

CHAPTER 4

OUTDOOR RECREATION PARTICIPATION AND PREFERENCES BY BLACK AND WHITE CHICAGO HOUSEHOLDS

John F. Dwyer

USDA Forest Service

North Central Forest Experiment Station

Ray Hutchison

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (1987) reports that *our greatest recreation needs are in urban areas close to home* and that *many urban residents have special needs*. However, in many instances planners and managers have difficulty serving these special urban needs because they lack information about them. A review of the recreation literature suggests that little is known about the recreation preferences and patterns of the urban black population, which is the largest minority group in Chicago and in many other large cities (Wendling 1981). Consequently, planners and managers do not know what approaches should be taken to provide recreation opportunities for this group. As a step toward filling this void, this chapter reports on an effort to more precisely delineate the outdoor recreation patterns and preferences of black and white Chicago households, compare these patterns, and explore explanations for similarities and differences. It also discusses recommendations for recreation resource management and research.

Our research is based on a secondary analysis of data collected on recreation participation as part of the Illinois Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning process. The Illinois effort, designed to forecast participation in recreation activities for the next several decades, included a telephone survey of 10,402 households selected by random digit dialing. Our analysis is based on responses by 269 black and 481 white non-Hispanic Chicago households. The data reflect several aspects of recreation behavior including participation (percent of households where at least one individual engaged in the activity), frequency of participation (days by the household in the previous year), and distance travelled to the most frequently used site. In addition, questions were asked about preferences for site development, social interaction, and the importance of *free time*.

Data were also gathered on household structure and social background characteristics of the household head. Not enough complete cases were received to examine variations within the black or white group, consequently the analysis is confined to comparisons between the two groups. This is done with recognition of the significant variation in outdoor recreation preferences and behavior within each group. The present study is to provide policy makers with general guides for meeting the needs of these groups and to suggest research that will provide more specific recommendations for recreation resource planning and management.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Previous studies show that urban blacks are more inclined to concentrate their recreation activities closer to home than are urban whites. Kornegay and Warren (1969) and Enosh, Christiansen, Staniforth and Cooper (1975) report vacation travel to be less frequent among black households, and even when vacations were taken, the distance was much shorter than for white households. O'Leary and Benjamin (1982) report that for a wide-ranging set of recreation activities, blacks were more likely than whites to use city/town resources than rural resources. They also found higher participation by blacks than by whites for activities ordinarily engaged in close to home. Greater use by blacks of local parks and less use of state and national parks is reported by Yancey and Snell (1971) and Craig (1972). Enosh *et al.* (1975) report a greater proportion of black households participating in picnicking and park activities. Washburne and Wall (1980) report that in activities ordinarily engaged in closer to home, black participation was most similar to that of whites. Hauser (1962) indicates that the greater the degree of urbanization, the greater the similarity between white and non-white participation in particular activities. A study of black and white fifth grade Chicago public school children indicates that black students who had visited forests were more likely to have done so close to home than were their white counterparts (Metro, Dwyer and Dreschler 1981).

Previous research suggests that blacks are more likely than whites to prefer *meeting people* over *getting away* as well as *developed sites* over *preserved sites*. Check, Field and Burdge (1976) report that blacks favor interaction with other groups when involved in outdoor recreation. Hutchison (1988) reports that in Chicago parks, blacks were more likely than whites to participate in group rather than individual activities. Black preferences for *developed* recreation sites are also reported by Peterson (1977), Washburne (1978), and Washburne and Wall (1980). Weak black preferences for *getting away* and *preserved sites* are suggested by somewhat negative attitudes toward experiences associated with nature, wildlife, and

rural parks and preserves that are reported by Dorsey (1972), Kellert (1984), Meeker (1971) and Washburne (1978). Peterson (1977) reports that black teenagers, both male and female, are more likely to prefer urban rather than rural parks than are their white counterparts. Strong black preferences for *meeting people* and *developed sites* as well as substantial participation in organized camping may be attributed, in part, to higher black participation in voluntary organizations within the local community such as churches or clubs that sponsor retreats or other meetings at camps and other developed recreation sites (Babchuk and Booth 1969, Babchuk and Thompson 1962, Antunes and Gaitz 1975, Olsen 1970, Williams, Babchuk and Johnson 1973).

