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As the Hispanic/Latino population grows in the United States, increased attention is being given to how and why Hispanic/Latino recreation differs from Anglo recreation. Concerns over equal access to natural resources and recreation have led researchers to question the causes for the differences in recreation choices. The discussion has largely focused on the restrictive effects of ethnicity and the marginal position of minorities in society creating recreation patterns in which minorities are practically nonexistent in wildland recreation areas. Stepping away from the negative valuation about dissimilarities in Hispanic/Latino versus Anglo recreation, this study of Hispanics/Latinos in Cache Valley, Utah focuses on recreation as defined by participants, recreation sites both visited and not visited, and the decision drivers participants identify as most influential. Through the use of a participant mapping activity, this study first identifies patterns in types of sites visited and not visited by participants. Using exploratory, semi-structured interviews, this study also uncovers the participants’
definitions of recreation as well as important elements driving their recreation choices, including desired and undesired sites for recreation. Municipal recreation sites are visited most commonly by participants and the major drivers attracting their visitation are the physical site characteristics comprised of proximity to their residences, available facilities, suitability for family outings, scenery, a feeling of seclusion or relaxation, and activities specific to the site. Sites not visited span the categories of municipal, federal, state, and private. Federal sites are the most commonly desired and undesired types of sites not visited by participants. Non-visitation of sites was found to largely be the result of marginality characteristics such as a lack of money, time, knowledge, language, and fear. Ethnicity and custom also proved to be influential drivers of recreation decisions through elements like language and participant conceptualization of recreation as seeking spaces in which to gather with others. This study concludes that customs and powers of access (as related to ethnicity and marginality) intermingle to influence recreation choices among Hispanic/Latino participants. Looking at Hispanic/Latino recreation beyond its comparative Anglo differences provides a necessary holistic understanding of the elements driving this ethnic group’s decisions. As this understanding increases, work can be done to ensure equality in access to resources like recreation as desired by the minority population.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Population in the United States (U.S.) increases daily, with expansion in minority populations accounting for the fastest growth. The latest U.S. Census conducted in 2010 revealed that persons of Hispanic or Latino origin make up 16.3% of the nation’s population, a 43% increase over the 2000 census (United States Census Bureau, 2010). As the U.S. population expands, more and more attention is given to resource use and development, including such resources as recreation areas. With rapid growth of a minority group comes attention to equality in resource use and development and opportunities, including how to best accommodate increased diversity at existing recreation sites. For recreation areas it requires understanding if visitor needs and desires are being met, and how the changing clientele might best be served.

Minority recreation research has firmly established that minorities and Anglos (or whites) do not recreate in the same spaces or in the same ways (Blahna & Black, 1993; Hutchison & Fidel, 1984; McMillen, 1983; Solop, Hagen, & Ostergren, 2003; U.S.D.A. Forest Service, 2010). The starkest difference has consistently been in the country’s wilderness areas, as they are infrequently used by minority visitors. Research has attempted to determine if constraints act to impede demand (the marginality theory) or if recreational differences are due to cultural preferences in recreation (the ethnicity theory). Ultimately the question has been framed as: why do differences in minority recreation exist and what should be done to reduce those differences?

This research study approaches minority recreation by investigating location as a key factor in recreation decisions. Cache Valley, Utah, with its vast public recreation
opportunities and the relatively recent growth of its Hispanic/Latino population, is an ideal area to investigate minority recreation site patterns and desires, or what we can think of as the geography of Hispanic/Latino recreation. The purpose of the research is to move the discussion toward an analysis of the influences on Hispanic/Latino recreation location choices rather than remaining focused on the constraints that cause their non-participation in certain Anglo-dominated recreation sites and activities.

Keying in on *how Hispanics/Latinos in Cache Valley, Utah decide where to recreate* uncovered three essential elements of the study aimed at furthering discussion about recreation decisions of Hispanics/Latinos as a minority group in the United States. Firstly, understanding *what embodies recreation for the participants* can help connect how conceptualization of recreation affects its operationalization through decisions and choices. Also, obtaining a spatial knowledge of *which recreation locations are visited and not visited by Hispanic/Latino participants in and around Cache Valley* can contribute to understanding where recreation takes place for participants and working to ensure they are welcomed in all recreation areas. Lastly, identifying *what participants view as the greatest influences on their recreation choices* gets to the heart of addressing the *why of where*, determining what drives recreation decisions in choosing locations. Investigating and incorporating all of these elements contributes to a more complete understanding of the dynamics of recreation choices, helping managers and society at large recognize the needs and meet the expectations of all members of society.

Two articles have been developed based on the results of this thematic research on recreation patterns and decision drivers among Hispanics/Latinos in Cache Valley,
Utah. Each article addresses different aspects of minority decisions in recreation. The first article, which focuses on the places participants do visit to recreate, highlights the driving forces that draw respondents to their chosen recreation locations. It also analyzes participant definitions of recreation to discern how those interpretations affect choices about where to visit for recreation. The second article engages in discussion about where people do and do not go for recreation with particular focus given to the deeper decision drivers that cause non-visitation to desired and undesired recreation sites. Placed within a framework of access powers (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) possessed by minority populations, the decision drivers found to affect participant recreation choices contribute to the larger discussion about minorities’ rights versus abilities to benefit from recreational resources.

The U.S. Census Bureau projects that by the year 2050, Hispanics will make up 30.25% of the total U.S. population (United States Census Bureau, 2008). Understanding how this shift in population could translate to changes in visitors and their usage of recreation sites is imperative in appropriately managing those sites. In addition, and more critically, this diverse population demands and deserves just access to our nation’s natural resources (Getches & Pellow, 2002). Recognizing what affects minority decisions in where to recreate and how inequalities in socioeconomic power affect those decisions is an essential step in working for equality in recreation resource access and use.
References


CHAPTER 2
A BIGGER BACKYARD: TOWARD RE-CONCEPTUALIZING AND RE-INTERPRETING HISPANIC/LATINO RECREATION GEOGRAPHY

Abstract

Minority recreation research often discusses low visitation of minorities to spaces such as national parks traditionally used by members of the majority population. Hispanics/Latinos are the largest ethnic minority group in the United States, and this study attempts to re-conceptualize this group’s recreation patterns by looking at where they do recreate rather than where they do not recreate. Through interviews and interactive mapping, thirty participants defined recreation in their own terms and explained reasons for their recreation site choices. Research findings on recreate sute selection suggest that minority recreation as an activity done outside the home leads participants to seek “bigger backyard” spaces with characteristics and facilities suitable for family and large group use. The methodological approach of investigating minority recreation in positive terms leads to a clearer understanding of factors driving recreation differences.

Introduction

Oprah Winfrey received a letter from a United States national park ranger who expressed dismay at the low number of African-Americans that visit national parks each year. According to the 2000 National Park Service Comprehensive Survey of the

---

1 Coauthored by Jodie Madsen, Claudia Radel, and Joanna Endter-Wada
American Public, 36% of white non-Hispanic respondents visited a national park unit within the previous two years. During the same time period, a lower percentage of Hispanic (27%) and African American (13%) respondents indicated a visit to a national park (Solop, Hagen, & Ostergren, 2003). In response to the ranger’s letter, Winfrey and her friend Gale King embarked on a 2010 camping trip to Yosemite National Park. Through her visit, Oprah brought to light for many Americans a pattern researchers have studied for years.

The majority of previous research in minority recreation participation has been aimed at uncovering what constraints preclude minority groups from engaging specifically in public wildland recreation, because minorities are not present in wildlands to the same extent as are other segments of the population (Washburne, 1978). The goal of the research has been to determine if those constraints impede what would otherwise be a large demand for participation or if the recreational differences are due to cultural variations in recreation preferences. Other research has verified minorities are indeed found in urban parks and similar areas, where they are primarily engaged in unstructured, large group recreation activities (Scott & Kim, 1998).

Today, fairness considerations dictate that we meet the recreation needs of the growing Hispanic/Latino\(^2\) population. Currently, Hispanics/Latinos constitute 16.3% of the nation’s population (United States Census Bureau, 2010a). The U.S. Census Bureau predicts that by the year 2050, Hispanics will make up 30.25% of the total U.S.

---

\(^2\) As both Hispanic and Latino can refer to geographically specific ethnicities, the combination Hispanic/Latino is used in this paper to refer to participants ethnically identifying with Central America, South America, or the Caribbean.
population (United States Census Bureau, 2008). In Cache County, Utah, persons of Hispanic origin constitute 10% of the population (United States Census Bureau, 2010b), but in 2007 they made up only 6.2% of the visits to the nearby Wasatch-Cache National Forest (U.S.D.A. Forest Service, 2010). The story is similar in many recreation areas across the country. Stark differences between Hispanics/Latinos and the majority Anglo population exist in their observed use of both urban and wildland recreation areas, and while attention has been given to the topic, racialized recreation continues to exist in many places across the country (Phillip, 2000).

The field of recreation geography can contribute to the study of difference in recreation patterns with attention to where people recreate, as opposed to their failure to conform to majority group patterns. Recreation geographers concern themselves with three basic components of human geography: people, places, and activities. They seek to identify, explain, and predict the spatial patterns of these three elements in order to understand their interactions (Hall & Page, 2006). In this chapter we investigate and identify the spatial recreation patterns of the Cache Valley Hispanic/Latino community and explore a preliminary explanation for those patterns. We focus our presentation on where study participants recreate and why they choose those sites, with emphasis on the characteristics of the sites themselves and the goals of the recreationists. Elsewhere we explore deeper causal explanations for where study participants recreate, but also for where they do not (see Chapter 3). With the growth of a culturally distinct and structurally disadvantaged minority group comes the challenge to accommodate cultural diversity in a manner that is non-divisive and socially favorable, as well as to achieve
social justice in access to public resources. In the country’s recreation areas addressing
this challenge means finding the most appropriate ways to reorient and redistribute
services to meet the needs and circumstances of a changing society. Therefore, it also
becomes essential to understand how those users conceptualize recreation, which sites are
being utilized, and what drives decisions about recreation for minorities. With a better
understanding of the interaction between the elements of people, place, and activity,
recreation agencies and their managers can begin to make strategic plans to “invite,
include, and involve” ethnic minorities in recreation (Chavez, 2000), and ensure that they
are welcomed in all recreation areas. A more complete understanding of where
Hispanics/Latinos recreate and, more importantly, why they go there will help managers
recognize the needs and meet the expectations of all their visitors and of all members of
this growing segment of the population.

Even more critically, at the level of society and state, we can begin a more
productive dialogue around the distribution and fair management of public spaces and of
various types of recreation resources. Failure to do so may well mean policies will not
appropriately reflect the needs of minority group populations. The result could be a
portion of the population that is disconnected from recreation opportunities and important
public goods, raising concerns of environmental (in)justice and (un)equal access to the
benefits recreation spaces provide.

**Literature Review**

Major research of minority leisure patterns began in the 1970s and has since
produced a good deal of literature, the majority of which discusses the causes for low or
non-participation of minorities in traditional majority recreation activities. Particular attention is given to wildland recreation, as national surveys consistently indicate ethnic minority visits to United States National Forests are significantly less frequent than visits by whites (U.S.D.A. Forest Service, 2010). A large portion of research centers specifically on black under-participation in outdoor recreation on public land. However, the fast growth in Hispanic population prompted more recent studies (Chavez & Olson, 2009; Scott, Herra & Hunt, 2004) to center on recreation activities by that segment of the population.

In attempts to discuss the differences that exist between majority and minority recreation patterns, past research took a decidedly Anglo-conformist perspective. This research endeavored to identify the barriers that kept minority recreation from being the same as Anglo recreation. Several theories emerged from this work: the two most prominent became known as the marginality and ethnicity theories.

The marginality theory suggests the general marginal position of minorities in society is a result of external, preventive factors. As Washburne (1978) summarized, these factors include a lifestyle constrained by unmet basic needs (poverty), poor transportation, and limited opportunities due to an urban “ghetto” residence. Within the marginality theory is the idea that both historical and present racism and discrimination serve as barriers and constraints to minority recreation (Blahna & Black, 1993; Floyd, 1998).

The ethnicity theory contends leisure is a reflection of culture; there are inherent differences in cultural values and norms that influence recreation choices. Normative and
perceptive values maintained by minority groups can be affected by a variety of elements and be passed down over time. For example, a history of slavery for African-Americans contributes to wildlands carrying connotations of rural servitude and fear (Washburne, 1978). Cultural values such as the importance of the individual versus the collective group can also lead to group differences in leisure behaviors (Walker, Deng, & Dieser, 2005). Related to the ethnicity theory are the conclusions that assimilation (boundary reduction between differing culture groups) and acculturation (adoption of dominant culture characteristics) of a minority group will alter their patterns of recreation participation toward that of the dominant group (Carr & Williams, 1993; Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Shaull & Gramann, 1998). Other researchers continue to support the ethnicity theory through work investigating social organization, implying that social group organizational differences, such as the traditional family-oriented culture of Mexican-Americans, may help explain differences in recreation choices between minorities and the general population (Hutchison & Fidel, 1984).

Some of the more recent research asserts a combination of ethnicity and marginality theories is the best avenue for answering why there are differences in minority group recreation patterns. The authors commonly state differences in social marginality status and ethnic preferences lead to a complex interaction of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints affecting recreation behaviors of minorities (Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991; Gomez, 2002; Juniu, 2000; Scott, Herrerra, & Hunt, 2004). Marginality and ethnicity may well be inextricably linked as the marginal
position of ethnic minorities in a society, especially over time, shapes the norms and values of the group.

Another distinction is made in minority leisure research that affects its ability to speak to recreation research as a whole. Much of past and present research focuses on one of two categories of recreation: urban or wildland. Generally, urban recreation includes activities that take place in highly developed areas within close proximity to municipal districts, such as city parks. On the other hand, wildland recreation incorporates activities that take place in more natural, less developed areas such as national forests or rangelands, national parks, and wilderness areas. While not always explicitly stated, this delineation between urban and wildland recreation inherently turns the focus of the research to one type or the other, often asking, “why not there?”

