%)	10(1 4%)	4(0 6%)	5(0 7%)	20(2 8%)	4(0 6%)	34(4 7%)	
		Too Far from Table	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	13(1 8%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	
		Too Small	-	-	-	7(1 0%)	-	7(1 0%)	-	39(5 4%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	5(0 7%)	
8	Who do you usually come camping with? <u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u> <u>Who (interaction)</u>								(n = 721)								608 79***
		Alone	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	10(1 4%)	1(0 1%)	43(5 9%)	-	-	2(0 3%)***	4(0 6%)	-	1(0 1%)	
		Close Friends	-	2(0 3%)	2(0 3%)	14(1 9%)	2(0 3%)	17(2 4%)	1(0 1%)	91(12 6%)	6(0 8%)	4(0 6%)***	2(0 3%)	***	3(0 4%)	13(1 8%)	
		Scouts	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	3(0 4%)	-	8(1 1%)	2(0 3%)***	-	-	-	-	-	
		Family/Relatives	-	5(0 7%)	4(0 6%)	35(4 8%)	2(0 3%)	44(6 1%)	2(0 3%)	197(27 2%)	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	-	15(2 1%)	-	13(1 8%)	
		Church	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)***	-	
		Alone/Close Friends	-	-	-	-	-	3(0 4%)	-	8(1 1%)	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	
		Alone/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	4(0 6%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		Close Friends/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	16(2 2%)	-	9(1 2%)	-	65(9 0%)	2(0 3%)	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	-	12(1 7%)***	
		Scouts/Church	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		Scouts/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	
		Family/Relatives/Church	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		3+ Responses	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	3(0 4%)	-	16(2 2%)	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)***	2(0 3%)	
		Close Friends/Church	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		Close Friends/Scouts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05 \*\*p &lt; .01 \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 5 continued

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Managerial Items

Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		Ethnicity x Acculturation Level		Mexican		Canadian		Others		$\chi^2$
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
12	How many times have you camped in the last 12 months?								(n = 729)								453 16***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Seldom	-	8(1 1%)	7(1 0%)	71(9 7%)	2(0 3%)	64(8 8%)	2(0 3%)	343(47 1%)	11(1 5%)	7(1 0%)	1(0 1%)	10(1 4%)	5(0 7%)	38(5 2%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Year (interaction)</u>	Infrequently	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	14(1 9%)	-	38(5 2%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	3(0 4%)	-	3(0 4%)	
		Frequently	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	7(1 0%)	2(0 3%)***	14(1 9%)	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	
		Regularly	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)***	2(0 3%)	-	14(1 9%)	-	-	3(0 4%)	7(1 0%)	-	-	
		Almost Full Time	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	6(0 8%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		Full Time	-	-	-	-	-	6(0 8%)	-	31(4 3%)	-	-	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)	-	-	
13	Who did you first go camping with?								(n = 722)								737 80***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Alone	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)***	6(0 8%)	-	14(1 9%)	-	-	2(0 3%)***	1(0 1%)	-	-	
	<u>Before (interaction)</u>	Close Friends	-	1(0 1%)	-	12(1 7%)	2(0 3%)	13(1 8%)	1(0 1%)	51(7 1%)	7(1 0%)***	3(0 4%)	1(0 1%)	5(0 7%)	1(0 1%)	10(1 4%)	
		Scouts	-	-	-	7(1 0%)	-	10(1 4%)	-	35(4 8%)	-	-	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	
		Family/Relatives	-	7(1 0%)	6(0 8%)	46(6 4%)	1(0 1%)	55(7 6%)	3(0 4%)	303(42 0%)	3(0 4%)	4(0 6%)	2(0 3%)	13(1 8%)	3(0 4%)	22(3 0%)	
		Church	-	-	1(0 1%)***	-	-	3(0 4%)	-	8(1 1%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	
		Alone/Close Friends	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		Alone/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	2(0 3%)***	-	-	
		Close Friends/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	6(0 8%)	-	4(0 6%)	-	14(1 9%)	-	-	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	
		Scouts/Church	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		3+ Responses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5(0 7%)	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)***	1(0 1%)	
		Family/Relatives/Church	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3(0 4%)	-	-	-	1(0 1%)***	-	-	
		Close Friends/Scouts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		Scouts/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	3(0 4%)	1(0 1%)***	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	
15	Who do you usually go camping with now?								(n = 723)								849 87***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Alone	-	-	-	-	-	8(1 1%)	1(0 1%)	31(4 3%)	-	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	
	<u>Acculturation x Now (interaction)</u>	Close Friends	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	15(2 1%)	2(0 3%)	21(2 9%)	1(0 1%)	94(13 0%)	8(1 1%)	3(0 4%)	1(0 1%)	-	3(0 4%)	14(1 9%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Now (interaction)</u>	Scouts	-	-	-	-	-	3(0 4%)	-	7(1 0%)	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	-	-	
		Family/Relatives	-	6(0 8%)	5(0 7%)	37(5 1%)	2(0 3%)	46(6 4%)	2(0 3%)	203(28 1%)	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	13(1 8%)	-	15(2 1%)	
		Church	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		2+ Responses	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	5(0 7%)	-	17(2 4%)	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	-	2(0 3%)	
		Alone/Family/Relatives	-	-	-	18(2 5%)	-	9(1 2%)	-	69(9 5%)	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)	-	8(1 1%)	
		3+ Responses	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	21(2 9%)	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)***	1(0 1%)	
17	How many hours did it take you to travel to the park?								(n = 704)								541 53***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	1	-	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	12(1 7%)	-	14(2 0%)	-	72(10 2%)	1(0 1%)	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	
	<u>Ethnicity x Hours (interaction)</u>	2	-	3(0 4%)	5(0 7%)	23(3 3%)	1(0 1%)	14(2 0%)	1(0 1%)	61(8 7%)	7(1 0%)	5(0 7%)	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	12(1 7%)	
		3	-	3(0 4%)	1(0 1%)	14(2 0%)	1(0 1%)	17(2 4%)	-	54(7 7%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	-	7(1 0%)	
		4	-	-	-	9(1 3%)	-	10(1 4%)	-	54(7 7%)	2(0 3%)	-	3(0 4%)***	4(0 6%)	2(0 3%)	6(0 9%)	
		5	-	1(0 1%)	-	9(1 3%)	-	7(1 0%)	1(0 1%)	70(9 9%)	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)	-	2(0 3%)	-	10(1 4%)	
		6	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	2(0 3%)	11(1 6%)	-	55(7 8%)	-	-	-	3(0 4%)	1(0 1%)	1(0 1%)	
		7	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	2(0 3%)	1(0 1%)***	21(3 0%)	-	-	-	4(0 6%)	-	2(0 3%)	
		8	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	11(1 6%)	-	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	2(0 3%)	
		9+	-	-	-	-	-	13(1 8%)	-	36(5 1%)	-	-	-	2(0 3%)	-	2(0 3%)	