Washburne and Wall (1980) report significantly higher black preferences for spending federal recreation funds in urban areas and for more facilities. A study of users and nearby residents of neighborhood parks in Chicago indicates heavy use of these resources and strong support for their continued management and maintenance by both blacks and whites. However, blacks were much more concerned with the maintenance of these parks than whites (Joseph, 1980). This concern may have been heightened by greater use of these parks by families and other groups. Washburne and Wall (1980) report inadequate maintenance as a significant barrier to the use of urban parks by blacks.

Previous studies have shown that black preferences for specific outdoor recreation activities also differ from those of whites. Kornegay and Warren (1969), Washburne (1978), and Washburne and Wall (1980) report that if we look at preferences for activities rather than activities actually engaged in, black/white differences may increase rather than decrease.

The reasons behind black/white differences in recreation preferences and behavior continues to be debated. Two viewpoints predominate in the literature, each with a distinctly different implication for recreation resource management (Hutchison 1988, Hutchison and Fidel 1984, Wendling 1981, Washburne 1978). The *marginality* perspective holds that black/white differences are attributable to the generally lower socio-economic position of blacks in society. It calls for efforts to overcome the barriers to participation and enjoyment that are the result of that position, so that black/white differences will disappear. The *ethnicity* perspective attributes black/white differences to the preferences of a distinctive black subculture. It calls for efforts to provide the different opportunities sought by the black subculture. The empirical test generally applied to these perspectives is to control for socio-economic variables and attribute the associated reductions in black/white differences to marginality and the differences that remain to ethnicity. Even when the test is applied, the results are widely divergent in the different applications, offering support for both the marginality and ethnicity perspectives. However, the ethnicity approach as usually implemented is problematic in its underlying assumption of homogeneity

within the black population and its assertion that blacks represent a distinct *ethnic* group (Hutchison 1988).

Based on the foregoing review of the literature, we propose the following hypotheses in the present study:

1. Participation by white households will exceed that of black households for activities that ordinarily take place substantial distances away from home.
2. Among households that participate in a given activity, white households are likely to travel greater distances to their most frequently used site than are black households.
3. Black households will be more likely than white households to select *visit or meet new people over getting away from a lot of other people* and will emphasize the need to *develop facilities and conveniences for people over preserve the area in its natural state*.
4. It is not clear whether differences between black and white participation patterns will persist after controlling for socio-economic variables. Consequently support for both the *marginality* and *ethnicity* perspectives will likely be found for explaining black/white differences.

RESULTS

Participation

Participation by white households exceeded that of black households for 19 of the 23 activities studied (Table 1). In 11 instances these differences were statistically significant ($p < .05$), spanning all six major activity categories. Black participation exceeded that of whites in four activities; but in no case was the difference statistically significant ($p < .05$). Although large differences were found for black and white participation in particular activities, a ranking of activities by percent of households participating was similar for the two groups. Predominantly urban-based activities top each list, particularly those activities that ordinarily take place close to home. O'Leary and Benjamin (1982) reported similar rankings of activities for urban blacks and whites in Indiana. The clusters of activities in which Chicago households tended to engage are similar for blacks and whites. A factor analysis of the 23 activities (not presented here) identified the following three distinct groups of activities for both blacks and whites: (1) urban activities, (2) camping and overnight hiking, and (3) boating and primitive camping.

Table 1. Participation of Black and White Chicago Households in 23 Selected Outdoor Recreation Activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>%Black Households</u>	<u>%White Households</u>	<u>Difference (1)-(2)</u>
Swimming			
Pools	40	35	5
Lake Michigan	23	32	-9*
Other beaches	7	28	-21*
Biking and non-motorized riding			
Day hiking	13	31	-18*
Overnight hiking	4	6	-2
Bicycling	30	32	-2
Horseback riding	15	17	-2
Boating			
Large horsepower motorboating	3	14	-11*
Motorboating on Lake Michigan	5	7	-2
Small horsepower motorboating	2	8	-6*
Lake canoeing	3	5	-2
River canoeing	2	5	-3*
Lake Michigan sailing	4	6	-2
Sailing on other lakes	2	3	-1
Camping			
Developed	10	20	-10*
Organized	9	7	2
Primitive	2	5	-3*
Transient	2	5	-3*
Overnight Lodging			
Lodging without housekeeping facilities	6	14	-8*
Lodging with housekeeping facilities	8	11	-3
Off-road vehicles			
Motorcycles	4	4	<1
Snowmobiling	<1	4	-4*
4-wheel drive	2	1	1