A great deal of researchers over decades have taken a forest-centered approach and attempted to investigate why minorities do not frequent wildland recreation areas or participate in wildland recreation activities on U.S. national forests on in proportion with their population in society (Carr & Williams, 1993; Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Scott, Hererra & Hunt, 2004; Washburne, 1978). These findings can often be categorized as aligning with either the marginality or ethnicity theories, or a combination thereof, stating that the more minority recreationists become more economically and socially similar to the majority population, the more their recreation patterns also become similar to that of the majority. However, practically none of these studies asked where the participants actually were recreating, if not in wildlands.
Research on recreation behaviors of Hispanics/Latinos within the national forests is exemplified through the work of Deborah Chavez of the Pacific Southwest Research Station of the U.S. National Forest Service. Working within the Angeles National Forest in California, Chavez and her colleagues find Latino survey respondents consistently rate the availability of amenities as important or very important, or otherwise desire the development of sites (Chavez, 2002; Chavez & Olson, 2009). Other studies support these findings as well, indicating Latinos recreate at sites where picnic opportunities exist, especially those with access to water either for activities or scenery (Chavez, 2001; Sasidharan, Willits, & Godbey, 2005). Researchers also documented the importance of places that could accommodate families and large groups, often for team activities like playing soccer, or picnicking and socializing. As Carr and Chavez (1993) found, differences often exist within seemingly uniform activity categories. For example, picnicking for Latinos tends to be an all-day event including on-site preparation of meals, and almost always includes nuclear and extended family members. These studies again focus only on forest recreation among minorities, but do attempt to identify the factors driving choices of particular recreation sites within the broader management category.

Some of the first investigations into minority leisure were done on urban park use in the early 1970s. Since then, many other studies attempted to explain the role urban parks play as recreation places for minorities (Blahna & Black, 1993; Hutchison & Fidel, 1984; McMillen, 1983). This line of research generally concludes social organization, racism, and isolation from Anglo culture affects the practice of minorities to prefer urban parks and recreation areas. However, the research rarely attempts to ask what it is about
the specific urban recreation space that draws participants there instead of to other places. It focuses on explanations for what drives minorities to urban spaces in general, often incorporating cultural and ethnicity-based interpretations of group recreation preferences.

An often overlooked critique about minority recreation research is that researchers frequently assume everyone in a study has the same understanding and definition of leisure (Parr & Lashua, 2004) or recreation. How participants conceptualize recreation will conceivably impact their behaviors and preferences, as well as affect their frame of reference when responding to questions. Most research in the field fails to define recreation and often imposes a boundary on places of recreation, overwhelmingly focusing on outdoor recreation, with much of this outdoor recreation conceptualized by researchers as occurring in wildland locations. Evidence suggests ethnic identity plays a role in the meaning of recreation (Parr & Lashua, 2004). Therefore, when trying to understand the greater landscape of recreation patterns, respondents must be allowed to define for themselves what that recreation includes.

The perception that racialized spatial patterns exist within recreation warrants continued explorations of the topic. As Kelly (1999) stated, “Leisure is ethnic…It is separate from nothing that significantly affects our lives” (p. 145). By attempting to uncover the geography of Hispanic/Latino recreation in Cache Valley, Utah, this study endeavors to build upon the existing body of research highlighting the intersection of the marginality and ethnicity explanatory theories, and to expand this body of research through insights to be gained from a broader spatial lens of focus. By drawing upon recreation geography and exploring the diverse patterns and processes associated with
recreation on the landscape (Smith, 1983), this study seeks to extend the discussion beyond forests versus city parks, allowing participants to identify recreation as they perceive it. This study attempts to uncover what minority recreation is rather than solely focus on what it is not. As no previous in-depth research has been done in Utah regarding minority recreation, this study intends to add to both the local and national discussion by identifying what embodies recreation for Hispanic/Latino participants, where they go to engage in it, and what site characteristics attract them to these places.

Methods

Site

Cache County, Utah, like much of the United States, has experienced an increase in immigrant workers over the last several decades. Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin make up nearly 10% of the population, by far the county’s largest minority group (United States Census Bureau, 2010b). Cache County, also often referred to as Cache Valley\(^3\), incorporates approximately 26 different communities, with the majority of minorities living in the cities of Logan and Hyrum.

With the increasing minority population, community access issues are now beginning to garner some public attention. Public and private recreation opportunities abound in Cache Valley, making it an ideal site to explore how those places are utilized by the rapidly growing Hispanic/Latino population. Within the county’s borders are

---

\(^3\) Cache Valley is technically in both Cache County, Utah and Franklin County, Idaho. Cache County covers only the southern portion of the valley which is also where the population is concentrated.
found a variety of recreation opportunities including federal, state, and municipal sites. The Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest is quite literally in residents’ backyard and is traversed by the Logan Canyon Scenic Byway that begins in the city of Logan. Along the western edge of the county is the Wellsville Mountain Wilderness Area, and the eastern edge hosts the Mount Naomi Wilderness Area. These areas lie within the national forest, which also maintains numerous trails, picnic sites, and campgrounds outside the designated wilderness areas. Numerous rivers run through the valley, there are several small lakes, and reservoirs have been created throughout the county. The southern end of the valley hosts Hyrum Lake State Park, the county’s largest reservoir with abundant fishing, boating, and camping opportunities. A variety of municipal facilities are available throughout Logan and its surrounding communities including numerous parks, nature trails, recreation centers, museums, and a zoo. Cache County also offers its residents a wide variety of private indoor and outdoor recreation options, from skiing to indoor rock climbing and bowling to horse riding.

Participants

Participants in this study were a convenience sample of volunteers from within the Latino community of Cache Valley. Participants were referred to the study by a friend or colleague through a snowball technique, meaning at the conclusion of each interview, participants were asked to refer others who might be interested in participating in the study. Thirty in-depth interviews were conducted, 21 (70%) of which were with female respondents and 9 (30%) of which were with male respondents. Table 1.1
conveys the basic demographic respondent information revealed through observation and in responses to interview questions.

Table 1.1: Demographics of Respondents
n=30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Positive Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Spanish/English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residency in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were all first generation immigrant residents with varying levels of English ability. Twenty-four of the participants preferred to have the interview conducted solely in Spanish, with four preferring English, and two using a mixture of both languages. The ages of participants ranged from their early 20s to their 60s, most of whom (23) were married with children. One was married with no children, and six
respondents were single (three with no children and three with grandchildren). Length of residency in the United States ranged from 6 months to 26 years with the average residency being approximately 12 years. The majority of participants (21) self identified as being Mexican in nationality, with the rest identifying as either Venezuelan, Peruvian, Dominican, Guatemalan, Uruguayan, or Salvadoran. Participants were engaged in a variety of occupations, including university students, business owners, and day laborers. Although this was not a random sample survey, the characteristics of the participants are typical of the relatively new, diverse, and growing demographic status of the Hispanic/Latino community in Cache County.

Data Instrument/Data Collection

The primary objective of the larger study was to investigate decision drivers for recreation location choices among Hispanics/Latinos in Cache Valley. To achieve this objective, researchers employed an exploratory, qualitative approach based on grounded theory, a strategy often used when a researcher is attempting to understand the view of participants and to describe meanings of actions from their perspective (Creswell, 2009). Semi-structured interview questions were aimed at uncovering three essential elements: how participants conceptualize recreation, how participants operationalize recreation through where they visit and do not visit, and what participants view as the greatest influences on their recreation choices. To allow for open communication of views, interviews were audio-recorded and then later transcribed in full, requiring minimal researcher notes to focus on highlights and significant ideas or statements provided by
participants, and to allow the researcher to concentrate on prompting for more in-depth responses.

The study was conducted in two phases. The first (largely preliminary) phase focused on recreation public officials and their general observations of local recreation patterns. The second (core) phase focused on local Hispanics/Latinos and their perspectives on their own behaviors. As an exploratory study, the purpose was to first determine the spatial patterns of recreation for participants, and then move into a discussion of what drives participant recreation location choices. Choosing not to focus on one pre-determined type of (e.g., outdoor, wildland) or site for (e.g., national forest, city park) of recreation allowed the study to maintain its exploratory focus, looking at recreation with non-dominant populations differently methodologically instead of looking at them as different from majority recreation patterns.

Data gathered from the public officials during the first phase of the study served as investigative information about recreation patterns in Cache Valley from the perspective of key informants with federal, state, and local public recreation management agencies. The purpose of this phase was to help researchers understand what recreation managers view as patterns and changes in Hispanic/Latino recreation across the valley, and how their agency is responding to Latino recreation use. Six key informant interviews were conducted with public officials from recreation management agencies in Cache Valley including the Uintah-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Hyrum State Park, Logan Parks and Recreation, and Hyrum Parks and Recreation (Appendix A). The recreation managers were asked to report on their observations of Hispanic/Latino
visitors to recreation areas within their jurisdiction, as well as any actions their agency has taken to meet the needs of Hispanic/Latino recreationists (Appendix B). This information served as an introductory and exploratory data-gathering phase designed to gain a better overview of Latino recreation patterns in Cache Valley, with no detailed data coding or analysis taking place.

Phase Two of the study involved a deeper investigatory, exploratory research process with the recreationists themselves. Data collected during this phase became the foundation upon which this chapter’s analysis is focused. This phase involved 30 semi-structured interviews lasting approximately 60 minutes each, in which interviewees were prompted to reflect on their views and decisions regarding recreation for themselves and their families. The researcher allowed respondents to determine what activities and places are part of their personal concept of recreation. In order to provide some context to respondents and make the process as systematic as possible, a substantial list of potential local recreation places and activities was provided to each participant immediately before and during the interview (Appendix C). Participants were reminded to answer interview questions based on their personal definition and perception of recreation, even if the locations and activities did not appear on the provided lists.

The researcher began by asking each participant to describe or define what recreation means to him or her. After some basic information questions about when and with whom recreation generally takes place, respondents were asked to identify locations throughout the valley they visit for recreation purposes, and to comment on why they choose those locations. Respondents were then asked to identify and comment on places
they would like to visit but have not yet visited. Following this, respondents were asked to identify and explain the recreation places they have no interest in or would likely never visit. Participants were also asked what would have to change in order for them to start visiting sites they currently do not. Following this, participants were asked to state if and how specific recreation constraints (prompted) affect their recreation choices, with identified constraints pulled from the existing literature. Participants were additionally asked what role they felt being Hispanic or Latino played their recreation choices (Appendix D).

As participants spoke about the places they visit, want to visit but do not, and do not want to visit, a map of the valley was used to mark locations with color-coded stickers corresponding to those three categories. A larger-scale map of Logan City was used for the identification of sites within the cities of Logan, North Logan, and Providence. A smaller scale map of the county was used to mark places outside the central Logan area (Appendix E). All the interviews were conducted, translated, and transcribed by the first author in order to ensure consistent translation of all research data and materials from Spanish to English.

Analysis

Each of the interviewee color-coded maps were compiled into one aggregate map in order to conduct a spatial analysis of locations utilized by participants. This process revealed several pieces of information about sites respondents visited, wanted to visit, and did not have interest in visiting. Clear groupings of sites visited by multiple respondents were revealed, showing which were the most commonly mentioned sites and
their locations compared to each other (Appendix F). This mapping process also aided in an analysis of the dispersal across the valley of recreation places used by interviewees. Distance as a driver or constraint to recreation was discussed in the interviews, and the map analysis provided a spatial component to seeing the actual spread and diversity in places most utilized by interviewees. Every site mentioned was also later categorized by researchers according to the management/tenure agency that oversees it, as either a federal, state, municipal, or private recreation site. Counting how many respondents mentioned sites within each of these four categories revealed the management/tenure diversity in types of sites that are visited, desired, or undesired by participants, as well as how common these responses were among participants.

Open-ended responses from the semi-structured interviews received another type of analysis. During review of each transcription, the researcher coded and organized information based on common responses throughout the interview. Commonalities in desired site characteristics revealed themes in the recreation decision process and highlighted important aspects of participants’ choices about where to go. In order to maintain consistency in theme development and ensure coding reliability, transcripts were reviewed and independently coded in full by the senior author at least twice. Key representative quotes were identified during a third read-through for illustrative use. This chapter focuses on the portion of the data regarding what recreation means for participants, where it takes place and why they choose those locations. Results focusing on where participants are not recreating and why are reported elsewhere (see Chapter 3).
Results/Findings

Manager Perspectives and Observations

Interviews with national forest, state park, and city recreation managers, revealed all three managing agencies experienced an increase in usage of their sites by Hispanics/Latinos, more specifically usage of outdoor sites with developed facilities such as bathrooms and picnic tables. These local managers perceive that Hispanics/Latinos prefer large group capacity, day-use facilities with areas sufficient enough to allow picnicking and/or participation in sports activities (specifically soccer or basketball). State park and national forest managers reported visits to their sites by Hispanics/Latinos increase significantly on Sundays and focus on use of water resources, almost exclusively for fishing from the banks, and often include family picnics. While both the national forest and state park agencies maintain numerous campsites and hiking trails, managers state that nearly all users of those are Anglo.

Logan City Parks and Recreation managers also commented on the extremely low participation by Hispanics/Latinos in the Logan-based recreation center and city-organized recreation leagues. While some growth of participation in youth soccer leagues has occurred, participation by adults in the many recreation offerings by the city remains practically non-existent. In 2008, the Hispanic Health Coalition conducted a focus group to investigate what the Hispanic/Latino population knows about the Logan City Parks and Recreation programs and facilities. They found the Hispanic/Latino population is generally uninformed about Logan’s recreation programs and facilities, and that time, money, language, and geographic location of the recreation center may
preclude participation in some programs. Information from this focus group was made available to city officials who expressed interest in understanding the Hispanic/Latino portion of the population better.

However, little has been done by the national forest, state park, or city recreation agencies to reach out specifically to the Hispanic/Latino residents because managers felt their recreation desires were already being met. The only limitation noted by agency interviewees was that of providing regulatory signage in Spanish focusing on adverse effects to sites and facilities that could accompany increased usage. These basic and common observations by the manager key informant interviewees contrast with the key themes revealed by analysis of the individual Hispanic/Latino participant interviews.