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05 \*\*p &lt; .01 \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 5 *continued**Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies & Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Managerial Items*

		Ethnicity x Acculturation Level																
Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		$\chi^2$	
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High		
22	What is the last year of school that you have completed so far?		(n = 709)															737.76***
		Elementary	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	-	4(0.6%)	-	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)		
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Junior High	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	-	-	-	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	-	-	-	-	-		
	<u>Acculturation x School (interaction)</u>	High School	-	6(0.8%)	4(0.6%)	37(5.2%)	2(0.3%)	17(2.4%)	3(0.4%)	131(18.5%)	5(0.7%)	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)	7(1.0%)	1(0.1%)	10(1.4%)		
	<u>Ethnicity x School (interaction)</u>	1 Year College	-	-	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	-	3(0.4%)	-	28(3.9%)	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	4(0.6%)		
		2 Years or Associates Degree	-	-	1(0.1%)***	5(0.7%)	-	11(1.6%)	-	61(8.6%)	-	2(0.3%)	-	2(0.3%)	-	9(1.3%)		
		Junior College	-	-	-	3(0.4%)	-	1(0.1%)	-	32(4.5%)	-	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)***	1(0.1%)	-	4(0.6%)		
		College Degree	-	2(0.3%)	-	18(2.5%)	1(0.1%)	28(3.9%)	-	107(15.1%)	4(0.6%)	-	1(0.1%)	8(1.1%)	1(0.1%)	7(1.0%)		
		Graduate Hours	-	-	-	-	-	4(0.6%)	-	16(2.3%)	1(0.1%)	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-		
		Masters Degree	-	-	-	5(0.7%)	-	13(1.8%)	-	39(5.5%)	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)		
		Doctoral Hours	-	-	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	-	4(0.6%)	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		PH Degree	-	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	8(1.1%)	-	11(1.6%)	-	-	-	-	-	2(0.3%)		
		Post PH Hours	-	-	-	-	-	3(0.4%)	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	-	-		
27	Number of years you have lived in the United States		(n = 688)															1321.21***
		1-17	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	2(0.3%)***	-	-	2(0.3%)	4(0.6%)	2(0.3%)	-	4(0.6%)	3(0.4%)	7(1.0%)		
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	18-29	-	4(0.6%)	3(0.4%)	31(4.5%)	-	12(1.7%)	1(0.1%)	96(14.0%)	1(0.1%)	5(0.7%)	-	-	2(0.3%)	11(1.6%)		
	<u>Acculturation x Yrlived (interaction)</u>	30-39	-	2(0.3%)	-	21(3.1%)	-	12(1.7%)	1(0.1%)	72(10.5%)	2(0.3%)***	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	7(1.0%)		
	<u>Ethnicity x Yrlived (interaction)</u>	40-49	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	13(1.9%)	-	24(3.5%)	-	97(14.1%)	-	-	-	-	-	9(1.3%)		
		50-59	-	-	1(0.1%)	6(0.9%)	-	14(2.0%)	-	69(10.0%)	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	1(0.1%)		
		60-69	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	24(3.5%)	1(0.1%)	76(11.0%)	-	-	-	-	-	5(0.7%)		
		70+	-	-	-	1(0.1%)	-	2(0.3%)	-	29(4.2%)	-	-	-	-	-	2(0.3%)		

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05 \*\*p &lt; .01 \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 6