*difference significant at 0.05 level

Days of Participation

For the set of activities studied, black households that participated in an activity tended to engage in fewer days of the activity than whites, averaging 78 percent of white participation for the total set of activities (Table 2). Although the percent of households participating in 23 activities points heavily toward higher participation for whites (Table 1), the black/white pattern in median days per participating household in each activity was more diverse. Because of the small number of responses for each activity (especially among blacks), we can investigate only 11 activities in greater detail, and black households reported more days of participation than whites for five of these activities (Table 2). However, as with participation, the general pattern in days of participation points toward a greater concentration of black recreation activity close to home.

Travel Distance

Comparisons of distances travelled by black and white households engaging in a particular activity are based on the median travel distance to the most frequently used site (Table 3). Black households tended to travel shorter distances than whites for a given activity. White households had longer median travel distances for eight activities, travel distances were the same for one activity, and black households travelled longer distances for only two activities. One of the two instances in which blacks had a longer median travel distance was a difference of four miles for bicycling on trails by blacks compared to three miles by whites; the other instance is more substantial and involves a median of 148 miles for organized camping by blacks compared to 100 miles by whites. Black participation in organized camping might be linked with a high rate of black participation in voluntary and church groups, some of which have organized camps.

Activities in which black households were as likely to participate as white households tended to be those with short travel distances such as swimming at pools and bicycling on trails (Tables 1 and 3). Black participation is similar to whites in seven of eight activities in which Chicago residents have a median travel distance of 40 miles or less but similar to whites in only five of 15 activities with median travel distances of greater than 40 miles.

Black households have higher median days of participation in five of eight activities for which the median travel distance is less than 100 miles but none of the three activities with a median travel distance of more than 100 miles. Days of participation for black households are especially high compared to whites for activities that generally take place close to home,

Table 2. Median Days of Participation in 23 Selected Outdoor Recreation Activities per Participating Chicago Household, per Year

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Black Households</u>	<u>White Households</u>	<u>Difference (1)-(2)</u>
Swimming			
Pools	20	14	+6
Lake Michigan	9	8	+1
Other beaches	10	7	+3
Biking and non-motorized riding			
Day hiking	5	6	-1
Overnight hiking	3	4	-1
Bicycling	30	16	+14
Horseback riding	5	3	+2
Boating			
Large horsepower motorboating	2	7	-5
Motorboating on Lake Michigan	4	8	-4
Small horsepower motorboating	3 ^a	10	-7 ^b
Lake canoeing	5 ^a	6	-1 ^b
River canoeing	10 ^a	4	+6 ^b
Lake Michigan sailing	4 ^a	10	-6 ^b
Sailing on other lakes	4 ^a	7	-3 ^b
Camping			
Developed	4	5	-1
Organized	5	6	-1
Primitive	9 ^a	5	+4 ^b
Transient	5 ^a	4	+1 ^b
Overnight lodging			
Lodging without housekeeping facilities	3	5	-2
Lodging with housekeeping facilities	4	7	-3
Off-road vehicles			
Motorcycles	5 ^a	6	-1 ^b
Snowmobiling	21 ^a	5	+16 ^b
4-wheel drive	7 ^a	3	+4 ^b

^amedian based on less than 10 observations and consequently suspect

^bdifference is suspect because one of the medians was based on less than 10 observations

Table 3. Median Travel Distance to the Most Frequently Used Site, by Activity for Black and White Chicago Households