Hispanic/Latino Resident Interviews

Conceptualization of Recreation. When local Hispanic/Latino respondents were asked to provide their personal definition of recreation, seven key characteristics were mentioned that frame their conceptualization of what makes recreation. For the respondents in this study, recreation is defined as one or more of the following: fun/enjoyment, being with others/family, being outside the home, rest/relaxation, outdoors/in fresh air, a planned activity, or a physical activity. Of the 30 participants, two said they do not use the word recreation in Spanish, or “recreación,” and instead use terms like “convivir” and “salir a divertirse.” Directly translated the term “convivir” means to coexist, but it is often used to express the concept of spending enjoyable time with others. “Salir a divertirse” translates as going out to have fun/enjoy oneself. Both of these participants provided a definition of what it was to “convivir” or “salir a
divertirse,” identifying the same characteristics as the other 28 participants that defined the word “recreación.”

Three characteristics in participants’ definitions were most commonly mentioned. Fifteen of the 30 participants’ definition (50%) included a statement that recreation was specifically done for fun or enjoyment. Nearly as common (46%) were the statements that recreation is something done with others, most often family, and that recreation is done outside the home (including indoor and outdoor locations). For some respondents, all three characteristics made up their definition of recreation, illustrated by statements such as, “Recreation for me is going out…to have fun…to do activities with family or with friends.” Another respondent said it similarly, “To me recreation is going out to have fun for a bit as a family; to enjoy a good time with my kids and my husband.” However, for some respondents one of the characteristics took priority in their definition of recreation, just as this man explained: “More than anything it’s the time that one can spend with people, whether it’s family or people you have fun with, friends, etc. Being alone isn’t really in my definition of recreation.”

Recreation defined as rest or relaxation was mentioned by nine of the participants (30%), often indicating that it was to help de-stress. “[Recreation is] something outside of work that you do to kind of relax and enjoy. [It is] something fun and it doesn’t have to be physical or anything, it can also just be to quiet the mind.”

Six of the 30 respondents (20%) stated recreation was defined as only taking place outdoors or in the fresh air, or “aire libre,” with one participant describing, “I don’t think of it so much as in the house. I see it as outside. It’s always in fresh air.” Less
commonly mentioned but still an important aspect of their definition of recreation for four of the participants (13%) was that it is something that must be planned, or as a respondent stated, “designating the time for recreation, like planning it.”

While most of the respondents indicated recreation could include physical activities like sports, for only two of the participants (7%) did the definition of recreation require a physical element. One participant explained, “Recreation is going out on walks or [bike] rides….a physical activity.” For the majority of respondents in this study, recreation did not mean engaging in specific activities in specific places, but was more about gathering with friends or family outside the home and having fun.

After describing their conceptualization of recreation, participants were also asked if and how their definition of pastime or “pasatiempo” was different from recreation. When respondents considered the word in the context of describing the places they go and activities they do, 24 of the 30 participants (80%) stated they considered the words recreation and pastimes to be interchangeable. Reflecting on pastime versus recreation, six participants (20%) felt that recreation was more indicative of outdoor places and activities, requiring more planning or effort than regular pastime activities.

“Pastime I say is going outside here to play ball with my kids, football. Or let’s say pastime is going to the gas station that’s close. Recreation, I say is planned, going further away, taking food, inviting more family, more people, friends, sometimes neighbors.”

Mapping activity and site categorization: Where Do they Go? Findings from the mapping activity important to this article include locations participants identified as those they use for recreation activities. Although the home was mentioned by some respondents, those same participants also indicated that the activities they engaged in at
home were not as much recreation as they were “pastimes” or “pasatiempos.” As one participant explained: “Occasionally we play here at home. But I call it a pastime, playing some games here with my kids and neighbors.” Another spoke of gardening at home: “We have some space in the back…so I plant. I always have my tomatoes in my garden. I do it and can them to make salsa. But it’s something I do as a pastime.” Therefore, the analysis presented here is focused on places outside of the participants’ homes.

The mapping activity gathered information on recreation locations visited by each respondent. This technique revealed the sample frequency of specific visited sites as each place mentioned was marked, even if they were all located in areas managed by the same recreation agency, such as the National Forest Service. By marking the individual locations during the interviews and then compiling all the maps into one, clear patterns emerged revealing which sites are visited by multiple respondents. Three Logan City parks (Willow Park, Merlin Olsen Park, and Canyon Entrance Park) are visited by the greatest number of respondents. Other municipal sites also dominated the respondent recreation scene. Although half of the respondents live in Hyrum City, which is located approximately nine miles south of Logan City, the same three Logan City parks were most commonly mentioned by all participants. The park visited by the greatest number of respondents (Willow Park) is also the park located within what is observed to be the geographic concentration of Hispanic/Latino residences in Logan City (Appendix F). Note that the research design did not assess frequency of use by respondents and
therefore we do not distinguish between sites visited regularly or occasionally, for example.

Other clusters became apparent through the mapping activity indicating Logan and Blacksmith Fork Canyons, part of the larger Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest system, are popular destination choices for many respondents. However, the sites most commonly mentioned are those clustered around the mouths of the canyons on the border between the cities (Logan and Hyrum) and the National Forest. Two of these sites are parks actually maintained by the cities of Logan and Hyrum within their Parks and Recreation Departments. Sites in the National Forest most mentioned are those with access to water near the small dams along Logan River or the Blacksmith Fork River.

Lakes were also revealed to be popular places for respondents with definite clusters forming around Hyrum Lake State Park and Bear Lake. While Bear Lake, located 45 miles to the northeast of Logan City, is not technically in Cache Valley, nearly every interviewee mentioned visits to its state park as a yearly recreation destination. Consequently, it is included in the analysis and grouped together with Hyrum Lake within the state park category.

A simple spatial analysis of the location map created by combining all the individual participant maps shows that while sites visited for recreation are located all over the Valley, the sites most utilized are relatively close to each other. Although Cache Valley is not an urban county with high population density, the three places most often mentioned by participants during the mapping exercise are all located within four miles
of each other. The two furthest places mentioned other than Bear Lake (and each of these
was mentioned only once), are located a full 28 miles from each other.

Using the details about sites mentioned during the interviews, researchers
subsequently assigned a management/tenure category to each site (municipal, state,
federal, and private), then identified which of the four categories each interviewee used
for recreation. This was not an attempt to count every mention each participant made
about their use of sites within the four categories, as the mapping activity is a visual
representation of that information. Instead, even one mention of a visit to or activity
within a category of sites was recorded as a positive response by the participant. Table
1.2 compares prevalence of use for the four categories of sites mentioned by the
participants, and Table 1.3 details the frequency of specific sites within those categories.

Table 1.2: Types of Sites Visited by Respondents
n=30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management/Tenure Category</th>
<th># of Positive Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Tenure Category</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td># of Participants Mentioning Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Canyon Entrance Park (First Dam)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willow Park</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willow Park Zoo</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merlin Olsen Park</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrum Canyon Park</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan Aquatic Center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adams Park</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Fair/Rodeo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition Derby/Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackhawk Area Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrum City Center Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan’s Place Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan Recreation Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan River Golf Course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan River Trail</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Festivals/Parades</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nibley Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan Skate Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Eccles Theater</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Crest H.S. Pool</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan City Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrum Town Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellsville Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Logan Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zollinger Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cliffside Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart Nature Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridgerland park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lundstrum Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smithfield Golf Course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bear Lake State Parks</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrum Lake State Park</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USU Anthropology Museum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USU Old Main Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USU Campus/Theaters</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Tenure Category</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td># of Participants Mentions Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Logan Canyon</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacksmith Fork Canyon</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Dam</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Forest (General)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Forest Campground</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific National Forest Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stokes Nature Trail</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wind Cave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Ephraim’s Grave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jardine Juniper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoshone Trail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naomi’s Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Grove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic Areas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware Ranch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellsville</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mendon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bear River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amalga</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smithfield Canyon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Canyon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Dam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avon Area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paradise Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providence Canyon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birch Creek Canyon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fun Park</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movie Theater</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stores/Shopping</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ice Rink</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock Climbing Gym</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaver Mountain Ski Resort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shooting Range</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American West Heritage Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All 30 participants (100%) indicated they had used municipal recreation sites at least once while living in Cache Valley. City parks, including the Willow Park Zoo, dominate as the kinds of sites visited within the municipal category. In addition to city parks, several other municipal sites were mentioned by many respondents, including the golf course (where there is also a public trail), the high school swimming pool, town museums, Logan City Recreation and Aquatics Center, the rodeo and other activities at the county fairgrounds, and the annual town parades and festivals held throughout the Valley. While a great diversity of municipal sites were mentioned, no one particular site was mentioned with regularity other than specific city parks.

State recreation sites, especially Bear Lake and Hyrum Lake State Parks, were also a common type of site utilized, with 22 (73%) of the respondents indicating they had visited one of those sites at least once. It should be noted that Utah State University, which is included within the State category, provides very different types of recreation locations when compared to the two lake parks included in the same category. The University locations identified in the interviews included the Museum of Anthropology as well as plays and concerts hosted on campus. However, just as many references to the University were connected to a popular hill used for outdoor sledding during the winter time.

Visits to federal recreation sites were the lowest reported category. Seventeen of the 30 participants (57%) indicated they had used a federal site at least once. The most popular use of federal sites were the picnic areas and campgrounds located just off of Highway 89 in Logan Canyon. Smithfield, Blacksmith Fork, and Green Canyons were
also mentioned as sites within the federal category, but were associated only with picnicking, not with camping. While other sites were mentioned, including specific hiking, ATV, cross-country ski and snowshoe trails, as well as fishing spots, these did not receive the multiple references the picnic and camping areas did.

Use of private business recreation sites was about as common as the use of federal sites. Of the 30 participants, 18 (60%) indicated they had visited a private site at least once. The business mentioned most often was the Cache Valley Fun Park, an indoor arena with an arcade, roller-skating rink, bowling alley, laser tag room, and soft play area for young children. However, several other businesses were mentioned including another bowling alley, a health club, movie theaters, an indoor ice-skating rink, a ski resort in Logan Canyon, an indoor rock climbing gym, a shooting range, local restaurants and stores, and The American West Heritage Center that is open year-round and hosts several large annual themed events. This category proved to have the most diversity in the kinds of recreation places identified.

It is important also to note the references to sites utilized primarily during the winter, which in Cache Valley generally lasts from November to April. Throughout the 30 interviews, winter-related activities and sites were mentioned by only six people (20%). Sled hills, the ski resort, a snowshoe and cross-country trail, and the outdoor ice rink at one of the city parks were the only outdoor winter recreation sites participants indicated they had visited. These sites cross all four previously described categories (municipal, state, federal and private). Twenty-four (80%) of the respondents indicated summer is the primary season for their visits to recreation sites. One participant voiced a
common sentiment among respondents: “I came from a country that’s really warm, so I can’t bear the cold. I don’t like it much, so I prefer to stay in my house.” Several respondents mentioned indoor winter recreation sites, with either the movie theater or the Cache Valley Fun Park being the only recreation sites they visit in the winter. As explained by one participant: “In the winter we go to the Fun Park. It’s a place that’s inside, so it’s a place we go to when it’s winter.”

**Decision drivers: Why do they go there?** Considerable research has been conducted on constraints for minority recreation, seeking to explain why their patterns are different from majority Anglo recreation patterns (Crawford et al., 1991; Floyd, 1998; Scott et al., 2004; Washburne, 1978). In this study, researchers sought to focus less on explaining how and why Hispanic/Latino recreation was different, and more on where and why Hispanics/Latinos do choose to recreate. Therefore, development of common themes uncovered during the 30 interviews centered primarily on characteristics about the locations that explain why respondents visited those particular places. These site characteristic “decision drivers” are those elements that respondents described as attractive and which drew them, often repeatedly, to those particular sites for recreation.

An analysis of common themes resulted in the development of six categories for why a respondent visited their chosen recreation locations: facilities, family suitability, scenery, activity, seclusion, and proximity (Table 1.4). These themes identify various physical characteristics and elements associated with the recreation site itself.
Table 1.4: Recreation Site Characteristics Decision Drivers

n=30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Positive Responses</th>
<th>% of total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Suitability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seclusion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities provided at the recreation location proved to be an important characteristic preferred by respondents. Of the 30 participants, 24 (80%) indicated they visited at least one of their recreation locations because of its developed facilities. These included sites from all four categories, and referred to such facilities as bathrooms, children’s play sets, BBQ grills, pavilions, tracks or trails, water fountains, campgrounds, and open fields for sports. As described by one participant: “We look for a place where everything is ready. We pay…a little money, and they let us in and they have all the services. We like places where there are all the services.” Speaking of fishing locations, another respondent described it this way: “It’s kept up really clean by the Forest Service…there’s a restroom there for the kids and the family can use it. There’s a little grassy area where the kids can run around and we enjoy that.” Another spoke of the pond and park near the mouth of Logan Canyon: “[I go there because] it has bathrooms for the family, it’s close, you can go walk all the way around it, and it has a park for playing, and tables.” Sites visited within the National Forest are almost entirely the developed sites, often for camping or picnicking, with bathrooms, tables, and fire pits. Therefore, physical development of sites and facilities built on those sites are important.
characteristics of recreation locations for participants in this study. Of all respondents, only three mentioned using the forest in less developed areas, one for hiking, one for camping, and one for riding ATVs.

*Family suitability* also emerged as highly important; 22 interviewees (73%) indicated they chose certain places because they could take their family there. This most often referred to the participant’s own children or grandchildren and meant the location provided something beneficial to children in particular. As one grandmother respondent put it:

> “I think the kids feel good, that they feel free to run here and there...They can climb trees that one doesn’t have at home, and there’s space for the whole family. They also can get together with other kids and make friends.”

Others indicated appreciation of sites that offered something for both children and adults to enjoy together. “Going out to eat at a restaurant, I call it recreation because we go as a family and we’re together enjoying it.” Another respondent spoke of a developed trail near the mouth of Logan Canyon: “We can go as a family, some on bike and others walking. [But not hiking or climbing up]...just simple and easy.” Still others gave responses indicating the location was visited because it could accommodate extended family get-togethers, such as birthday parties or family picnics. “I love it there because…it’s big. It’s one we choose for the whole family. It’s a big family on my husband’s side.”

*Scenery* proved to also be a popular characteristic as 19 participants (63%) indicated they chose recreation locations because they provided some kind of scenic aspect, including animals, plant-life, water, fresh air, and attractive views. As one
woman put it: “You can go and discover nature.” Another spoke of scenery this way: “I like it because it’s fresh, there’s a lot of air because there are plenty of trees. And one can relax by the water too. There’s a lot of space.” Water in particular was a popular scenic element for respondents, as they indicated having a stream flow by or watching the water while sitting along the banks of a pond or lake was a particular draw to them. “I like to go to the rivers because there are really pretty landscapes to be with the family and see nature, because nature is really pretty.”