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Camping Preferences

Ethnicity x Acculturation Level																	
Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		X <sup>2</sup>
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
Natural Environment																	
30a	Is enjoying natural surroundings important?	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	(n = 701)		-	-	-	-	-	-	171 33***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	8(1 1%)	7(1 0%)	69(9 8%)	3(0 4%)	93(13 3%)	4(0 6%)	429(61 2%)	11(1 6%)	7(1 0%)	5(0 7%)	22(3 1%)	4(0 6%)	1(0 1%)***	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>																
30b	If yes to 30a, how much?	Slightly	-	2(0 4%)***	-	3(0 5%)	-	2(0 4%)	(n = 552)		-	13(2 4%)	1(0 2%)	-	2(0 4%)	-	132 45***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Very	-	4(0 7%)	4(0 7%)	42(7 6%)	3(0 5%)	72(13 0%)	4(0 7%)	336(60 9%)	3(0 5%)	4(0 7%)	5(0 9%)	20(3 6%)	2(0 4%)	2(0 4%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>																
49a	Is playing radios from cars important?	No	-	4(0 6%)	3(0 4%)	44(6 2%)	3(0 4%)	83(11 7%)	(n = 712)		2(0 3%)	380(53 4%)	7(1 0%)	2(0 3%)	5(0 7%)	14(2 0%)	289 80***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	4(0 6%)	4(0 6%)	29(4 1%)	-	9(1 3%)	2(0 3%)***	53(7 4%)	5(0 7%)	5(0 7%)	-	7(1 0%)	3(0 4%)	31(4 4%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>																
55a	Is enjoying the sights and sounds of nature important?	No	-	-	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	(n = 723)		-	4(0 6%)	-	-	-	-	173 1
	<u>No interaction</u>	Yes	-	8(1 1%)	7(1 0%)	71(9 8%)	3(0 4%)	93(12 9%)	4(0 6%)	439(60 7%)	12(1 7%)	7(1 0%)	5(0 7%)	22(3 0%)	5(0 7%)	1(0 1%)	
55b	If yes to 55a, how much?	Slightly	-	4(0 7%)***	-	6(1 1%)	-	8(1 4%)	(n = 554)		-	37(6 7%)	1(0 2%)	-	1(0 2%)	2(0 4%)	98 00***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Very	-	3(0 5%)	4(0 7%)	41(7 4%)	3(0 5%)	69(12 5%)	4(0 7%)	308(55 6%)	2(0 4%)	3(0 5%)	4(0 7%)	20(3 6%)	1(0 2%)	5(0 9%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>																
Facilities																	
64a	Is having well-cared-for facilities important?	No	-	2(0 3%)	-	1(0 1%)	-	-	(n = 717)		-	4(0 6%)	2(0 3%)	-	-	-	515 30***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	6(0 8%)	7(1 0%)	71(9 9%)	1(0 1%)	92(12 8%)	4(0 6%)	438(61 1%)	10(1 4%)	7(1 0%)	5(0 7%)	22(3 1%)	4(0 6%)	1(0 1%)***	
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>																
64b	If 64a is important, how much?	Slightly	-	-	-	5(0 9%)	-	12(2 1%)	(n = 559)		2(0 4%)***	30(5 4%)	-	1(0 2%)	-	-	64 99***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Very	-	4(0 7%)	5(0 9%)	48(8 6%)	1(0 2%)	63(11 3%)	2(0 4%)	323(57 8%)	2(0 4%)	2(0 4%)	5(0 9%)	21(3 8%)	1(0 2%)	3(0 5%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>																

Note Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01 \*\*\*p &lt; .001



Table 6 continued

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Camping Preferences

Ethnicity x Acculturation Level																	
Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		$\chi^2$
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
65a	Is having signs important?								(n = 716)								180.78***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	-	11(1.5%)	-	41(5.7%)	1(0.1%)	-	-	5(0.7%)***	-	2(0.3%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	8(1.1%)	7(1.0%)	71(9.9%)	3(0.4%)	82(11.5%)	4(0.6%)	396(55.3%)	11(1.5%)	7(1.0%)	5(0.7%)	16(2.2%)	5(0.7%)	39(5.4%)	
69a	Is being able to rent equipment important?								(n = 665)								384.40
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	1(0.2%)	-	12(1.8%)	3(0.5%)	74(11.1%)	4(0.6%)	252(37.9%)	2(0.3%)	-	5(0.8%)	16(2.4%)	1(0.2%)	16(2.4%)	
		Yes	-	5(0.8%)	5(0.8%)	56(8.4%)	-	16(2.4%)	-	150(22.6%)	10(1.5%)	7(1.1%)	-	2(0.3%)	4(0.6%)	24(3.6%)	
69b	If 69a is important, how much?								(n = 161)								153.58***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	3(1.9%)	1(0.6%)***	14(8.7%)	-	8(5.0%)	-	81(50.3%)	-	2(1.2%)	-	2(1.2%)	-	12(7.5%)	
	<u>Acculturation x Preference (interaction)</u>	Very	-	-	1(0.6%)	15(9.3%)	-	-	-	14(8.7%)	2(1.2%)	-	-	-	2(1.2%)	4(2.5%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>																
<u>Social</u>																	
46a	Is being with people that are like you important?								(n = 708)								204.07***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	20(2.8%)***	-	20(2.8%)	1(0.1%)	68(9.6%)	-	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	5(0.7%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	7(1.0%)	6(0.8%)	53(7.5%)	3(0.4%)	71(10.0%)	3(0.4%)	362(51.1%)	12(1.7%)	5(0.7%)	4(0.6%)	20(2.8%)	2(0.3%)	37(5.2%)	
<u>Psychological</u>																	
45a	Is enjoying peace and quiet important?								(n = 725)								230.73
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	1(0.1%)	-	5(0.7%)	-	2(0.3%)	-	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	-	-	-	2(0.3%)	
		Yes	-	7(1.0%)	7(1.0%)	68(9.4%)	3(0.4%)	92(12.7%)	4(0.6%)	440(60.7%)	11(1.5%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	22(3.0%)	5(0.7%)	40(5.5%)	
45b	If 45a is important, how much?								(n = 563)								139.78***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	1(0.2%)	2(0.4%)***	5(0.9%)	-	13(2.3%)	-	32(5.7%)	1(0.2%)	2(0.4%)***	1(0.2%)	2(0.4%)	1(0.2%)	6(1.1%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>	Very	-	4(0.7%)	2(0.4%)	41(7.3%)	3(0.5%)	61(10.8%)	4(0.7%)	322(57.2%)	5(0.9%)	-	4(0.7%)	20(3.6%)	1(0.2%)	30(5.3%)	

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received.