Activity	Chicago	Black	White	Differences
	Households	Households	Households	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(3)
*Transient camping	302	700 ^a	300	400 ^b
Lodging with housekeeping	201	127	292	-165
*Primitive camping	199	90 ^a	400	-310 ^b
*Lodging without housekeeping	180	156	201	-45
Overnight hiking	151	119 ^a	280	-161 ^b
Organized camping	126	148	100	48
*Developed camping	121	120	125	-5
*Small horsepower motorboating	101	60 ^a	111	-51 ^b
*River canoeing	100	78	105	-27 ^b
Lake canoeing	98	98 ^a	99	-1 ^b
*Snowmobiling	91	1 ^a	99	-98 ^b
Sailing other than Lake Michigan	91	100 ^a	91	9 ^b
*Swimming other than Lake Michigan	90	50	86	-35
*Large horsepower motorboating	85	250 ^a	80	170 ^b
*Day hiking	50	15	75	-60
Horseback riding	36	25	46	-21
4-wheel drive	33	30 ^a	55	-25 ^b
Off-road motorcycles	30	42 ^a	20	22 ^b
Lake Michigan sailing	10	3 ^a	10	-7 ^b
Motorboating on Lake Michigan	10	8	10	-2
*Swimming at Lake Michigan	5	5	5	0
Biking on trails	3	4	3	1
Swimming at pools	3	2	4	-2

*activity in which a significantly larger portion of white households than black households participated.

^amedian based on less than 10 observations and consequently suspect

^bdifference is suspect because one of the medians was based on less than 10 observations

such as bicycling and swimming at pools. O'Leary and Benjamin (1982) report a similar pattern of a greater number of days participating for blacks in primarily urban-based activities.

The only activity in which black households have higher participation and participation rates than whites is swimming at pools. This activity has the shortest median travel distance to the most frequently used site.

Preferences

Three general attitudinal measures permit a test of differences in perceptions between the black and white households. Respondents were asked whether (1) they viewed outdoor recreation as an opportunity to *visit or meet new people* or for *getting away from a lot of other people*; (2) in the development of new recreation areas it is more important to *preserve the area in its natural state* or to *develop facilities and conveniences for people*; and (3) when meeting new people, they preferred to talk mainly about their *work*, their *free-time activities*, or *both*. Blacks and whites gave significantly different ($p < .05$) responses to questions concerning their preferences for social interaction and for recreation area development. Blacks indicated a strong orientation toward *meeting people* rather than *getting away* whereas whites divided their responses evenly between the two categories (Table 4). With regard to site development, blacks strongly preferred *developed facilities and conveniences* rather than *preserved natural areas*, while whites strongly preferred *preserved natural areas* (Table 5). Cross-tabulating the responses to these two questions shows that *meet people* and *develop* are the predominant responses for blacks while *get away* and *preserve* are the most common for whites (Table 6). The responses tend to correspond to the concentration of black participation in activities that are ordinarily engaged

Table 4. Preferences for Social Interaction by Black and White Chicago Households

<u>Preference</u>	<u>Percent of Black Households (N=263)</u>	<u>Percent of White Households (N=468)</u>
To meet people	51	36
To get away	27	35
Both	15	18
Neither	8	12

$$\chi^2 = 17.24, p < .001$$

Table 5. Preferences for Development of Recreation Areas by Black and White Chicago Households

<u>Preference</u>	<u>Percent of Black Households (N=257)</u>	<u>Percent of White Households (N=463)</u>
Preserved	27	57
Developed	53	24
Both	20	19

$$\chi^2 = 72.42, p < .001$$

in close to home and are characterized by lots of facilities, site development, and a large number of users. When asked about their preferences for talking about *work* or *free-time* activities when meeting new people, both blacks and whites have a similar probability of mentioning free-time activities (Table 7). Therefore, free-time activities seem to have a similar significance for both groups.

Social Class and Ethnicity

A direct test of the effects of social class and ethnicity across the 23 activities would require a comparison of *race* (as a proxy variable for ethnicity) and *income* (as a proxy variable for marginality). Because of the limited number of cases for which we had income data, we could only make two tests of the marginality and ethnicity perspectives. In the first we used education as a surrogate measure to estimate the possible effects of marginality on participation in activities. In the second, where our analysis was not constrained to individual activities and the limited cases available, we used income as a surrogate measure for marginality in an analysis of recreation preferences.

The set of multiple linear regression models were estimated to predict participation in the eleven activities that had a significant difference in participation between blacks and whites. These models include race; household size; presence or absence of children; and gender, age, and education of the household head. In eight of the cases, the coefficient for race was significant. And in five of those instances, race had the largest standardized coefficient, offering support for those who advocate the ethnicity perspective. In the other three instances race was not significant.