Water also played an important role in some participants’ preferences in recreation location because of specific activities it could support. This theme or classification of activity is based upon comments by 19 (63%) participants indicating they choose some of their recreation places because they contain designated areas for specific activities in which they like to engage. These included soccer fields, volleyball and basketball courts, skiing and ATV trails, fishing ponds, and museums. One respondent’s husband used a site for fishing, and she also indicated the activities that took her to that site: “I love getting wet myself, that’s why I always go where there’s water. That’s basically where I go: the water or the volleyball court.” Another respondent spoke of the historical sites and museums scattered across the Valley as a means of education: “If I live in a city, I go to visit the museum to inform myself. For example, if I see an old building and it has information about the first ones that arrived, I see and read why they came, things like that.”

The fact that some places provide an element of seclusion is also of some import. Just over a third of the respondents (11) identified being able to go somewhere less
crowded, distanced from the city, where there is less noise and one can relax, was a characteristic that drew them to those places. Speaking of the city park near the mouth of the canyon, one participant described it this way: “It’s a place, for me personally, where I can go to feel peace outside of the city.” Yet another spoke of seclusion in terms of its relaxation properties: “Going to the canyon there’s lots of trees and one can go de-stress.”

**Proximity**, while not as commonly mentioned by respondents, still is an important characteristic as nine of the 30 respondents (30%) said that they choose some locations because they are close to their house and they can easily access these sites. “A lot of the time we choose this place because if something were ever to happen, we’re close to home; we’re not too far.” Another commenter spoke of a trail near the golf course in her neighborhood saying, “It’s really close, we get there by walking.”

**Discussion**

By one definition, recreation is what we do when we are free to choose (Broadhurst, 2001). In addition to choosing what to do and with whom, a primary element of recreation is deciding where to spend that time. The so-called ethnicity of leisure has been investigated by researchers for decades, producing evidence that a mix of cultural elements shapes the many aspects of leisure for participants. However, culture is not the only element influencing choices in recreation among minorities and it has been shown that recreation choices involve a complex interplay of many decision drivers and constraints. Leisure, as a culturally learned behavior and matter of custom and habit, more directly influences what recreation means and what is perceived as leisure through the concepts encouraged in a given culture (Kelly, 1999; Mannell, 2005). These
perceptions in turn influence how participants operationalize recreation in their own lives, in conjunction with other types of constraints and decision drivers better characterized as structural.

Allowing each participant to determine the scope of “recreation” for himself or herself, and respond accordingly, this study captured some of the key elements important to participants’ conceptualization of recreation and identified the prevalence of those elements among all the respondents. The fact that half of all respondents stated recreation is defined as something done for enjoyment, with others, and outside the home shows a strong pattern of agreement among participants. For the majority of participants recreation was not defined by the activity, but rather by the purpose for which one does it (enjoyment or relaxation), with whom it occurs (family or others), and where it takes place (outside the home or in the fresh air). Thus, our main finding is that, for this group of respondents, recreation entails seeking space to gather with others and have fun.

How this goal maps to specific recreation places or sites is key to the discussion of the landscape of recreation. While opinions differed as to the kind of place in which recreation could occur (i.e., whether it included indoor and outdoor spaces equally), it becomes obvious when looking at the places participants visit that recreation does not generally include wild or undeveloped outdoor spaces. The strong preferences among Hispanics/Latinos in this study for recreation sites with scenery, facilities, and family suitability remain consistent with previous findings (Chavez 2002; Chavez & Olson, 2009). Participants generally saw recreation as something done outside the home because, for most participants in this study, their home spaces did not have all of the
qualities desired in a recreation location. Where their homes may have lacked scenery, seclusion, and suitability for larger family or group gatherings, they often maintained the characteristics of being close and having some desired facilities. Participants therefore chose recreation sites similar to a “bigger backyard,” or spaces to gather in which they could find the desired qualities in recreation locations they lacked at home, due to socioeconomic status and the inability to purchase homes on larger landscaped lots that have grown in prevalence in the United States.

The results of this study also indicate similarities among the Hispanic/Latino respondents regarding where they choose to recreate. Roughly half of the land in Cache County is federally owned land, designated either as national forest or wilderness lands (Cache County Agricultural Advisory Board, 2003). There are, therefore, far fewer municipal recreation sites compared to potential federal sites. However, municipal recreation sites, particularly city parks, are those sites most frequently and commonly visited by respondents, and federal sites are the least visited. Despite their abundance, relatively few federal recreation sites have the gathering space characteristics preferred by participants such as facilities, family suitability, scenery, and proximity. While these characteristics are not unique solely to municipal sites, they are characteristics shared consistently by all municipal sites which appears to account for why they attracted higher visitation by these respondents.

It may seem contradictory for respondents to prefer both developed facilities and scenery in a recreation location as development can be considered an intrusion on scenery. Just as with the meaning of recreation, what these participants consider
“scenery” may differ from the general Anglo perception. For nearly all the participants in this study, scenery and scenic views were not wild places, but rather outdoor spaces in which they could enjoy valued elements of nature such as bodies of water, trees, and other plants, while still enjoying the other “backyard” benefits of facilities for use by those in their family or other members of their recreation group. Seclusion too may differ based on comparison to contexts at home. Smaller homes and larger family groups living together may restrict one’s ability to “get away.” Other recreationists, whose homes and backyards provide suitable scenery for gatherings or seclusion for rest, may look for different kinds of scenic, secluded spaces that are often found in wildlands.

Other researchers have reported that Hispanics/Latinos, both inside and outside the United States, are more collectivistic than European Americans (Walker et al., 2005). This collectivistic propensity for Hispanics/Latinos may very well contribute to the fact that despite the highly varied geography of recreation in Cache Valley, Utah, only three city parks stood out as those most often and commonly visited by study respondents. When asked how they learned about local recreation places, every participant stated they first learned of the locations they now visit by speaking to others. The role of social networks and word-of-mouth is important among this population as they tell each other about places to recreate and invite each other to recreation events. And as Chavez and Olson (2009) have pointed out, Latino visitors are likely to continue to frequent those places as well as tell others, which leads to increased use by that population of the same places.
Conclusions

This exploratory research utilized a unique perspective and recreation mapping activity, prompting different understanding, conceptualization, and interpretation of Hispanic/Latino recreation. Seeking and recognizing the participant-provided definition of recreation broadens the scope and understanding of what recreation means, and allows for the emergence of themes left unexplored by previous research. This study contributes to the theme of site specific characteristics driving recreation decisions - an area often overlooked in minority recreation research. Research of non-dominant population recreation rarely attempts to spatially or geographically understand recreation spaces used by minorities from the point of view of how they choose to recreate, but instead generally focuses on why they do not use certain places more frequented by majority populations.

This research can be used to help recreation agencies and managers better understand the recreation places most preferred by the fastest growing portion of the population, and how to manage the characteristics of those sites in order to meet the needs and expectations of those visitors. Everyone should have some leisure, but ethnic minorities are among those for whom society historically does not provide so well (Broadhurst, 2001). The recreation managers in this study held the perception that the Latino minority population’s recreation needs are presently being met and, as a result, they are not taking active measures to develop or facilitate Hispanic/Latino recreation. However, as leisure practitioners recognize how recreation is different for a portion of their visitors, they can work to avoid or eliminate the ways recreation spaces themselves can contribute to unequal usage of sites. Taylor (2000) posited that because managers
(specifically wildland managers) often assume visitors will be white, they have historically managed those areas in a way benefiting only white users, which is a practice that is no longer appropriate as the minority population grows.

The findings from this research support the literature indicating that Hispanic/Latino recreation occurs in specific types of sites, but contributes new interpretive perspectives that does not simply solidify stereotypes. While city parks are popular as recreation locations among Hispanics/Latinos, this study shows that recreation site choice among this population is diverse and, more importantly, is driven by specific preferences and reasons. Understanding the reasons for site selection is paramount to getting beyond simply emphasizing cultural differences, leading to larger questions about access and distribution of resources as these reasons are tied to the concept of why they seek a “bigger backyard.” The exploratory makeup of the study does limit its ability to generalize findings to the larger Hispanic/Latino population or make direct comparisons to recreation patterns of other populations. Also, given that most respondents in the study’s sample were women, it highlights potential questions about gender differences in recreation meaning and choice. Future research could benefit from a look into what and how women characterize “their” recreation under the assumption that ideas of what recreation is come mostly from men. Additionally, a study conducted similarly to this with just men may uncover differences in important recreation decision drivers. There is also great potential for further research into this study’s findings about the importance of site specific characteristics that serve as major decision drivers. This can include investigating if and how managing sites with consideration to the six site characteristics
outlined here affects visitation by Hispanics/Latinos to those sites.

If care is not taken in how recreation space is regulated and managed according to such characteristics as facilities, family accommodations, and scenery, the portion of the population to whom those characteristics are important will not be drawn to that space. However, as those recreationists seek out and gather in the spaces that do provide the characteristics shown to be important in this study, the risk of creating and reinforcing ethnic and racial boundaries increases. The field of environmental justice has primarily concerned itself with the uneven distribution of environmental pollution impacts by race. Now, however, efforts are being made to expand the concerns of environmental justice to include a focus on how natural resources are being managed and used in ways that lead to social (in)justice (Getches & Pellow, 2002). The United States is growing in ethnic and cultural diversity every day, and our leisure spaces should reflect this change. “The nation that works together must be merged with the nation that plays together” (Phillip, 2000, p.123). Understanding the effect recreation spaces have in achieving this objective is a crucial step in the process, and one that must not be overlooked. A critical first step is that we re-conceptualize and re-interpret minority recreation patterns in positive terms that move us away from an Anglo-conformist bias which attempts to erase difference.
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CHAPTER 3

UNMET RECREATION DESIRES OR UNDESIRED RECREATION? ACCESS AND CUSTOM IN HISPANIC/LATINO RECREATION CHOICES

Abstract

Not all recreation spaces are equal when considering use by minority populations. The Hispanic/Latino population is the fastest growing minority group in the United States and this research study approaches Hispanic/Latino recreation by investigating location as a key factor in recreation decisions. Utilizing interviews and interactive mapping with thirty Hispanic/Latino Cache County, Utah residents, this study gives particular focus to unvisited sites and the decision drivers leading to non-visitation of desired and undesired recreation sites. Drivers such as money, fear, and knowledge are found to affect recreation choices and contribute to a larger discussion about how access powers (Ribot and Peluso 2003) and custom can come together to influence minorities’ decisions and abilities to utilize recreational resources.

Introduction

Minority populations in the United States are steadily growing. For decades research in a variety of fields—including that of leisure and recreation—has investigated how to meet the needs of this increasingly diverse demographic. Special attention is

---

1 Coauthored by Jodie Madsen, Claudia Radel, and Joanna Endter-Wada
again being given to minority leisure studies as the Latino/Hispanic\(^2\) ethnic group became the nation’s largest ethnic minority group, with projections that by the year 2050 it will account for 30.25% of the total U.S. population (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2008).

Evidence in minority leisure and recreation studies abounds demonstrating minority groups do not recreate in similar places or similar ways as Anglos. Much of this research focuses on wildland spaces such as national parks and forests. In a National Park Service Comprehensive Survey of the American Public released in 2000, only 13% of African American respondents and 27% of Hispanics reported visiting a national park in the previous two years, compared with 36% of white non-Hispanic respondents. In Cache County, Utah, the site of this study, only 2.2% of the visits to the neighboring Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest were made by Latino/Hispanic visitors even though they constitute 9.4% of the county population (U.S.D.A. Forest Service 2010).

Out of the early wildland or “forest-centered” research emerged a continuing discussion about the constraints and barriers to minorities’ recreation. Elements such as racism, discrimination, socio-economic factors and ethnicity were studied as potential factors affecting minority recreation. Despite the growth of minority populations and increased attention to the issue, it is evident that racialized recreation—the segregation of recreation activities and locations by race—exists in many places across the nation (Phillip 2000). Understanding more about what drives recreation choices becomes socially pertinent as minority populations continue to expand.

\(^2\) As both Hispanic and Latino can refer to geographically specific ethnicities, the combination Hispanic/Latino is used in this paper to refer to participants ethnically identifying with Central America, South America, or the Caribbean.
Discussions about environmental justice are increasingly focused on discrepancies among minority groups’ rights and abilities to benefit from natural resources (Getches and Pellow 2002). As research continues to investigate minority recreation patterns and the important elements driving their recreation decisions, insights will be gained about the connections between decision drivers and the ability to benefit from resources, and the underlying access powers a minority group possesses or lacks. An important connection exists between how decision drivers and limitations on powers of access lead to unmet desires in recreation (desires in recreation that are going unfulfilled due to various constraints) and undesired recreation (recreation for which no interest exists). Understanding more about the relationship of what influences unmet desires in recreation and undesired recreation will help managers, policy makers and society in general determine if and how those desires can be addressed in beneficial and productive ways.

**Literature Review**

The emergence of the civil rights movement in the United States led to increased awareness of issues regarding equality in a variety of social arenas. For leisure and recreation researchers, it led to investigations into minority recreation patterns and the conclusion that minority leisure behaviors differ significantly from those of Anglos in both place and activity. These findings fostered concerns about racial inequality in recreation resources access and rights. Since the civil rights era, research and literature has largely adopted an Anglo-centered approach, attempting to determine how and why minority recreation is low or even non-existent in some locations and activities when
compared to traditional “white” recreation, and why it does not conform to middle-class Anglo patterns of recreation.

Two theories dominate the literature that addresses minority recreation differences. Washburne (1978) summarized these two theories as the marginality and ethnicity theories. The marginality theory contends the position of minorities on the margins of society is due to external or structural factors that lead to a life of poverty and few opportunities. This theory has also come to incorporate the effect racism and discrimination, both present and throughout history, have in creating barriers for minorities to engage in certain recreation (Blahna and Black 1993; Floyd 1998).