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 6 *continued**Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies & Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Camping Preferences*

<u>Ethnicity x Acculturation Level</u>																	
Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		$\chi^2$
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
52a	Is mentally unwinding or relaxing important?	No	-	1(0.1%)***	-	1(0.1%)	-	3(0.4%)	(n = 717)		-	-	-	-	-	-	182.86***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	7(1.0%)	7(1.0%)	70(9.8%)	3(0.4%)	89(12.4%)	4(0.6%)	435(60.7%)	12(1.7%)	7(1.0%)	5(0.7%)	22(3.1%)	5(0.7%)	42(5.9%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>																
52b	If 52a is important, how much?								(n = 717)								121.33***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	2(0.4%)	2(0.4%)***	3(0.5%)	-	9(1.6%)	-	52(9.4%)	1(0.2%)	-	1(0.2%)	4(0.7%)	-	-	
	<u>Ethnicity x Preference (interaction)</u>	Very	-	5(0.9%)	2(0.4%)	47(8.5%)	1(0.2%)	60(10.9%)	4(0.7%)	295(53.5%)	4(0.7%)	3(0.5%)	2(0.4%)	18(3.3%)	2(0.4%)	34(6.2%)	
	<u>Resource</u>																
34a	Is having a lake or river nearby important?	No	-	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	-	11(1.5%)***	(n = 721)		-	-	-	3(0.4%)	-	1(0.1%)	179.52***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	8(1.1%)	6(0.8%)	71(9.8%)	3(0.4%)	82(11.4%)	4(0.6%)	416(57.7%)	11(1.5%)	7(1.0%)	5(0.7%)	19(2.6%)	5(0.7%)	41(5.7%)	
	<u>Preference (interaction)</u>																

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received.

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 7

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Barriers To Camping

Ethnicity x Acculturation Level																		
Item	Description	Response	Latno/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		X <sup>2</sup>	
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High		
General Lifestyles																		
71a	Too difficult to get here		(n = 707)															209.97
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	5(0.7%)	6(0.8%)	55(7.8%)	1(0.1%)	78(11.0%)	3(0.4%)	332(47.0%)	7(0.1%)	5(0.7%)	5(0.7%)	17(2.4%)	2(0.3%)	28(4.0%)		
		Yes	-	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	17(2.4%)	2(0.3%)	13(1.8%)	1(0.1%)	97(13.7%)	5(0.7%)	2(0.3%)	-	5(0.7%)	3(0.4%)	14(2.0%)		
71b	If yes to 71a, how strongly?		(n = 93)															64.13***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	2(2.2%)	-	4(4.3%)	2(2.2%)	6(6.5%)	-	47(50.5%)	1(1.1%)	1(1.1%)	-	1(1.1%)	1(1.1%)	5(5.4%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Very	-	-	1(1.1%)	3(3.2%)	-	2(2.2%)	1(1.1%)***	7(7.5%)	2(2.2%)	-	-	3(3.2%)	1(1.1%)	3(3.2%)		
72a	Too expensive		(n = 706)															198.90***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	2(0.3%)	6(0.8%)	47(6.7%)	3(0.4%)	69(9.8%)	3(0.4%)	299(42.4%)	7(1.0%)	4(0.6%)	2(0.3%)	19(2.7%)	3(0.4%)	25(3.5%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	6(0.8%)***	1(0.1%)	25(3.5%)	-	22(3.1%)	1(0.1%)	131(18.6%)	5(0.7%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	3(0.4%)	2(0.3%)	16(2.3%)		
73a	Too far to go		(n = 710)															190.98***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	50(7.0%)	3(0.4%)	68(9.6%)	1(0.1%)	299(42.1%)	7(1.0%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	17(2.4%)	1(0.1%)	27(3.8%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	4(0.6%)	2(0.3%)	22(3.1%)	-	23(3.2%)	3(0.4%)	133(18.7%)	5(0.7%)	3(0.4%)	-	5(0.7%)	4(0.6%)***	15(2.1%)		
73b	If yes to 73a, how strongly?		(n = 143)															117.73***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	2(1.4%)	1(0.7%)	11(7.7%)	-	13(9.1%)	2(1.4%)	68(47.6%)	1(0.7%)	-	-	1(0.7%)	2(1.4%)	10(7.0%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Very	-	1(0.7%)	-	2(1.4%)	-	1(0.7%)	-	21(14.7%)	2(1.4%)	-	-	3(2.1%)***	1(0.7%)	1(0.7%)		
Social/Cultural																		
74a	No one to go with		(n = 710)															193.44
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	5(0.7%)	5(0.7%)	52(7.3%)	3(0.4%)	79(11.1%)	3(0.4%)	365(51.4%)	10(1.4%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	19(2.7%)	3(0.4%)	26(3.7%)		
		Yes	-	3(0.4%)	2(0.3%)	20(2.8%)	-	12(1.7%)	1(0.1%)	67(9.4%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	-	3(0.4%)	2(0.3%)	16(2.3%)		
74b	If yes to 74a, how strongly?		(n = 76)															43.87***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	1(1.3%)	-	8(10.5%)	-	10(13.2%)	-	21(27.6%)	-	1(1.3%)	-	2(2.6%)	1(1.3%)	5(6.6%)		
	<u>Acculturation x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Very	-	1(1.3%)	1(1.3%)	5(6.6%)	-	1(1.3%)	-	16(21.1%)	1(1.3%)***	-	-	-	1(1.3%)***	1(1.3%)		
78a	Never talked much about it as a kid		(n = 704)															192.30***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	5(0.7%)	6(0.9%)	60(8.5%)	3(0.4%)	83(11.8%)	2(0.3%)	390(55.4%)	10(1.4%)	5(0.7%)	5(0.7%)	21(3.0%)	3(0.4%)	30(4.3%)		
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	12(1.7%)	-	8(1.1%)	2(0.3%)***	37(5.3%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	12(1.7%)		

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received.