Table 6. Cross Tabulation of Preferences for Social Interaction and Development of Recreation Areas for Black and White Chicago Households

<u>Preference for Social Interaction</u>	<u>Site Development</u>			
	<u>Black Households^a</u>		<u>White Households^b</u>	
	<u>Preserved</u>	<u>Developed</u>	<u>Preserved</u>	<u>Developed</u>
To meet people	32	78	90	48
To get away	19	34	104	30
Total	51	112	194	78

^a $\chi^2 = .48$, ns

^b $\chi^2 = 4.52$, $p < .05$

However, the limited explanatory power of the equations and the limited variables used precludes a strong endorsement of either perspective.

The stronger black preference for *meeting people* and *developed sites* persisted even when accounting for income, which offers additional support for the ethnicity perspective.

DISCUSSION

The results correspond closely to the expectations raised by previous studies. Each of the hypotheses outlined at the beginning of the chapter are supported by the data presented here.

The most significant underlying dimension in the differences between the recreation participation and preferences of black and white Chicago households is the stronger urban orientation of black households. It is primarily urban-based activities in which black participation (percent of households) and participation rates (days) approach or exceed those of whites. Lower participation and participation rates for blacks are most common in activities for which Chicago residents ordinarily travel the longest distances. Black participants in particular activities also tended to travel shorter distances than whites. Blacks were more likely than whites to prefer *meeting people* and *developed sites*, both of which are more likely to characterize experiences in or near urban areas.

Although this and other research tends to confirm the more highly urban orientation of the recreation behavior of urban blacks in comparison to

Table 7. Preferences for Talking about Work, Free Time Activities, or Both when Meeting New People, Black and White Chicago Households

<u>Preference</u>	<u>Black Households</u>	<u>White Households</u>
Work	10	9
Free Time	57	62
Both	22	21
Neither	11	8

$\chi^2 = 1.99$, ns

urban whites, researchers disagree about the reasons for this difference. Like many of those before it, this study leaves unanswered questions in this area.

The persistence of black/white differences in participation after accounting for household characteristics adds support to the ethnicity argument. The existence of significant black/white differences in preferences for site development and social interaction after accounting for income also supports the ethnicity theory. However, these findings are far from overwhelming and other results should be considered as well.

The higher concentration of black outdoor recreation participation in activities engaged in closer to home, as well as lower median travel distances for blacks engaged in specific activities, cannot easily be attributed to either the marginality or ethnicity perspective. The shorter distances might be the result of limited resources available to black households (marginality), or blacks may choose activities and areas close to home where they may participate with other persons similar to themselves. Also fear of discrimination in areas more distant from home cannot be ruled out.

Although distance can be interpreted as a cost barrier (i.e., marginality), other costs are associated with particular activities such as equipment costs (i.e., off-road vehicles and boats) and daily expenses for fuel, supplies, rentals, and user fees. Washburne (1978) and Washburne and Wall (1980) report that blacks are more likely than whites to report cost and transportation as barriers to participation. All of the activities in the present study for which black and white participation are similar took place close to home, involved low costs, and were not necessarily associated with a natural environment. Many could be categorized as opportunities that occurred on developed sites and provided opportunities to meet people. At the same time many of the activities with low black participation could be

characterized as occurring on preserved sites, providing opportunities for getting away from people, and requiring substantial supplies, equipment, etc.

It is not yet clear to what extent black/white differences are attributable to the socio-economic constraints placed on blacks (i.e., the marginality perspective), to a distinctive black subculture (i.e., the ethnicity perspective), or to other causes. This study offers some encouragement for each of these explanations and the associated policy implications. In other words, distinct black preferences should be recognized and efforts undertaken to meet them; but barriers to black participation should also be recognized in some kinds of outdoor recreation and efforts undertaken to break them down.

The foregoing discussion focused on two important population segments -- urban blacks and urban whites. Most of the attention has been given to differences between the two groups and not to similarities between the groups or variations within each group. This is because our purpose was to determine if different approaches should be taken to providing recreation opportunities for each group. However, it is important that similarities between groups as well as variations within each group be recognized in efforts to provide improved opportunities for recreation.