The ethnicity theory proposes leisure and culture are connected and reflect one another. Therefore, minority populations maintain different recreation values due to differences in historical and cultural relationships with recreation (Washburne 1978). Proponents of this theory also contend assimilation and acculturation of a minority group will ultimately affect the group’s recreation patterns, with the minority population becoming more similar to the majority population with which it is acculturating (Carr and Williams 1993; Floyd and Gramann 1993; Shaull and Gramann 1998). Some researchers also investigate ethnicity-based constraints on recreation created by differences between minorities and the majority population in the organization of social groups (McMillen 1983; Hutchison and Fidel 1984). In general, the proponents of the ethnicity theory of recreation difference do not necessarily identify differences in recreation patterns and resource usage rates as problematic. Much of this work embodies an unspoken
assumption of ethnicity as cultural difference only and not as a reflection of differential power positioning within society.

Social identity, including ethnicity and race, plays a critical role in discussions about minority recreation. Feagin (2007) describes the distinction between the two terms as belonging to a social group set apart based on physical characteristics (race), or cultural or nationality characteristics (ethnicity). While there is not necessarily a relationship between ethnicity and race, they are often linked. Their commonality is that both physical and cultural characteristics can serve as the basis for unequal structural positioning of power within a society and unequal treatment (Floyd 1999). Attempting to discuss how these group differences should be addressed in public policy, a politics of difference asserts that social identification of difference (group belonging/exclusion marked by race, ethnicity, and other social groupings) should be not be ignored. Young (2008) describes two lines of thought within a politics of difference as positional difference and cultural difference. Politics of positional difference upholds that social processes position people and social groups along social axes, creating inequalities in power, status, and opportunity. Politics of cultural difference posits that some groups face distinctive issues simply due to what defines them as a societal culture, such as nationality. Operating under the assumption that societies today consist of at least two cultural groups, and that one of these cultural groups dominates the polity, the politics of cultural difference discusses the requirements of justice in accommodating and recognizing cultural diversities. Young, however, argues that public policy to address social difference must consider both positional and cultural difference.
Research in minority recreation aligns well with the politics of difference, supporting the theories of marginality (positional difference) and ethnicity (cultural difference), and many of the constraints and drivers of recreation often studied by researchers can be explained by one of those two theories. Research in the 1980s was designed predominately to study which of the theories was more robust (Gomez 2002). However, since the early 1990s, much of minority leisure research incorporates both theories by studying elements of marginality status of ethnic populations as well as ethnic preferences in recreation (Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey 1991; Scott, Herrera, and Hunt 2004). The discussion is increasingly focusing on the complex interactions of various types of decision drivers, constraints, and other influential factors affecting recreation patterns of minorities. The crossover is also noted within politics of difference discussions, with Young stating oppression of minority cultures can merge into positional or structural inequalities (2008). Other researchers add to this mixed theory by asserting members of a culture will hold beliefs about the nature of leisure based on shared experiences and knowledge (Parr and Lashua 2004) and, therefore, recreation itself carries different meanings and is practiced differently based on those beliefs.

Researchers developed recreation decision models in an attempt to address the dynamic processes of negotiating recreation drivers and constraints associated with the different theories. A hierarchy of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints put forth by Crawford et al. (1991) proposes that while researchers have focused primarily on the least important tier of structural constraints, it is actually intrapersonal constraints which include elements of culture and ethnicity that are the strongest drivers.
of recreation decisions. Other researchers propose a minority group’s level of acculturation serves as the driving force that affects other variables such as socioeconomic status and ultimately perceived discrimination (Juniu 2000; Gomez 2002). Walker, Deng, and Dieser (2005) conclude decision models also need to incorporate the relationship one’s cultural norms of individualism (motivation for self) or collectivism (motivation for the group) can have on choices in recreation. Most recreation decision models demonstrate the overarching effect ethnicity can have on several elements that affect decisions in recreation.

Decisions about recreation include various intersecting elements, including where, how, and with whom to recreate. Location of recreation has received the most attention in research given that contrasts are most evident in where minority and Anglo populations recreate. When studying recreation places minorities frequent, the majority of research attention focuses on wildland recreation spaces, as surveys over the years consistently indicate minority visits to national forests, parks and wilderness areas are significantly less frequent than visits by Anglos (U.S.D.A. Forest Service April 2010). Researchers have generally looked from public land outward, attempting to explain why minorities are not visiting the nation’s forests, parks, wildernesses, and other wildlands. Some have concluded that socioeconomic factors play some part in low wildland visitation as well as low levels of assimilation and acculturation by minorities (Washburne 1978; Floyd and Gramann 1993; Carr and Williams 1993). Other categories of constraints, including intrapersonal, such as interest or desire, and information/access,
were found to be of particular importance for why Hispanic recreationists had not visited wildland sites (Scott et al. 2004).

Urban recreation areas, primarily municipal parks, have also been studied and are generally considered the primary recreation places for minority groups. For most of these studies, the attempt has been to explain white/minority differences in use of those sites. Explanations include the trend for ethnic groups to isolate themselves from the general population, preferring stationary activities involving families and group sports (Hutchison and Fidel 1984; Gomez 2002). Other researchers have also attempted to uncover barriers to urban park recreation, concluding that historical and continuing discrimination constrain minorities’ freedom of choice in recreation due to a lack of experience in natural areas, fear of potential racism, and economic deprivation (Blahna and Black 1993).

Less direct forms of environmental discrimination (meaning forms of discrimination that reflect outcomes as opposed to intents) have also motivated the emergence of the environmental justice movement. Though first focusing on inequalities in exposure to environmental pollution, the field is beginning to turn its attention to natural resource access and management (Getches and Pellow 2002). Regarding natural resources as a public good that all have the right to access raises concerns about social injustice when disparities exist in ability to access that good. Ribot and Peluso (2003) argue property, or the “right to benefit,” does not always translate to access, or the “ability to benefit,” from a given resource. These authors posit that a group’s access to “bundles of power” including technology, capital, markets, labor and labor opportunities,
knowledge, authority, social identity, and social relations, shape how benefits are distributed, affecting equity in resource use by members in a society. However, this is not a static situation as a group’s powers are constantly in flux, changing access relations throughout history. Identifying powers which groups exhibit and lack in their ability to access recreation resources is essential to understanding differences in recreation patterns and outcomes. We use the Ribot and Peluso conceptual framework to discuss the findings of our study on recreation location choices by the Hispanic/Latino population in Cache County, Utah.

Minority leisure literature demonstrates research in recreation decisions is a complex issue. This study brings the discussion of Hispanic/Latino recreation out from the forest or the park and into all the spaces participants themselves view as places of personal recreation, whether they visit them or not. We thus explore both positive (visit) and negative (do not visit) choices, and further divide the sites not visited by study participants into those desired but not accessed (unmet recreation desires) and those undesired (undesired recreation). This study applies Ribot and Peluso’s access and power framework to provide insight into decisions not to visit particular potential recreation sites and in this way begins to discern which powers and access relationships are most essential for understanding resource use and recreation behaviors by the Cache County Hispanic/Latino community.
Methods

Site

Cache County, Utah, situated in a valley of the same name (Cache Valley) along Utah’s northeast border with southwestern Idaho, has experienced an increase in Hispanic/Latino immigrant workers over the last few decades. It is estimated that 10% of the county’s population is of Hispanic or Latino descent, constituting the largest minority group in the county (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2010). With a Census Bureau estimated population of just over 115,000, Cache County is the sixth most populous county in Utah. The county incorporates 26 different communities, with the majority of Hispanic/Latino residents living in the centrally located cities of Logan and Hyrum.

Recreation opportunities abound in Cache County, with several federal, state, municipal, and private sites across the Valley. From city parks to the national forest and state reservoirs to bowling alleys, Cache County offers its residents a wide variety of recreation options. This fact, along with an increasing awareness surrounding community access by minority populations, makes Cache County an ideal place to explore how the growing Hispanic/Latino population recreates and the potential racialization of recreation.

Data Instrument/Data Collection

A grounded theory approach was chosen for this study due to its exploratory nature. Grounded theory is a strategy often utilized when researchers attempt to understand the view of participants and to describe meanings of actions from their
perspectives (Creswell 2009). To achieve this end, semi-structured interview questions were utilized, allowing participants freedom to express their understanding of their recreation decisions, with primary emphasis on recreation location. All the interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed to facilitate open communication during the interviews and allow the interviewer (the first author) to focus field notes on the significant ideas and themes provided during the interviews.

Data collection was carried out in two phases. First, the manager perspectives and observations phase involved obtaining personal observations on local recreation patterns from public officials working with federal, state, and local recreation management agencies. This phase of the study helped researchers gain a manager’s view of the patterns and changes in Hispanic/Latino recreation across the valley. Five key informant interviews were conducted with officials from recreation management agencies in Cache Valley including the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Hyrum Lake State Park, Logan City Parks and Recreation, and Hyrum City Parks and Recreation (Appendix A). Several questions were posed to the recreation managers primarily focusing on patterns in Hispanic/Latino recreation within their agencies, as well as what their agencies are doing to address the needs and interests of that population (Appendix B). No detailed data coding or analysis of these data took place given that this information largely served as an introductory data-gathering phase designed to gain a better overview of Hispanic/Latino recreation in Cache Valley.

Phase two of the study incorporated deeper investigatory interviews with Hispanic/Latino Cache County residents regarding their own recreation behaviors. Data
collected during this phase became the foundation upon which the study’s analysis is focused. During the 30 semi-structured interviews, each participant was asked to reflect on his or her own recreation patterns. Knowing that “recreation” can have different meanings based on one’s own experiences and culture, researchers in this study allowed participants to label and define their own recreation time, activities, and settings. To make the process as systematic as possible, each participant was asked to review a list of potential local recreation places and activities before the interview, which remained visible as a reference for the duration of the interview (Appendix C). However, participants were reminded to consider any and all possibilities for locations or activities they personally consider part of their recreation frame of reference, whether or not it appeared on the provided lists.

Questions were presented to participants in a purposeful order, beginning with a request for respondents to define and describe their personal conceptualization of recreation. After some foundational questions about when and with whom participants recreate, respondents were asked to first identify the places they choose to visit for their recreation activities and why those places are chosen. Following this, participants were asked to identify the recreation places they would like to visit but had not (unmet recreation desires), and why they had not yet been to these sites. Respondents were then asked to identify the places they did not have interest in visiting for recreation (undesired recreation) and why. Lastly, participants were asked to consider a list of potential recreation decision drivers and constraints common in minority research literature and comment on whether and how those elements affect their choices regarding recreation.
The list incorporated common constraints from previous literature such as money, time, language, and fear (Blahna and Black 1993; Scott et al. 2004). Included in the consideration of possible decision drivers, respondents were also asked about the effect, if any, their ethnicity had on their recreation choices (Appendix D).

Throughout the interview, but primarily during the three questions about where participants visit and do not visit, locations spoken of were marked on a county map with color coded-stickers corresponding to whether a participant visits, wants to visit, or doesn’t wish to visit the location. A map of Logan City was used to identify sites within Logan and its immediately surrounding communities of North Logan and Providence. A smaller scale map of Cache County was used to identify locations outside of the Logan population center (Appendix E).

To guarantee consistency in the Spanish-to-English translation of all research data, all the interviews were conducted, translated, and transcribed by the first author. Translation and transcription took place congruently to guarantee proper interpretation of questions and answers before conducting an analysis.

Participants

A total of 30 Cache Valley residents participated in this study, composed of a convenience sample of volunteers who self-identified as being of Hispanic/Latino descent. Referrals to the study came through a snowball technique in which participants were asked at the end of each interview if they knew other Latino/Hispanic residents who may be willing to participate in the study. Of the 30 interviews, 21 (70%) were with
female respondents. Through responses to interview questions and simple observation basic demographic respondent information was obtained, as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Demographics of Respondents
n=30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Positive Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Spanish/English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residency in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Residency: 11.95 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents consisted solely of first generation immigrants with varying levels of English acquisition. Four of the 30 respondents immigrated to the United States with their families as young children when they were under 12 years of age. Interviews were conducted in the language of preference for each participant. Twenty-five of the participants chose to conduct the interview entirely in Spanish, four preferred English and
two used a mixture of both languages with preference generally being given to Spanish. Ages of participants ranged from early 20s to 60s. Most participants (23) were married with children. One was married with no children. Of the six respondents who were single, three had no children and three had grown children and grandchildren. Length of residency in the United States ranged from 6 months to 26 years with the average residency being nearly 12 years. The majority of participants (21) self-identified as Mexican in nationality, with the rest identifying as Venezuelan, Peruvian, Dominican, Guatemalan, Uruguayan, and Salvadoran. The occupations of respondents were diverse, including university students, business owners, and laborers. While this was not a random sample of the Hispanic/Latino population in Cache County, the sample is a fair reflection of the county’s relatively new, diverse, and quickly-expanding minority Hispanic/Latino population.

Analysis

Several types of analyses were conducted based on the type of data obtained in this study and included a mapping analysis, recreation site categorization, and an open-ended response analysis. The mapping element enabled a spatial analysis to be conducted on the sites mentioned by participants, which were categorized as ones they visit, want to visit, or avoid. The management/tenure categorization of recreation sites (federal, state, municipal, and private) allowed for analysis of variety in the types of sites visited by participants. Lastly, the open-ended discussions about why respondents did or did not visit sites, as well as how certain recreation decision elements affected their
recreation choices, made possible an analysis of emergent themes common among participants.

Compiling the sites on all the color-coded maps created with participants as they spoke of the different places they visited, wanted to visit, and lacked interest in visiting for recreation enabled a spatial analysis of recreation sites for each category to be completed (Appendices F-I). Through this compilation of maps, obvious clusters emerged and easily facilitated a visual spatial analysis of the sites frequently mentioned by multiple respondents. This mapping analysis also provided the opportunity to see the actual geographic dispersion and diversity in places most utilized by interviewees. Results from this component of the study are reported in Chapter 1.