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 7 continued

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Barriers To Camping

Ethnicity x Acculturation Level																	
Item	Description	Response	Latno/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		X <sup>2</sup>
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
78b	If yes to 78a, how strongly?																42.07***
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	-	-	2(4.5%)	-	3(6.8%)	-	16(36.4%)	1(2.3%)*	-	-	1(2.3%)	-	8(18.2%)	
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Very	-	1(2.3%)	-	2(4.5%)	-	-	1(2.3%)	9(20.5%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
80a	Lack of experience																15.02*
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	4(0.6%)	4(0.6%)	58(8.2%)	1(0.1%)	86(12.2%)	3(0.4%)	397(56.2%)	11(1.6%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	21(3.0%)	2(0.3%)	34(4.8%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	4(0.6%)	3(0.4%)	14(2.0%)	2(0.3%)*	5(0.7%)	1(0.1%)	33(4.7%)	1(0.1%)	3(0.4%)	-	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	8(1.1%)	
80b	If yes to 80a, how strongly?																98.29***
	<u>Acculturation (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	-	1(2.9%)	4(11.8%)	2(5.9%)	2(5.9%)	1(2.9%)	11(32.4%)	1(2.9%)*	-	-	1(2.9%)	-	3(8.8%)	
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Very	-	1(2.9%)	-	-	-	1(2.9%)	-	5(14.7%)	-	-	-	-	-	1(2.9%)	
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>																
81a	Don't enjoy the out-of-doors much																14.41*
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	2(0.3%)	5(0.7%)	58(8.2%)	1(0.1%)	87(12.3%)	3(0.4%)	404(57.2%)	10(1.4%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	21(3.0%)	4(0.6%)	37(5.2%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	6(0.8%)	2(0.3%)	13(1.8%)	2(0.3%)*	4(0.6%)	1(0.1%)	25(3.5%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	5(0.7%)	
81b	If yes to 81a, how strongly?																25.73*
	<u>Acculturation (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	1(3.4%)	1(3.4%)	4(13.8%)	2(6.9%)*	1(3.4%)	-	6(20.7%)	-	1(3.4%)	-	-	-	3(10.3%)	
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Very	-	1(3.4%)	-	1(3.4%)	-	-	-	7(24.1%)	-	1(3.4%)	-	-	-	-	
82a	Don't know where to go																229.65***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	3(0.4%)	4(0.6%)	57(8.1%)	2(0.3%)	83(11.8%)	2(0.3%)	392(55.5%)	10(1.4%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	22(3.1%)	2(0.3%)	30(4.2%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	5(0.7%)	3(0.4%)	15(2.1%)	1(0.1%)	8(1.1%)	2(0.3%)*	37(5.2%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	-	-	2(0.3%)	12(1.7%)	
86a	Feel uncomfortable or out of place																279.87***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	7(1.0%)	6(0.8%)	67(9.5%)	3(0.4%)	91(12.9%)	3(0.4%)	419(59.3%)	10(1.4%)	5(0.7%)	5(0.7%)	22(3.1%)	3(0.4%)	37(5.2%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	5(0.7%)	-	-	1(0.1%)*	10(1.4%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	-	-	2(0.3%)	5(0.7%)	
88a	My family/friends would think I'm crazy																240.06**
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	6(0.9%)	5(0.7%)	61(8.7%)	3(0.4%)	88(12.6%)	3(0.4%)	409(58.3%)	11(1.6%)	5(0.7%)	5(0.7%)	22(3.1%)	2(0.3%)	34(4.9%)	
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	9(1.3%)	-	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)*	17(2.4%)	-	2(0.3%)	-	-	3(0.4%)	8(1.1%)	
<u>Psychological/Fears</u>																	
75a	Don't like snakes																205.78
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	5(0.7%)	2(0.3%)	48(6.8%)	1(0.1%)	77(10.9%)	2(0.3%)	331(46.7%)	8(1.1%)	3(0.4%)	5(0.7%)	13(1.8%)	1(0.1%)	32(4.5%)	
		Yes	-	3(0.4%)	5(0.7%)	24(3.4%)	2(0.3%)	14(2.0%)	2(0.3%)	100(14.1%)	4(0.6%)	4(0.6%)	-	9(1.3%)	4(0.6%)	10(1.4%)	

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received

\*p &lt; .05, \*\*p &lt; .01, \*\*\*p &lt; .001

Table 7 continued

Cross-Tabulation of Observed Frequencies &amp; Percentages for Acculturation Level x Ethnicity x Barriers To Camping