Similarities between urban blacks and whites include a strong urban orientation and attaching great importance to free-time activities. Efforts to enhance opportunities for recreation in and near urban areas are likely to benefit both groups.

In interpreting the results, it is important to avoid stereotyping any group in terms of the typical or average behavior. Behaviors and preferences differ widely within each group; consequently, a wide range of opportunities should be provided for each. Although urban blacks as a group tended to participate more heavily in urban-oriented activities and expressed preferences for developed sites and opportunities to meet people, there are most likely significant numbers of urban blacks who used wilderness resources and strongly supported the preservation of these areas and the associated opportunities for solitude. The group means presented and discussed are intended only as broad guides to policy because they were formed by aggregating the behavior of diverse members of each group.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT

Chicago households, particularly blacks, devote a significant amount of their outdoor recreation time to activities close to home. Consequently, efforts to enhance the recreation opportunities for Chicago residents, and particularly blacks, should give significant attention to nearby resources. This includes the maintenance of public parks in urban neighborhoods as well as nearby recreation areas.

Second, the limited black participation in activities that ordinarily take place far from an urban environment poses a difficult question for managers and planners, particularly in light of limited knowledge of the reasons for such behavior. Should they accept these differences as due to cultural differences (i.e., adopt the ethnicity perspective) or undertake programs to break down barriers to wider recreation participation by blacks (i.e., adopt the marginality perspective)? Below are some possible means of increasing and enhancing the experiences of urban blacks in rural environments as a guide for those circumstances where it appears appropriate to do so.

1. Give particular emphasis to areas close to cities -- perhaps county, state, and federal areas near urban areas. This will reduce barriers posed by travel, provide opportunities for group outings, and make a wider range of opportunities available for urbanites.
2. Provide high-quality opportunities for activities that appear to be especially popular with urban blacks, such as bicycling, swimming, fishing, and off-road vehicle riding.
3. Provide means for catering to large groups as well as opportunities for reservations by churches and other social groups.
4. Provide increased levels of facility development and maintenance.
5. Initiate education, information, and interpretive programs aimed at enhancing the experiences of urban blacks in a natural environment.

A component of these programs might be aimed at public school children and their teachers.

The above suggestions assume that it is an appropriate policy to make a wider range of recreation opportunities available to the urban black population. However, we should not assume that blacks *ought to behave like whites*. We could as easily argue that urban whites should be encouraged to act like urban blacks and spend an increased portion of their leisure time close to home -- with the resulting benefits of reduced travel costs and increased opportunities for large group outings.

The strong black orientation to *developed sites* and *meeting people* suggests that efforts to enhance recreation opportunities for blacks should give particular attention to developed sites and opportunities for social interaction. This often points toward large, developed areas. Strong black preferences for well maintained and litter free areas appear consistent with such opportunities. Whites, on the other hand, are more likely to prefer preserved sites and the opportunities to avoid large groups. These needs

are more likely to be met at small, undeveloped sites where maintenance and litter may not be significant considerations in relation to other site attributes.

Some support was found for both the marginality and ethnicity explanations for black/white differences in recreation behavior, suggesting that managers give careful attention to the specific needs associated with both social class and ethnic differences both within and between these population groups in public involvement sessions and other efforts to more fully understand urban needs.

Finally, limited knowledge to guide efforts in this area calls for careful evaluations of the effectiveness of those undertakings aimed at enhancing the recreation opportunities for urban blacks.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

The set of activities included in this study limits the implications that can be drawn from the analysis. With the strong orientation of Chicago households, especially blacks, to urban activities it would be desirable if subsequent research aimed at urbanites would include additional urban-based activities such as picnicking, observing plants and animals, attending outdoor events, fishing, walking/hiking, and participating in sports. It also may be useful to extend the analysis beyond outdoor recreation to a wider range of leisure activities.

Although the focus on households in the present study is useful, it would be helpful also to have information on which individuals in the household participated in particular activities. The composition of the household also is likely to be important in explaining individual behavior. Is it a nuclear family, extended family, single-headed household (of which gender), etc.? This would allow for a more detailed analysis that goes beyond participation to the types of leisure groups and the meaning of leisure in the family environment.