Using the management/tenure categories of federal, state, municipal, and private, a simple descriptive analysis was completed by placing each site mentioned into the appropriate category. A percentage calculation was then made possible by tallying the number of respondents that indicated they visited, wanted to visit, or lacked interest in visiting sites in each category. A similar analysis was conducted with responses to a list of specific potential recreation decision drivers asked of each participant. These decision drivers included time, distance, knowledge, money, language, interest, fear, and their ethnicity as a Hispanic/Latino, many of which were common elements mentioned by key informants in the manager perspectives and observations phase of this study, as well as in minority recreation literature (Scott et al. 2004). Again, a straightforward method for this analysis was utilized by tallying how many participants indicated in their responses that the factor affected their recreation decisions in any way.
An analysis was also conducted on the open-ended responses from the semi-structured interviews. As each interview transcription was reviewed, the researcher tagged each response with the reasons given for why the interviewee did or did not visit the sites. All the reasons given by respondents were then organized into categories sharing similar characteristics. Looking across all the interviews, the categories revealed commonalities among respondents with regards to recreation choices. Personal decision drivers and specific recreation site characteristics are the two broad categories of themes developed through this process. The themes of personal recreation decision drivers common among participants in this study were money, time, language, knowledge, fear, interest or company of others. Themes of site-specific characteristics included proximity, family suitability, seclusion, facilities, scenery, and on-site activities. Researchers then determined the percentage of respondents that indicated reasons corresponding to each category as important to their recreation decisions. To ensure coder reliability, transcripts were reviewed in full by the senior author at least two times, checking for consistency in the categories. A third read-through was conducted to identify key representative quotes.

3 Use of the term “personal” with regards to a category of decision drivers, refers to influences on recreation decisions that are largely recreationist-centered as opposed to site-centered. These influences relate to socioeconomic and identity characteristics of the individual recreationist, but they also relate to membership in or exclusion from social groupings including families and ethnic groups, which makes “personal” a less than ideal term perhaps.
Findings/Results

Manager Perspectives and Observations

The first phase of this study, which consisted of five interviews with national forest, state park, and city recreation managers, revealed interviewees in all three categories perceive an increase in usage of outdoor recreation sites by Hispanics/Latinos. State park and national forest managers specified while use of their outdoor facilities has increased, it is primarily the developed, well-maintained facilities that have experienced increased use and not the more remote sites or trails. When asked to reflect on what drives these choices among local Hispanics/Latinos, managers conveyed the perception that Hispanics/Latinos prefer to recreate with their extended families, and therefore prefer day-use facilities with the capability to host large groups for activities such as picnicking and/or participation in sports activities like soccer.

Logan City Parks and Recreation managers reported increased use of many outdoor municipal sites but low use of the Recreation Center and other city-run programs by Hispanics/Latinos. When asked what could be driving this absence of participation, managers stated that a possible lack of knowledge about the programs or their cost could be preventing use by some residents. This was based on a 2008 focus group conducted by the Hispanic Health Coalition investigating what the Hispanic/Latino population knows about the Logan City Parks and Recreation programs and facilities. Despite the stated observation by all five managers that Hispanic/Latino visitation to their sites is disproportionately low (despite observed increases), the perception is that recreation
desires are being met so little has been done by any of the agencies to specifically target increased Hispanic/Latino visitation or identify causes for low participation.

**Hispanic/Latino Resident Interviews**

The results presented here are based upon four critical interview questions regarding where participants do and do not recreate (including sites not visited despite the desire) and what affects their choices in recreation participation. Each question and subsequent response highlights a different perspective on the potential constraints and drivers that influence respondents’ recreation choices. Decisions about recreation include various intersecting elements and, in this study, primary focus is placed on the location decision, with the other elements of the recreation decision being explanatory of the location choice.

*Types of sites chosen/not chosen.* Sites mentioned by participants were categorized after completion of the interviews based on the land management or tenure description. Municipal sites comprised both indoor and outdoor spaces including city parks, the Willow Park Zoo, the city golf course, the high school swimming pool, town museums, Logan City Recreation and Aquatics centers, the rodeo and other activities at the county fairgrounds, and the annual town parades and festivals held throughout the Valley. State sites mentioned were predominately outdoor sites including Bear Lake and Hyrum Lake state parks. The campus of Utah State University, which is included within the state category, provides very different types of recreation locations including the Museum of Anthropology as well as plays and concerts hosted on campus. However, the same number of references to the University were connected to a popular hill used for
outdoor sledding during the winter. Federal sites incorporated only outdoor recreation areas including campsites, picnic areas, fishing spots, an elk wildlife management area, and ATV, cross-country skiing, and snowshoe trails in Logan Canyon, as well as Smithfield, Blacksmith Fork, and Green canyons. Private recreation sites encompassed mostly indoor activities at businesses throughout the valley including the Cache Valley Fun Park (an indoor arcade/roller/bowling/laser tag/soft play arena), the bowling alley, concert venues, health gyms, movie theaters, an indoor ice-skating rink, ski resort and horse-riding businesses in Logan Canyon, an indoor rock climbing gym, a shooting range, local restaurants and stores, and the American West Heritage Center that hosts several themed events throughout the year. Table 2.2 details the differences in reported use, desired and undesired, within each of the management categories.

Table 2.2: Types of Sites Visited and Not Visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Visited Sites n=30</th>
<th>Unvisited Desired Sites n=28</th>
<th>Undesired Sites n=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Positive Responses</td>
<td>% of Total Respondents</td>
<td># of Positive Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the sites visited by respondents, all the participants indicated they use municipal recreation sites and, while a great diversity of municipal sites were mentioned, only the city parks were mentioned with regularity. State recreation sites, particularly Bear Lake and Hyrum Lake state parks, were also a common type of site utilized, with 73% of the respondents indicating they had visited a state site at least once. Private
businesses are visited by 60% of respondents, with the Cache Valley Fun Park being the most common example. With 57% of respondents indicating they used at least one federal recreation site, the most popular use of federal sites were the picnic areas and campgrounds located along Logan Canyon Scenic Byway.

The unvisited yet desired sites for recreation among participants were fairly evenly split among federal, municipal, and private. Federal recreation sites were the most commonly mentioned (57%) with camping sites in Logan Canyon and the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest being the most commonly mentioned. The private recreation sites were also common unvisited desired recreation sites (54%). The sites spoken of were diverse, ranging from the indoor ice rink to horse riding companies. No single business was spoken of by most respondents. Half of the respondents indicated they wanted to visit a municipal site, with the most common site being the Logan Aquatics Center. State sites were the least often mentioned (29%), with most indicating a desire to visit either Bear Lake, Hyrum Lake, or the museums on the campus of Utah State University.

Federal sites were by far the most regularly mentioned (72%) unvisited undesired sites by participants. Most of those participants simply stated the mountains or forest in general were the places they had no desire to visit rather than citing named areas or trails. Nearly all of the participants spoke of activities that took place on federal lands, the most common of these being camping and fishing. Private recreation sites were also commonly mentioned with 52% of respondents speaking of businesses they did not desire to visit for recreation. While most of the private recreation sites are indoor locations, the
private business site most often mentioned as undesired by participants is the ski resort in Logan Canyon. Only 32% of respondents identified municipal sites as recreation places they had no desire to visit, with the city golf course being the most common. State locations were mentioned by the fewest respondents (16%) as sites they were not interested in visiting. With the exception of one person, the state undesired sites spoken of were all found on the campus of Utah State University, including the football stadium and museums.

Some patterns are revealed by looking across the three categories of visited, unvisited desired, and unvisited undesired sites. Federal recreation sites were the least mentioned visited sites (57%), yet also the most mentioned unvisited sites in both desired (57%) and undesired (72%) categories. State sites show a nearly inverse result, as they were high in sites visited (73%), yet lowest in unvisited desired (29%) and unvisited undesired (16%) sites. Private recreation sites did not vary much in their results across the categories, as they were commonly mentioned as visited (60%), desired yet unvisited (54%), and undesired unvisited (52%) sites. Municipal recreation sites claimed the top position in the types of sites commonly visited (100%), and vied with private recreation sites for the middle position in sites unvisited, with 50% of the respondents not visiting certain municipal sites despite the desire, and 32% stating they lacked any desire to visit some municipal recreation sites.

Decision Drivers and Constraints

Why study participants visit. An analysis of the explanations given for why participants choose to visit the sites they identified resulted in the development of six
common themes or categories of decision drivers that promoted visitation of sites. Shown in Table 2.3, these decision drivers are the common elements respondents described as motivators for site choice. The responses and themes unilaterally related to the physical characteristics associated with the recreation site itself categorized as facilities, family suitability, scenery, activity, seclusion, and proximity.

Table 2.3: Recreation Site Characteristics Decision Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Visited Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Positive Responses</td>
<td>% of Total Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family suitability</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seclusion</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities provided at the recreation location such as bathrooms, children’s play sets, BBQ grills, pavilions, tracks or trails, water fountains, designated campgrounds, and open fields for sports proved to be an important characteristic preferred by most respondents (80%) in this study. When speaking of recreation sites, 73% of interviewees indicated they choose a certain place because it is suitable for visiting with their family, including both larger groups of extended family with adults and children, as well as their own young children. Scenery is a commonly preferred characteristic as 63% of respondents indicated they choose recreation locations because of the natural backdrop, including things like animals, water, plant-life, or other fresh-air amenities. The recreation activity participants plan to engage in is also a major decision driver for
location selection as 63% of participants indicated they choose some of their recreation places because they contain designated areas for specific activities including soccer fields, volleyball and basketball courts, skiing and ATV trails, fishing ponds, and museums. Seclusion and proximity, while not as common as other characteristics, are still important decision drivers for some respondents. Seclusion from the city, crowds, and noise where one could relax is a motivator in site selection for 37% of participants, and 30% stated that they choose locations because the short distance from their home made them easily accessible. Further details about this portion of the study are available (see Chapter 2).

Why study participants do not visit. An analysis of the explanations for why respondents do not visit certain sites for recreation, whether or not they had a desire to visit them, resulted in two categories of decision drivers and constraints: site characteristics and personal characteristics. While not mentioned nearly as often as they were for visited sites, proximity, family suitability, seclusion, facilities, scenery, and site-specific activity were still important to some respondents as reasons for not visiting certain sites.

Personal characteristics often described in literature like money, time, language, knowledge, fear, and interests of self and others became part of the recreation decision drivers and constraints discussion once respondents began to speak of why they had not visited specific sites. Results here are focused specifically on the categories created by including the explanations for not visiting sites—both desired sites and undesired sites. Due to the number of drivers and constraints, focus in this section is given to those that
proved to be common among many participants, with at least 30% of the respondents speaking of it in their responses. However, all result categories are included in Table 2.4

Table 2.4: Decision Drivers and Constraints for Unvisited Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desired Sites n=28</th>
<th>Undesired Sites n=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Positive Responses</td>
<td>% of Total Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Suitability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seclusion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests of Self and Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reason</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Driver or constraint with a response rate exceeding 30%

For 68% of the respondents in this study, if a recreation site was used for a specific activity in which the respondent was not interested in participating, this served as the greatest constraint on the participant ever visiting the site. Common site-specific activities mentioned were golfing, camping, rock-climbing, and fishing. The lack of interest in going to the site to participate in that activity most often stemmed from it being seen as an activity too boring or dangerous. Speaking of fishing, one respondent expressed, “I hate fishing. I think it’s just so boring…. it’s just like, ‘Are you serious,
you’re just gonna sit there and wait? I don’t like it whatsoever.” Another spoke of museums in a similar way: “They’re good things because you can learn, but they bore me. Or visiting historic sites, it’s really boring. I don’t like the theater either, and I don’t take my kids either. If I don’t like it, they won’t.”

A personal characteristic that serves as a recreation decision driver and constraint for 61% of the respondents is knowledge or lack thereof about the place, about the activities that occur there, or about how to access the site. One participant stated he would like to try golf, but hadn’t yet because, “I don’t know what you need to go on the course, or if they give classes, or if it’s free or you pay.” Another spoke about unsuccessfully trying to visit the elk wildlife refuge:

“We went, they had an activity there, but we didn’t see anything because they said that there were deer and elk, and we didn’t see anything. We saw people, but we didn’t know if it was part of the city, or if it was part of another person’s party. We went and watched from afar, [but didn’t go in].”

Still another participant mentioned she wanted to visit the university’s museum, but lacked knowledge about the campus, saying, “It seems really complicated to get there. It’s a big place and I don’t know where it (the museum) is.”

Another personal characteristic affecting non-visitation to recreation sites mentioned by many respondents (52%) was that of fear. Most of the responses indicated a fear of being in the wild with unknown animals or people. “It scares me to stay out there like that in the wilderness. There’s no light. You think that something can happen to you, an emergency. My kids are scared a lot of animals.” Explaining that going into the mountains is something she would likely never do, one respondent stated, “Because it
would scare me to go up and that I can fall. Or get lost in the mountains. You can see
dangerous animals.” Another spoke of being afraid of the activity that takes place at
certain recreation sites. Speaking of rock-climbing sites, one participant spoke of his
opinion that the activity is too dangerous for him to ever be interested in going there. He
said, “It’s dangerous. Here the people that climb are always whites, and they like danger
a lot. And I don’t.” Another described skiing similarly: “I’ve never skied. Since I’ve
never done it, it scares me. It’s dangerous. Better that I don’t, it’s dangerous and I’d
break a leg. People start doing that from when they’re little kids.” One respondent talked
of being fearful of some recreation locations because of the people he might encounter
there, saying that his fear would “be of finding people that are going to attack or are
going to discriminate against you.”

Money and time were each mentioned by 36% of respondents as the reasons why
they had not visited their desired recreation sites. Often money was mentioned as a
constraint because it kept participants from buying the necessary equipment for an
activity at the site. One respondent spoke of golf in this way, “I don’t have the
equipment. I think it’s expensive, the equipment. Of all the people I know, no one plays
golf, so it’s not a theme of conversation between us.” Another stated that the Fun Park
was a prime example of a place she’d like to visit with her family, but having sufficient
funds had kept them from being able to as of yet.

“A recreation place would be the Fun Park. But money doesn’t allow us
to go. That’s why we go where it’s the cheapest for us. So the Fun Park,
or for my husband to go bowling, things like that, all those things that cost
to do. For me what limits what we can do that would be good, because in
truth they are good, they’re fun, they’re not bad things, would be money.”
Many respondents also said they simply lacked sufficient time to do all they want to do, such as go camping in Logan Canyon. One woman explained, “I haven’t done it because sometimes there’s no time. Sometimes one just has a little while, maybe a whole day. But to stay [overnight] you don’t have it [time].” Another woman spoke about the lack of time to engage in recreation even closer to home, saying:

“It’s nice to see others that get around on bikes, or that get out and walk. But I work at Miller [a meat packing plant], and I get home so tired. And sometimes my husband says, ‘Let’s go on a walk.’ But no. You’re so tired, and get home to clean, and there’s no time.”