Ethnicity x Acculturation Level																		
Item	Description	Response	Latino/a		Mexican American		European		American		Mexican		Canadian		Others		$\chi^2$	
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High		
75b	If yes to 75a, how strongly?		(n = 103)															40.14***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	-	-	7(6.8%)	-	3(2.9%)	-	26(25.2%)	1(1.0%)***	-	-	5(4.9%)	1(1.0%)	5(4.9%)		
	<u>Acculturation x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Very	-	-	2(1.9%)	7(6.8%)	2(1.9%)***	5(4.9%)	2(1.9%)	32(31.1%)	-	-	-	2(1.9%)	1(1.0%)	2(1.9%)		
76a	Don't like other animals in the woods		(n = 704)															255.98
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	3(0.4%)	3(0.4%)	60(8.5%)	3(0.4%)	84(11.9%)	3(0.4%)	389(55.3%)	9(1.3%)	5(0.7%)	4(0.6%)	20(2.8%)	1(0.1%)	35(5.0%)		
		Yes	-	5(0.7%)	4(0.6%)	11(1.6%)	-	7(1.0%)	1(0.1%)	40(5.7%)	3(0.4%)	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	7(1.0%)		
76b	If yes to 76a, how strongly?		(n = 42)															25.57*
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	1(2.4%)	1(2.4%)	-	-	5(11.9%)	-	15(35.7%)	1(2.4%)	1(2.4%)	1(2.4%)	2(4.8%)	1(2.4%)	3(7.1%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Very	-	-	1(2.4%)	2(4.8%)*	-	1(2.4%)	-	7(16.7%)	-	-	-	-	-	-		
77a	Feel uncomfortable in the country		(n = 707)															239.76***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	7(1.0%)	6(0.8%)	63(8.9%)	3(0.4%)	86(12.2%)	3(0.4%)	406(57.4%)	10(1.4%)	6(0.8%)	4(0.6%)	22(3.1%)	1(0.1%)	36(5.1%)		
	<u>Acculturation x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	9(1.3%)	-	5(0.7%)	1(0.1%)	24(3.4%)	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)	1(0.1%)	-	3(0.4%)***	6(0.8%)		
77b	If yes to 77a, how strongly?		(n = 30)															32.62**
	<u>Ethnicity x Barrier (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	-	1(3.3%)	3(10.0%)	-	5(16.7%)	-	5(16.7%)	-	-	1(3.3%)**	-	1(3.3%)	5(16.7%)		
	<u>Acculturation (interaction)</u>	Very	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9(30.0%)	-	-	-	-	-	-		
79a	Don't like to be out in the dark		(n = 704)															18.24
	<u>No interaction</u>	No	-	6(0.9%)	3(0.4%)	63(8.9%)	1(0.1%)	88(12.5%)	3(0.4%)	409(58.1%)	10(1.4%)	4(0.6%)	5(0.7%)	19(2.7%)	3(0.4%)	35(5.0%)		
		Yes	-	2(0.3%)	4(0.6%)	8(1.1%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	19(2.7%)	2(0.3%)	3(0.4%)	-	3(0.4%)	2(0.3%)	6(0.9%)		
79b	If yes to 79a, how strongly?		(n = 27)															60.86***
	<u>Acculturation (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	-	1(3.7%)	2(7.4%)	2(7.4%)***	1(3.7%)	1(3.7%)	7(25.9%)	-	1(3.7%)	-	2(7.4%)	-	3(11.1%)		
	<u>Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	Very	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5(18.5%)	-	-	-	-	1(3.7%)	1(3.7%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>																	
84a	Don't like insects		(n = 705)															191.54***
	<u>Acculturation x Ethnicity (interaction)</u>	No	-	6(0.9%)	5(0.7%)	49(7.0%)	1(0.1%)	75(10.6%)	2(0.3%)	356(50.5%)	8(1.1%)	4(0.6%)	3(0.4%)	20(2.8%)	4(0.6%)	32(4.5%)		
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Yes	-	2(0.3%)	2(0.3%)	23(3.3%)	2(0.3%)***	15(2.1%)	2(0.3%)***	73(10.4%)	4(0.6%)	3(0.4%)	1(0.1%)	2(0.3%)	1(0.1%)	10(1.4%)		
84b	If yes to 84a, how strongly?		(n = 77)															24.89*
	<u>Barrier (interaction)</u>	Slightly	-	-	-	8(10.4%)	2(2.6%)*	6(7.8%)	-	28(36.4%)	-	1(1.3%)	1(1.3%)*	-	-	6(7.8%)		
		Very	-	1(1.3%)	1(1.3%)	3(3.9%)	-	2(2.6%)	-	16(20.8%)	-	-	-	1(1.3%)	1(1.3%)*	-		

Note: Dashes indicate no responses received.

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

## REFERENCES

- Abreu, J. A. (1987). Leisure programming for Hispanics. *Parks and Recreation*, 22(12), 52-54,75.
- Allison, M. T. (1988). Breaking boundaries and barriers: Future directions in cross-cultural research. *Leisure Sciences*, 10, 247-259.
- Allison, M. T. (1992). Fostering cultural diversity: Problems of access and ethnic boundary maintenance. In D. J. Chavez (Tech. Co.), *Proceedings of the Symposium on Social Aspects and Recreation Research* (Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-132, pp. 22-24). Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.
- Allison, M. T. (1993). Access and boundary maintenance serving culturally diverse populations. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 99-107). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Baas, J. M. (1992). Identifying service delivery strategies for ethnically diverse users of a wildland-urban recreation site. In D. J. Chavez (Tech. Co.), *Proceedings of the Symposium on Social Aspects and Recreation Research* (Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-132, pp. 40-41). Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.

- Baas, J. M. (1993). Assessing ethnic group participation in federal land management agency public involvement processes. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 357-370). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Baas, J. M., Ewert, A. W., & Chavez, D. J. (1993). Influence of ethnicity on recreation and natural environment use patterns: Managing recreation sites for ethnic and racial diversity. *Environmental Management*, 17(4), 523-529.
- Bammel, G., & Burris-Bammel, L. L. (1996). *Leisure and human behavior*. Dubuque, IA: Times Mirror Higher Education Group (USA).
- Blahna, D. J. (1992a). *Forest recreation and urban minorities: A small group interview approach*. (Final Report, Contract No. 23-88-23). Chicago, IL: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Blahna, D. J. (1992b). Comparing the preferences of Black, Asian, Hispanic, and White fishermen at Moraine Hills State Park, Illinois. In D. J. Chavez (Tech. Co.), *Proceedings of the Symposium on Social Aspects and Recreation Research* (Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-132, pp. 42-43). Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.
- Blahna, D. J., & Black, K. S. (1993). Racism: A concern for recreation resource managers? In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings, Fourth North American Symposium on Society and Resource Management* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NC-163, pp. 111-118). Madison, WI: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station.

- Blahna, D. J., & Toch, M. F. (1993). Environmental reporting in ethnic magazines: implications for incorporating minority concerns. *Journal of Environmental Education, 24*(2), 22-29.
- Blahna, D. J., Toch, M. F., Erickson, M., & Phelan, G. D. (1990). *Attitudes and preferences of fishermen at Moraine Hills State Park, McHenry, Illinois*. (Research Report). Chicago, IL: Northeastern Illinois University, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies.
- Bullock, A., & Stallybrass, O. (1977). *The Harper dictionary of modern thought*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carr, D. S., & Williams, D. R. (1992). Social structural characteristics of Hispanic recreationists on the Angeles and San Bernardino National Forests. In D. J. Chavez (Tech. Co.), *Proceedings of the Symposium on Social Aspects and Recreation Research* (Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-132, pp. 30-31). Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.
- Carr, D. S., & Williams, D. R. (1993). Understanding the role of ethnicity in outdoor recreation experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research, 25*(1), 22-38.
- Chase, D. R., & Cheek, Jr., N. H. (1979). Activity preferences and participation: Conclusions from a factor analysis study. *Journal of Leisure Research, 11*(2), 92-101.
- Chavez, D. J. (1993a). *Visitor Perceptions of Crowding and Discrimination at Two National Forests in Southern California* (Research Paper, PSW-RP-216). Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.