Although actual recreation behavior reveals preferences, it is also useful to know what activities individuals would like to engage in if they could. Such an effort would have to be carefully designed to present participants with the full range of options available to them, including those that they have never experienced, so that their choices would not be constrained by existing knowledge, resources, and participation patterns. It could begin by intensively interviewing small groups of urban blacks to obtain realistic and complete responses and perhaps follow the general format of *focus group* sessions commonly used in market research.

Although it is useful to identify activities engaged in and those that are preferred, it is at least as important for managers to know the preferred settings or environments for these activities. Many of the issues faced by

recreation resource planners and managers concern the management of settings. Furthermore, the limited questions concerning preferences for site development and social interaction used in this study suggest significant black/white differences that appear to have implications for resource management. This information would be useful in efforts to plan for and manage specific recreation areas. Replicating the work by Schroeder and Anderson (1984) concerning preferences for and perceptions of urban parks with urban black subjects might be particularly effective. Numerous opportunities also seem to exist for making use of market research techniques.

Exploring reasons for the strong urban orientation of Chicago blacks and the low level of black participation in many nonurban activities may provide significant guidance for recreation resource planning and management. It may be that Chicago blacks engage heavily in outdoor recreation activities not included in this study, such as picnicking, or prefer nearby urban resources for a number of other reasons, including a desire to participate in large family or other social groups. Perhaps blacks prefer intensively managed open spaces and sports facilities such as are often found in Chicago parks. On the other hand, the urban-based recreation behavior of black households may be the result of limited resources for travel, fear of discriminatory behavior, lack of skills and equipment for rural-based activities such as primitive camping, or lack of knowledge of rural opportunities. If barriers are limiting the participation and enjoyment of black households, these barriers should be identified and programs developed to remove them. Like the effort suggested above, this undertaking might best be accomplished with in-depth interviews or small group discussions rather than a large survey such as the one that formed the basis of this study.

Further efforts to identify the ethnic differences in recreation behavior could benefit from (1) considering additional urban groups such as Hispanics and Asians, and (2) using additional concepts and variables to reflect ethnicity (as suggested by Hutchison 1987, 1988). Hispanic and Asian communities are becoming increasingly significant urban populations in Chicago and elsewhere. In addition, including other ethnic groups in the analysis would provide new perspectives on inter- and intra-group differences. Limited research has been conducted on the attributes of ethnic subcultures that influence preferences for recreation activities and environments. It is important that this research be concerned with cultural influences on preferences for site attributes as well as recreation activities.

Because evidence indicates that much of the recreation activity of Chicago residents is at the neighborhood level, subsequent research should emphasize recreation behavior at that level. This is particularly important in research on ethnic groups because many Chicago neighborhoods are dominated by a single ethnic group. Such studies would be particularly

useful if they would identify specific recreation areas or parts of those areas that are used by each group as well as the attributes of users and nonusers toward the management of those areas. This effort would build on the work of Klobus-Edwards (1981), Joseph (1980), and Woodard (1988).

Much can be learned also from research that evaluates the effectiveness of policies and programs aimed at increasing and enhancing the recreation experiences of urban blacks and other groups. Such research must focus on how individuals perceived and responded to these efforts.

In summary, this study has supported and extended a number of previous findings and moved us a little closer toward identifying differences in the recreation patterns of urban ethnic groups and understanding those differences. It has suggested some directions for management and research aimed at enhancing the opportunities available to urban blacks. However, much more needs to be learned about the preferences of this and other urban ethnic groups before we can develop comprehensive guides for recreation programs aimed at serving diverse urban ethnic groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are indebted to the Illinois Department of Conservation and Southern Illinois University for the data used in this study.

REFERENCES

- Antunes, G. and C.M. Gaitz. 1975. Ethnicity and participation: Study of Mexican-Americans, blacks, and whites. *American Journal of Sociology* 80:1192-1121.
- Babchuk, N. and A. Booth. 1969. Voluntary association membership: A longitudinal analysis. *American Sociological Review* 34:31-4.
- Babchuk, N. and R. Thompson. 1962. Voluntary associations of negroes. *American Sociological Review* 27:647-655.
- Cheek, N.H., D. Field and R.J. Burdge. 1976. *Leisure and Recreation Places*. Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Inc.
- Craig, W. 1972. Recreational Activity patterns in a small negro urban community: The role of the cultural base. *Economic Geography* 48:107-115.
- Dorsey, A.H.H. 1972. *A Survey Study of the Comparative Status of Understanding and Reasoning in Conservation Concepts by Ninth Grade Students in the Public Schools of South Carolina*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Virginia, 123 pp.