After the open-ended questions asking interviewees to explain why they had not yet visited certain recreation sites (including those they desired to visit and those they did not), respondents were then asked if and how eight specific decision drivers and constraints affected their choices of where to recreate. Their responses did not necessarily refer only to recreation places they had not visited, but potentially also included recreation sites they did visit regularly. Many respondents had already mentioned several of these recreation decision drivers and constraints when talking about specific recreation sites. However, when asked to comment on each potential driver or constraint without the site-specific connection, the number of respondents indicating that it did affect their recreation decisions increased for each category, with more than 30% of respondents confirming the influence for each one of the eight drivers and constraints, as shown in Table 2.5.
Table 2.5: Researcher-Prompted Recreation Decision Drivers and Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unspecified Type of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Positive Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests of Self or Others</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Money was commonly pronounced by participants as the primary element affecting their choices in recreation sites. While recreation interests of oneself or others in the recreation group, knowledge, and time also were mentioned by most of the participants as having some effect on their recreation choices, money was deemed by many to have the biggest effect. One participant explained, “It’s always lacking, it’s never left over.” Many of the 73% of participants who positively indicated money affected their recreation site choices described their preference of recreation places that were free or relatively inexpensive, as exemplified by this woman’s statement:

“Normally we go to places where we don’t pay, where they don’t charge. There are times that yes, we go to some places [that charge] and we look for places that aren’t very expensive. If they are places where you don’t pay and you can have fun, then all the better.”

Others spoke of how money restricted their ability to buy necessary equipment for some activities such as mountain climbing. A respondent stated, “I’d like to do it, but…there’s no money to be able to buy the equipment.” Money also placed limitations on how often some participants could visit certain sites, “There are more places we enjoy going to but...
we don’t do it often because we don’t have the money…the number one constraint is the money.”

One’s own interest in a site or activity, or the interest of those with whom they often recreate, was also confirmed by 73% of respondents as exhibiting an effect on their recreation choices. As one participant explained, “My husband likes to go fishing and it doesn’t attract my attention much. I go with him because of the kids; they also want to go. It’s a little boring to me, to see if the fish will ever bite. I don’t fish.” Similarly, another mom described her family’s differences this way: “One of my sons doesn’t like to walk much. The other two do like to. So sometimes we argue…so it’s difficult; see if we go or don’t go. I myself like to go walking, but here [in town], not in the mountains.”

Many of the participants expressed a lack of interest in visiting some sites because they had no experience with the site or the activity that took place there. However, it was often stated that the constraint of interest could potentially be overcome. One participant said, “That’s why I don’t have interest in it [being in the mountains]; I’ve never [gone]. If someone invited me, maybe I’d have interest in going, there’s a chance.”

Knowledge as a decision driver or constraint was mentioned by 70% of respondents as having an effect on their recreation decisions. The explanation was one of having limited knowledge about local recreation sites and opportunities, as well as lacking knowledge on how to obtain that information. One participant shared an example of how a friend’s lack of knowledge about picnic rules at parks led to an encounter with police in which they were told they had to leave, explaining that it was “for a lack of information; they didn’t know where a place was to which they could go.” One
respondent stated that even though she has lived in the valley for 20 years “I don’t know many places. I dedicate myself more to working, to the house, and going outside a little.”

Another participant spoke of a lack of knowledge about rules and regulations affecting his recreation options, explaining that in his country there are no rules about fishing or camping like exist in the United States. He chooses not to go fishing because he’s unsure of the rules, and while lack of knowledge makes him wary about camping in wildland, it doesn’t stop him, as he explained, “But we do it, because my friends and I…none of us know of anything that prohibits it. If there were a sign that says you can’t camp there I won’t go. It’s just not knowing if there is a rule.”

Time proved to be an important decision driver or constraint for 67% of participants, with all of them stating the hours they or their spouses spend at work limits their recreation. “There are times that I work seven days a week,” one respondent stated.

Another participant explained how work and family responsibilities affect her family’s choices in recreation. She said:

“Sometimes my husband works through Saturday and sometimes you can just go [to a recreation site] for two or three hours on Sunday because you have to do things at home, you have to prepare everything because your husband has to work Monday, and the kids go to school.”

Seventeen of the respondents (57%) stated fear also had an effect on their decisions regarding recreation. Which element of fear affected them differed among each participant, ranging from fear of people and animals to driving. One participant explained she was somewhat cautious of recreation places often visited by Anglos, saying, “If there’s going to just be American people and there isn’t anyone there that I know, it affects me a little. If it’s not Latinos and I’ll be there all alone, I’m a little
afraid.” One participant also explained she knew people who did not venture out to recreation sites because they were fearful of driving without a license, saying, “They are worried that the police will stop them…that’s a fear, to be driving without license.” Fear of the wild also affected some participants’ recreation decisions, as one explained, “Going to a place further away and with people we don’t know, that is insecure for my girls and for me, including going camping to place really far from the city, it risks wild animals or things like that.”

The distance of recreation sites from a participant’s home was mentioned by 11 of the interviewees as having an effect on their choices in recreation. Several spoke of their distaste for driving and therefore preferred closer sites. For one participant, the distance particularly affected her recreation options because of her young grandchildren. “If it’s really far and I want to go to some place, and if my grandkids have to go, I can’t take them, unless it’s in a car. If I have the small kids they have to have special seats. [I prefer] if there’s a recreation location close that I don’t have to have those things, that we can get there walking.”

Distance also affected some participants because of their dislike for being too far from home. One participant explained, “One feels separated from the house. But if you are…having fun then I think it’s worth it to go to the place. We just don’t like to be in a place if it’s far. We like to go here close to the house.” One respondent explained how the other decision drivers and constraints of time and money are connected to that of distance, saying, “It’s better if they’re places that aren’t so far. Because in order to go to places further away you need more time, more money.”

When asked specifically how being Hispanic/Latino affected the participant’s decisions in recreation (or as the question was put in Spanish: ¿Cómo le afecta el ser
Hispano/Latino en sus decisiones en recreación?), 10 of the 30 (33%) indicated it did affect their decisions in some way. Most of the respondents indicated they felt uncomfortable at certain sites and felt their ethnicity made them more aware of others looking at them “badly,” causing them to take more precautions not to bother others. As one participant explained:

“There are times that you feel a little discriminated against by people when you go to recreation places, especially if you make a commotion or lots of noise. We’re medium-loud, but we don’t want to bother anyone. And people make comments on how we are. So you feel a little uncomfortable.”

Another person who has lived in the United States since childhood expressed a similar feeling of constraint due to ethnicity, saying:

“If I go to some location and there’s a big group of non-Hispanics I feel like maybe I’m looked at. I feel awkward I guess. Even if I just spent money and I get there, I’ll just go home because I feel like I’m bothersome maybe.”

One participant spoke of her husband’s avoidance of town parades because of the tradition of the majority Anglo residents to designate their seats along the route days in advance of the event. She explained:

“You can’t get to a place because they’re already divided. So the people look at you like they don’t like you. Even though we’re Hispanic we know what our place is. We’re in a country that is not ours, so we can’t bother them. We do things, but we try not to bother people.”

Along with ethnicity affecting whether some participants felt welcomed at certain recreation sites, many also expressed the fact that their ethnicity affects the types of activities in which they engage. Speaking of hiking and other physical activities, one participant stated, “For Latinos it’s pretty rare that they like exercising, truthfully.”
Speaking of their own observation that not many of their countrymen go camping, another participant explained:

“I think that maybe it’s because of the customs one has in Mexico. I don’t hear anything about people going camping in Mexico. What happens here with camping, one goes and sleeps on the floor, right? But in Mexico that’s the lowest way that people live. Like, I left everything in my life to come here and camp?”

Some respondents spoke of ethnicity and language as interchangeable drivers or constraints, indicating an understanding that ethnicity and English abilities are related. When asked how ethnicity affected her recreation choices, one participant spoke of encounters with English at recreation sites, stating, “Here the problem always is English. Also, it depends on the kind of people you come across. There are people that can be really good, and people that can be a little patient, and people that can be really bad.”

Another respondent, when asked how language affected his recreation decisions, responded with an example of the different ethnicities with whom he participates in certain activities. Using the term “English-speakers” as a reference to Anglos, he explained, “Cross-country skiing is mainly just English-speakers because that’s the way it is; because of the snow and cold weather. I would say the majority [of Hispanics/Latinos] don’t [like snow].”

Approximately 30% of all respondents indicated that language affected their recreation decisions. For many, they felt it limited their ability to understand and be confident in their recreation activities. One participant explained:

“I would go to the museum with my kids, but the kids always ask about everything and the act of reading and not knowing how to explain what it says makes me feel weak. So it’s more comfortable in your own language.”
Others spoke of language affecting their ability to communicate with others they may encounter at recreation sites, though it didn’t necessarily prohibit them from visiting such sites. One mother spoke of encountering others while camping:

“For example when we forget something and we have to ask Americans for like a lighter or salt or that you lost something that you don’t know [how to say in English], it affects you. Or they come and ask you something and you don’t know how to answer. Right now it doesn’t happen a lot because my husband understands, and the older kids too. But sometimes I’m not confident if I’m alone preparing what we brought and they leave. It’s not that it stops us, we still go.”

A respondent who now speaks fluent English reflected on how language affected his own recreation in the past, and how it could act as a constraint for anyone with limited English skills, saying:

“[Knowing English] has made me a more secure person. Before I had more fear of mixing with people to do things. I used to play [soccer] with people that spoke my language, but outside of that I didn’t do anything else because, not speaking English, I couldn’t enjoy myself. Going to the Fun Park or wherever, you have to communicate in English, so it was difficult. The fact of being able to speak English helps one be able to do more activities because there’s no barrier, there’s no fear of going and not being able to understand if you have to speak with someone. I think it gives one more liberty to do more things.”

**Discussion**

Minority recreation literature often asserts that differences in minority recreation patterns are due to constraints caused by the marginal status of the group in society. This status in society, most often indicated by poverty and discrimination, forces members of the minority group to make recreation choices differently than they would otherwise prefer. For many of this study’s participants, recreation decisions involve a unique
interplay between diverse decision drivers and constraints. The constraints so often discussed in literature became a part of respondents’ conversations only when explaining their lack of visitation to recreation sites. Primary drivers motivating visitation to sites had more to do with site characteristics preferred because of the benefits they provided to respondents and their families.

In line with Ribot and Peluso’s (2003) conceptual framework for the role of powers in access to resources, access is not just the right to benefit but the ability to benefit from resources. The places respondents visit are those they are able to navigate in order to receive preferred benefits. Sites go unvisited when a limited ability to navigate the space exists in a way that makes it inaccessible to the group, often because of a lack of the powers associated with capital, knowledge, social identity, and social relationships.

Capital as a power affects access to wealth, which we see as taking the form of time and money for respondents in this study. It was repeatedly stated that these influenced participants’ recreation decisions in diverse ways. Money was described by several participants as the greatest driver and constraint shaping their choices because, “Whenever we go somewhere, we have to assume: ‘How much will it cost?’” In addition to considering the cost of entrance fees, money also acted as a limitation on the ability to purchase equipment necessary for some activities, as well as placing restrictions on travel. Time was also an element many felt they lacked and which resulted in non-visitation to desired sites. Due to time demands by jobs and family, participants felt they had little time to rest and recreate, especially if it was recreation that required travel. The relationship of time and money with proximity, another important decision driver and
constraint, is critical to acknowledge, and exemplifies the interwoven complexity of these elements.

Powers of knowledge, which shape access through beliefs and systems of meaning, were also shown to be lacking for participants in this study. Here, fear, language, and knowledge were the decision drivers and constraints defined by participants as reasons they do not visit the sites they want to visit. Knowledge can be both “formal” and informal, or experiential. As all the respondents in this study are first generation immigrants, their knowledge of not only the surrounding geography, but of the rules and procedures for many activities, can largely be attributed to what exposure they have had to different recreation opportunities. It is apparent that lack of familiarity with how to access a site and the activities that take place there is a primary factor in unmet recreation desires for these participants. Not being able to effectively understand or communicate in English also affects decisions in recreation. While a lack in English skills sometimes caused non-visitation to some sites, it more often led to a feeling of uneasiness by participants while at recreation sites, potentially affecting their level of enjoyment. The personal attribute of fear was also a common element affecting a participant’s decision to avoid some sites, with fear of the wild being prevalent. Participants often explained this fear as the assumption they would encounter animals such as snakes, spiders, bears, and mountain lions, and not on their own experiences or experiences of others actually encountering animals in the wild.

Language and ethnicity are the elements found in this study that exemplify the power of social identity, or membership in a community or group, and social
relationships. For many of the participants, their perception was that as part of the non-English speaking community they were limited in opportunities and, as one participant put it, limited in “liberty” to do as they wanted for recreation. An intriguing revelation from this study was that most respondents (67%) did not state, when asked directly, that their ethnicity had any effect on their recreation decisions. They often cited the fact that because there are a lot of Latinos/Hispanics in the area, their ethnicity is not a very big factor. However, when responding to open-ended questions about what affected recreation choices, many respondents did often speak about constraints with potential origins in customs and non-dominant language, including a distaste for cold weather, preference for group over individual activities, and how language affects one’s knowledge of recreation opportunities that exist as well as the ability to understand information provided at sites. Several respondents also volunteered discussions about how negative inter-group social relationships affect their discomfort in certain places, linking it to their status as outsiders and a desire not to “bother” whites in largely white spaces. It is apparent that among these participants the influence that ethnicity, as understood in terms of a group identity and corresponding social position, has on their recreation decisions often goes unperceived but emerges in important ways.