- Chavez, D. J. (1993b). The wildland-urban interface: Hispanics in the National Forests. In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings, Fourth North American Symposium on Society and Resource Management* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NC-163, pp. 107-108). Madison, WI: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Chavez, D. J. (1995). Demographic shifts: Potential impacts for outdoor recreation management. In J. L. Thompson, W. Lime, B. Gartner, & W. M. Sames (Comp.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Trends Symposium and the 1995 National Recreation Resource Planning Conference* (pp. 252-255). St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota College of Natural Resources and the Minnesota Extension Service.
- Chavez, D. J. (2000). Invite, include, and involve! Racial groups, ethnic groups and leisure. In M. T. Allison & I. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Diversity and the Recreation Profession: Organizational Perspectives* (pp. 179-194). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Chavez, D. J., & Magill, A. W. (1993). Cultural diversity and ethnicity. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 51-52). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Clawson, M., & Knetsch, J. L. (1966). *Economics of Outdoor Recreation*. Baltimore, MD: Resources for the Future.
- Cottrell, S. P., & Graefe, A. R. (1993). Recreational programming in a family campground: An exploratory study. In G. A. Vander Stoep (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1993 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*, (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-

- NE-185, pp. 45-50). Saratoga Springs, NY: USDA Forest Service State Parks Management and Research Institute.
- Cramer, M. (1999). A clearing in the distance: Frederick Law Olmsted and America in the Nineteenth Century. [Review of the book by W. Rybczynski,(1998)]. *Whole Earth Review*, 98(86). (Ovid: Full Text Record Accession Number 04481977)
- Dahl, R. F. (1993). Principles for effective cross-cultural communications. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 147-159). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Disney, J. (1997, May/June). Taking responsibility. *National Parks*, 7(5/6), 48.
- Dolce, C. J. (1973). Multicultural education – Some issues. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 24, 282-284. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ090292)
- Dwyer, J. F. (1992). Outdoor recreation participation: Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, and Asians in Illinois. In D. J. Chavez (Tech. Co.), *Proceedings of the Symposium on Social Aspects and Recreation Research* (Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-132, pp. 80-81). Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.
- Dwyer, J. F. (1993). Outdoor recreation participation: an update on Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, and Asians in Illinois. In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings, Fourth North American Symposium on Society and Resource Management* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NC-163, pp. 119-121). Madison, WI: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Dwyer, J. F. (1994). *Customer diversity and the future demand for outdoor recreation* (Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-252). Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

- Dwyer, J. F., & Gobster, P. H. (1992). Recreation opportunity and cultural diversity. *Parks and Recreation*, 27(9), 22-32, 128.
- Dwyer, J. F., & Gobster, P. H. (1993). Black/White outdoor recreation preferences and participation: Illinois State Parks. In G. A. Vander Stoep (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1993 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NE-185, pp. 20-24). Saratoga Springs, NY: USDA Forest Service State Parks Management and Research Institute.
- Dwyer, J. F., & Gobster, P. H. (1997). The implications of increased racial and ethnic diversity for recreation resource management, planning, and research. In W. F. Kuentzel (Comp. Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1996 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NE-232, PP.3-7). Radnor, PA: USDA Forest Service Northeastern Forest Experiment Station.
- Dziekan, K. (2001). *Outdoor recreation and Texas Parks and Wildlife activities and attitudes among Hispanics in the general population*. Unpublished research report.
- Ewert, A.W. (1993). Research in the wildland-urban interface: Directions and issues. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 5-15). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Floyd, M. F., & Noe, F. P. (1992). Understanding intra-ethnic environmental attitude variations: Cuban origin population views. In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings, Fourth North American Symposium on*

- Society and Resource Management* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NC-163, pp. 127-129).  
Madison, WI: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Garvin, A. (1999). A parks agenda for the 21st Century. *Parks and Recreation*, 26-37.  
(Ovid: Full Text Record Accession Number 46837097)
- George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 11.0 update*. New York, NY: A&B Publications.
- Gobster, P. H. (1991). Urban park trail use: An observational approach. *Proceedings of the 1991 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-160, pp. 215-221). Radnor, PA: USDA Forest Service Northeastern Forest Experiment Station.
- Gobster, P. H. (1993a). Forest vegetation in urban parks: Perception of inner city children. In G. A. Vander Stoep (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1993 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NE-185, pp. 209-214).  
Saratoga Springs, NY: USDA Forest Service State Parks Management and Research Institute.
- Gobster, P. H. (1993b). Urban park trail use: An observational approach. In G. A. Vander Stoep (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1993 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NE-185, pp. 215-221). Saratoga Springs, NY: USDA Forest Service State Parks Management and Research Institute.
- Gobster, P. H., & Delgado, A. (1993). Ethnicity and recreation use in Chicago's Lincoln Park: In-park user survey findings. In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings, Fourth North American Symposium on Society and*