- Enosh, R., D. Christiansen, D. Staniforth and R.B. Cooper. 1975. *Effects of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics on Recreation Patterns in Low Income Urban Areas: Part II*. Madison, WI: Recreation Resources Center, University of Wisconsin-Extension. Department of Agricultural Economics, Madison, WI.
- Hauser, P.M. 1962. Demographic and ecological changes as factors in outdoor recreation. *Trends in American Living and Outdoor Recreation*. ORRRC Study Report 22, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hutchison, R. and K. Fidel. 1984. Mexican-American recreation activities: A reply to McMillen. *Journal of Leisure Research* 16:344-349.
- Hutchison, R. 1987. Race, ethnicity, and urban recreation: Blacks, whites, and hispanics in Chicago's public parks. *Journal of Leisure Research* 19:205-222.
- Hutchison, R. 1988. A critique of race, ethnicity, and social class in recent leisure-recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research* 20:10-30.
- Joseph, A. 1980. *Race and Class in Chicago Parks*. Chicago IL: North Central Forest Experiment Station, 58pp.
- Kellert, S.R. 1984. Urban Americans perceptions of animals and the natural environment. *Urban Ecology* 8:209-228.
- Klobus-Edwards, P. 1981. Race, residence, and leisure style: Some policy implications. *Leisure Sciences* 4:95-112.
- Kornegay, F.A. and D.I. Warren. 1969. *A Comparative Study of Life Styles and Social Attitudes of Middle Income Status Whites and Negroes in Detroit*. Detroit, MI: Detroit Urban League.
- Meeker, J.W. 1971. Red, white, and black in national parks. *The North American Review* Fall:3-7.
- Metro, L.J., J.F. Dwyer, and E.S. Dreschler. 1981. *Forest Experiences of Fifth-Grade Chicago Public School Students*. Research Paper NC-126, St. Paul, MN: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, 6p.
- O'Leary, J.T. and P.J. Benjamin. 1982. *Ethnic Variation in Leisure Behavior: The Indiana Case*. Sta. Bulletin 349. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Agricultural Experiment Station, 45p.
- Olsen, M.E. 1970. Social and political participation of blacks. *American Sociological Review* 33:682-697.
- Peterson, G.L. 1977. Recreational preferences of urban teenagers: The Influence of Cultural and Environmental Attributes. *Children, Nature, and the Urban Environment: Proceedings of a Symposium Fair*. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report NE-30, p. 113-121. Broomall, PA: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.

- President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. 1987. *Americans Outdoors: The Legacy, the Challenge*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Schroeder, H.W. and L.M. Anderson. 1984. Perceptions of personal safety in urban recreation sites. *Journal of Leisure Research* 16:178-194.
- Washburne, R.F. 1978. Black under-participation in wildland recreation: Alternative explanations. *Leisure Sciences* 1:175-189.
- Washburne, R.F. and P. Wall. 1980. *Cities, Wild Areas, and Black Leisure: In Search of Explanations for Black/White Differences in Outdoor Recreation*. USDA Forest Service Research Paper INT-249. Ogden, UT: Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, 13 pp.
- Wendling, R.C. 1981. Black/white differences in outdoor recreation behavior: State-of-the-art and recommendations for management and research. *Proceedings of the Conference on Social Research in National Parks and Wildland Areas*. March 21-22, 1980, Gatlinburg, TN: Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 106-117.
- Williams, J.A., N. Babchuk and D.R. Johnson. 1973. Voluntary associations and minority status: A comparative analysis of anglo, black, and Mexican-Americans. *American Sociological Review* 38:637-646.
- Woodard, M.D. 1988. Class, regionality, and leisure among urban black Americans: The post-civil rights era. *Journal of Leisure Research* 20:87-105.
- Yancey, W.L. and J. Snell. 1971. *Parks as Aspects of Leisure in the Inner-City: An Exploratory Investigation*. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Meetings in Philadelphia.