- Resource Management* (Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-NC-163, pp. 75-81). Madison, WI: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Gramann, J. H., Floyd, M. F., & Saenz, R. (1993). Outdoor recreation and Mexican American ethnicity: A benefits perspective. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 69-84). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hartman, L., & Overdevest, C. (1990). Race, ethnicity, and outdoor recreation participation: A state-of-the-knowledge review and theoretical perspective. In K. Zera (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Southwestern Recreation Research Conference*, (2 pp. 53-63, Feb. 15-17, 1989, Asheville, N.C.). Athens, GA: Institute for Behavioral Research.
- Holland, J. (1997, May). Research update. Enhancing multicultural sensitivity through teaching multiculturally in recreation. *Parks and Recreation*, 32(5), 42-50.
- Hurlburt, R. T. (1998). *Comprehending behavioral statistics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Hutchison, R. (1987). Ethnicity and urban recreation: Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics in Chicago's public parks. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 19(3), 205-222.
- Hutchison, R. (1988). A critique of race, ethnicity, and social class in recent leisure-recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(1), 10-30.
- Hutchison, R., & Fidel, K. (1984). Mexican-American recreation activities: a reply to McMillen. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16(4), 344-349.
- Irwin, P. N., Gartner, W. C., & Phelps, C. C. (1990). Mexican-American/Anglo cultural differences as recreation style determinants. *Leisure Science*, 12, 335-348.

- Jackson, R. G. (1973). A preliminary bicultural study of value orientations and leisure attitudes. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 5, 10-22.
- Love, L., McGregor, B., & Crompton, J. (1993). *Recreation in Texas: The 1993 citizen survey*. College Station, TX: Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences, A&M University.
- Marin, G. & Marin, B. (1991). *Research with Hispanic populations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Monroe, J. E. (1995). Leisure today: Developing cultural awareness through play. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance*, 66(8), 24-27.
- Moore, J. W. (1976). *Mexican Americans/ Joan W. Moore with Harry Pachon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Moore, J. W. (1985). *Hispanics in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Murdock, S. H. (2003). *Texas Population Estimates Program*. Retrieved March 22, 2003 from Texas A&M University System, Texas State Data Center and Office of the State Demographer, Department of Rural Sociology Web site:  
[http://txsdc.tamu.edu/presentations/2003\\_02\\_18\\_Houston\\_Hispanic\\_C\\_of\\_Commerce.pdf](http://txsdc.tamu.edu/presentations/2003_02_18_Houston_Hispanic_C_of_Commerce.pdf)
- Murdock, S. H., Hoque, M. N., & Pecotte, B. A. (1999). Texas population growth leads nation. In Ramos, M. G. (Ed.), *1998-1999 Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide* (pp. 293-295). College Station, TX: The Dallas Morning News.

- Murdock, S. H., Backman, K., Hoque, M. N., & Ellis, D. (1991). The implications of change in population size and composition on future participation in outdoor recreational activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23 (3), 238-259.
- Murdock, S. H., Backman, K., Colberg, E., Hoque, M. N., & Hamm, R. R. (1990). Modeling demographic change and characteristics in the analysis of future demand for leisure services. *Leisure Sciences*, 12, 79-102.
- Nichols, K., Goldbloom, A., & Deloney, J. (1989). *Texans outdoors: An analysis of 1985 participation in outdoor recreation activities*. Austin, TX: Comprehensive Planning Branch, Parks Division, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department.
- Phelan, G. D. (1991). *Minority underparticipation in wildland recreation: A case study in the Chicago area*. Unpublished master thesis, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago.
- Ramos, M. G. (1999). *1998-1999 Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide* (pp. 293-295). College Station, TX: The Dallas Morning News.
- Responsive Management (2001). Executive overview and implications of the public opinion and attitude surveys. In M. D. Duda (Exe. Dir.), *Texas Parks and Wildlife for the 21st Century*. Harrisonburg, VA: Author. Retrieved January, 2002, from <http://www.responsivemanagement.com>
- Schmidly, D.J., Parker, N.C. & Baker, R.J. (2001). *Texas Parks and Wildlife for the 21st Century*. (C.W. Chapman, Ed.). Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University.
- Shaull, S. L. & Gramann, J. H. (1998). The effects of cultural assimilation on the importance of family-related and nature-related recreation among Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(1), 47-63.

- Simcox, D. E. (1993). Cultural foundations for leisure preference, behavior and environmental orientation. In A.W. Ewert, D.J. Chavez & A.W. Magill, (Eds.), *Culture, Conflict, and Communication in the Wildland-urban Interface* (pp. 267-280). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stamps, S. M. & Stamps, M. B. (1985). Race, class, and leisure activities of urban residents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 17(1), 40-56.
- Stodolska, M. (1998). Assimilation and leisure constraints: Dynamics of residents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(4), 501-551.
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (1984). *1985 Texas outdoor recreation plan*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (1990). *1990 Texas outdoor recreation plan*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Thomas, J. R. & Nelson, J. K. (1996). *Research Methods in Physical Activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1973). Characteristics of the population, Texas. [Part 45, sec. 1, pp. 24-110]. *Census of Population 1970*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1983). Detailed population characteristics, Texas. [Part 45, sec. 1, pp. 1-55]. *Census of Population 1980*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1992). General population characteristics, Texas. [pp. 1-203]. *Census of Population 1990*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Vijver, F. & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and Data Analysis for Cross-Cultural Research* (pp. 39-42). Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.



Walsh, R. G. (1986). *Recreation Economic Decisions Comparing Benefits and Costs*.

State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

West, P. C. (1989). Urban region parks and Black minorities: Subculture, marginality, and interracial relations in park use in the Detroit Metropolitan area. *Leisure Sciences*, 11, 11-28.

## VITA

Leah Huth was born in Lakehurst, New Jersey, on June 7, 1959, the third daughter of Walter and Nancy Shappley. After graduating from Navarro High School, in 1977, she attended Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas. Graduating with highest honors, she obtained a Bachelor of Science in Recreational Administration in 1981. Initially employed by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department in San Antonio, Leah has subsequently worked at a variety of parks and is currently the Complex Manager Goliad State Park. In September 1998, she entered the Graduate School of Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas.

Permanent Address:           108 Park Road 6  
                                          Goliad, Texas 77963

This thesis was typed by Leah R. Huth.