While issues of access and power were found to be underlying explanations for the lack of visitation to some sites for participants, drivers less related to access were also shown to be important. The proposal that “leisure is ethnic” (Kelly 1999, 145) supports the argument that a mix of cultural elements helps to shape how one conceptualizes recreation and operationalizes it. Customs and traditions of the participants were found
to influence the decision drivers and constraints of interest by self or others in certain activities, as well as the activity perceived appropriate for certain recreation sites. For many respondents, the correspondence of a site with a specific activity in which they are not interested is the largest factor in their lack of desire to visit it. Often the activities are considered dangerous or simply boring, though most of the participants had never attempted the activities and based their opinion either on observation, or as explained by some participants, on customs they continue to carry such as the belief that sleeping on the ground is the lowest form of living. It needs to be noted that the association of places with specific activities, and the racialization of those activities by at least some respondents, suggests that “activity” as a decision driver reflects more than personal (and potentially “custom-based”) preferences for some activities over others. The respondent’s discussion of rock-climbing illustrates this complexity as he stated that the activity entailed danger, an element in recreation “whites” prefer. In other words, being a person “of color” meant he didn’t belong in certain spaces doing certain activities.

Lacking access to powers of capital, knowledge, and social identity results in discrepancies between what respondents want and what they are able to access. It is apparent that while lacking powers does act to constrain respondents’ recreation, it does not always lead to non-visitation, but can instead limit the frequency with which respondents can visit sites. For some respondents, changing or increasing the powers of access would result in visits to sites they had not explored before and, for many, it would mean being able to visit more often the sites they already frequent. Despite the recreation managers’ perceptions and observations that the minority population’s needs in recreation
are presently being met, this study demonstrates there are spaces yet underutilized according to the desires of participants. The study also demonstrates it is not just the forests respondents do not visit.

Social relationships are not only associated with the power of access in negative ways. For respondents in this study these relationships often serve as a bridge across other access power limitations. Directly, social relationships shape recreation decisions for participants by defining with whom one recreates and what he or she needs and prefers. Indirectly, social relationships greatly influence experiential knowledge about places and activities. Over and over again, participants stated they first learned about the recreation sites they actively visit through an invitation or referral by friends, family, or co-workers. Social relationships are the means to and process of access for many of these participants. Repeatedly participants stated an invitation had the potential to be a motivator in getting them to visit recreation places they do not currently visit, despite the drivers or constraints that had led to non-visitation. One participant, when asked if anything could change her statement that she had no interest in and would likely never visit a golf course, said:

“Maybe if someone invited me. If someone else invited me, that someone gets you excited and they know about more places. Maybe visiting it, and seeing how it’s played and everything. And maybe you’d get some enthusiasm for it. Sometimes we just say, ‘I don’t like it.’ But we’ve never tried it.”

It’s true a lack of diversity in social relationships can serve as a lack of power which affects access. As one participant put it:

“The majority of people that I have relations with are people that play soccer. So more than anything that’s our theme: soccer and soccer. No
one talks about golf or skiing. I think that if I had relations with more people that did, maybe that would be a motivation to try something new.”

However, the respondent also indicated friends could get him to “try something new.”

Many of the decision drivers and constraints that currently lead to non-visititation by respondents can easily be overcome as others “invite, include, involve” (Chavez 2000) them in diverse recreational possibilities.

The inseparable tie between the ethnicity and marginality theories becomes increasingly apparent as studies such as this one demonstrate the relationship of custom and access in minority recreation choices. Actualized in ways like language as a marker of social identity, custom, or the practice and tradition of what one sees one can do for recreation, is shaped by access powers such as capital, knowledge, and social relationships. Of course conversely, limitations on minority powers of access are created due to social identity and position or, as described within the politics of difference, structural injustices (positional differences) can be built on perceived cultural differences (Young 2008).

Conclusions

A multi-layered picture emerges from this study’s discussion of recreation choices by participants. The results from this study highlight some key aspects about minority recreation, particularly regarding the places minorities do not presently use for recreation. While an abundance of literature takes a federal public lands approach, it is clear that public lands are not the only places minorities are not visiting for recreation. By dividing the lack of visitation question into places respondents would like to visit and those they
would not, researchers were able to delineate between unmet desires in recreation and undesired recreation. This gave researchers, after identifying and categorizing the types of spaces not visited, the ability to focus more intensely on the decision drivers and constraints that participants perceived as influential to their recreation choices and desires. However, we found the line between unmet recreation desires and undesired recreation to be a blurry line at best. This idea is illustrated by the role that social networks can play in fostering interest in previously undesired sites. This idea is also represented by the fact that many sites are undesired by the study participants because of an association of those sites with specific activities. In other words, sites can be socially constructed as for certain activities only leading to the outcome of undesirability.

Issues of access and power were evidenced through several decision drivers and constraints revealed in this study to be reasons for non-visitation of both desired and undesired sites. Capital, knowledge, social identity, social relationships were exemplified in this study as powers with which participants struggle, and which restrict access to, or the ability to benefit from, resources such as recreation spaces. The power of an invitation and other positive social relationships are shown to be an important bridge helping many respondents overcome access barriers. This has tremendous implications for managers and recreation practitioners as well. Understanding where recreation occurs for minority groups is only the first step. By recognizing how minority choices are driven by factors such as customs and deficiencies in power and access, managers and recreation practitioners will better know how to reach out and address the desires of site visitors and non-visitors. Seeing the environment and natural resources as public goods
and working to guarantee equal access to that public good should be a primary goal of all public land managers. Stereotypes in recreation about minority population wants and needs, or the perception that it’s not used by minorities so it does not need to be managed for them, has great potential to result in policies that restrict equal access to environmental amenities. Thus, when dealing with issues of justice and political equality, equal respect does not necessarily mean ignoring group differences and simply treating everyone the same way (Young 2008).

The methodological approach of allowing participants to define and describe recreation sites themselves allows this study to contribute to a broader understanding of the interwoven elements involved in recreation site choice, including custom and access. Approaching in a different way questions about where minorities do not recreate, such as investigating both desired and undesired recreation spaces, helps this exploratory study broaden the scope on themes in minority recreation, empirically supporting previous literature, without the reification of stereotypes. Investigating and understanding the reasons for recreation site decisions goes beyond emphasizing just positional or cultural differences, but connect to overall questions about how those differences influence and shape each other. The importance of social relationships, both negative intergroup and positive intragroup relationships, is a particularly unique theoretical contribution of this study, demonstrating the intersection of social identity and social relationships is not just about the individual, but is about how “others” construct a recreation space and use it too.

Exploratory research of this type is inherently limited in its ability to apply its findings to the general population or society as a whole. However, these limitations can
become intriguing next steps for future research. While this study focused on Hispanic/Latino recreation, the fact that all the participants were first generation immigrants solicits investigations of similar patterns of power in access among other populations of recent immigrants. Additionally, most respondents in this study were women, highlighting the possibility for deeper studies in gender differences in recreation meaning and choices among ethnic minorities. Another appealing next step in minority recreation research includes examining if and how a change in powers and access limitations translates to changes in usage of recreation sites. As put forth by respondents in this study, could a single invitation, increased knowledge, or more time and money open decision possibilities and alter the recreation landscape for a participant?

In a society growing increasingly divided along political and economic lines, becoming a nation that plays together grows ever more important. As public budgets continue to shrink, cuts focused on recreation areas could differentially impact minorities and other residents, leading to continued and increased unmet recreation desires. Environmental justice concerns are finally bringing attention to powers of access and discrepancies between minority rights to benefit and abilities to benefit from resources like recreation lands. More fully understanding the key factors involved in recreation decisions is the first step to knowing how the Latino/Hispanic community, and many other minority populations, might best be served.
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CHAPTER 4
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As the Hispanic/Latino population grows in the United States, increased attention is being given to how and why Hispanic/Latino recreation differs from Anglo recreation. Concerns over equal access to natural resources and recreation has led researchers to question the causes for the differences in recreation choices. The discussion has largely focused on the restrictive effects of ethnicity and the marginal position of minorities in society creating recreation patterns in which minorities are practically non-existent in wildland recreation areas.

Stepping away from the negative valuation about dissimilarities in Hispanic/Latino recreation, this study focuses on recreation as defined by participants, recreation sites both visited and not visited, and the decision drivers participants identify as most influential. Allowing participants to define recreation for themselves rather than defining it for them through place or activity, allows a more broad and better understanding of the complex elements involved in recreation site choice to surface. Through the use of a participant mapping activity, this study first identified patterns in types of sites visited and not visited by participants, a spatial approach contributing to a broader scope on recreation, rarely attempted when examining minority recreation spaces. Using exploratory, semi-structured interviews, this study also worked to uncover the participant definition of recreation as well as important elements driving recreation site choices, including desired and undesired recreation sites.
Municipal recreation sites are visited most commonly among participants and the major drivers attracting visitation are the physical site characteristics comprised of proximity, facilities, family suitability, scenery, seclusion, and activities specific to the site. Sites not visited span the categories of municipal, federal, state, and private, with federal sites uniquely being both the most commonly desired and undesired types of unvisited sites. Non-visititation of sites was found to largely be the result of personal (marginality) characteristics such as a lack of money, time, knowledge, language, and fear. Ethnicity and custom also proved to be influential drivers of recreation decisions through elements like language and participant conceptualization of recreation as seeking spaces in which to gather with others. Findings from this research support previous studies while also resisting stereotypes of Hispanic/Latino recreation. Recreation managers in Cache Valley, Utah would do well to understand that there are yet unmet recreation desires among Hispanic/Latino residents, which include a diverse cross-section of recreation sites. A practical understanding of this study’s findings on site-specific characteristics driving recreation decisions will help managers and others alike more successfully recognize and work to satisfy the recreation desires of a greater portion of residents.

It is conceded that there are limitations to this study, including the characteristic that as an exploratory study, comparisons cannot be made to the larger Anglo community in Cache Valley. Given the relatively recent immigration of the participants in this study, results have the potential to differ greatly from Hispanic/Latino populations with multi-generational residency in the United States. Particularly, the language decision driver,
which proved to be important to participants in this study, would likely not be a factor for multi-generational residents. Additionally, due to the use of a convenience sample, little could be done to regulate other demographic characteristics of participants, such as gender, with most respondents being women. For all that, the limitations from this study can easily become suggestions for future research. Comparison studies with multiple ethnic groups or immigrant and immigrant minority populations, investigations in minority gender recreation differences, or examinations of the effect shifts in power and access have on recreation site choices all have the potential as future research that could contribute to a better understanding of the complexities in minority recreation.

This research demonstrates that customs and powers of access (as related to ethnicity and marginality or politics of cultural and positional difference) undoubtedly intermingle to influence recreation choices among Hispanic/Latino participants. Looking at Hispanic/Latino recreation beyond how it is comparatively different from Anglo recreation provides a necessary holistic theoretical understanding of the elements driving decisions, and how those elements connect to and shape one another. Marginality and ethnicity, while critical theories to comprehend, are better understood by making sense of the numerous ways they connect to and impact the other. As this understanding increases, work can be done to ensure equality in access to resources like recreation, as desired by the minority population.
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Recreation Management
Key Informant Interviews

Director of Logan City Parks and Recreation, September 14, 2009

Manager of Hyrum Lake State Park, September 16, 2009

Councilman over Parks and Recreation for Hyrum City, October 20, 2009

Recreation Department Manager and Staff Officer for Uinta-Wasatch Cache National Forest in the Logan Ranger District, October 27, 2009

Parks Division Director for Logan City Parks and Recreation, October 28, 2009

Forest Protection Officer for Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in the Logan Ranger District, December 3, 2009*

*Interview questions answered by email rather than in person.
Appendix B: Recreation Manager
Interview Questions

1. Could you start by telling me about your experiences working with public recreation and about your current position?

2. I am interested in knowing more about how use of various recreation areas has changed over the last 10 years and, more specifically, how it has changed in regards to the Latino population. Could you speak to what you have observed or know?

3. Can you describe the demographics of visitors and users of recreation places in this area?

4. Which of the locations under your agency’s or program’s management are most used by Latinos? Which locations are least used by Latinos?

5. Which recreation activities do Latinos engage in the most and which do they engage in the least?

6. From what you have observed and know, what would you offer as an explanation for the recreation patterns of Latinos? Why do you think they use certain areas and engage in certain activities?

7. Do you think Latino recreation needs differ from those of the general population? [Follow up if they answer yes] In what ways does your agency try to meet the particular needs of Latino recreationists?

8. Do you have any other general comments or observations about Latino recreation in the greater Cache Valley area?
Appendix C: Lists of Popular Local Recreation Sites and Activities

**English - Locations**

Logan River First Dam  
Logan River Second Dam  
Tony Grove  
Crystal Hot Springs  
Willow Park Zoo  
Logan Aquatic Center (Water Park)  
The Fun Park  
Hyrum State Park  
Green Canyon  
Logan Canyon  
Wellsville Mountains  
City Parks  
  Willow Park  
  The Skate Park  
  Merlin Olsen Park  
  Second Dam Park  
  Adams Park  
  Northwest Park  
Logan River Golf Course  
Logan Recreation Center  
Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge  
Bear Lake  
Eccles Ice Center (Ice Rink)  
USU Anthropology Museum  
Hardware Ranch  
Bonneville Shoreline  
Stokes Nature Center  
Wasatch-Cache National Forest  
**Reservoirs**  
  Pineview Reservoir  
  Mantua Reservoir  
  Cutler Reservoir  
  Newton Reservoir  
Logan River  
Bear River  
Little Bear River  
Your own neighborhood/yard  
*Other places
English - Activities

Walking
Hiking
Bicycling
Horseback riding
Roller skating
Skate boarding
Swimming (pool or non-pool)
Playing Sports
(baseball, soccer, basketball, football, volleyball, tennis, softball, golf)
Fishing
Hunting
Mushrooming/plant or fruit collecting
Boating
Sailing
Water skiing
Jet skiing
Canoeing
Kayaking
Going to a lake
Camping
Off-road driving
Rock Climbing
Mountain Climbing
Backpacking
Caving
Mountain biking
Snow skiing
Snowmobiling
Snow shoeing
Going to city parks
Picnicking
Playing yard games
Wildlife watching
Bird watching
Fossil hunting
Gardening
Going to a museum
Visiting zoo or nature center
Going to sporting events

Going to historic sites
Attending concerts or plays
Going to a town fair/festival
Running/jogging
Exercising /Going to a gym
Watching TV
Going to a movie
Working on a car
Reading
*Other activities
Spanish - Locations

Río de Logan Primer Presa o Dique  (Logan River First Dam)
Río de Logan Segunda Presa o Dique  (Logan River Second Dam)
Arboleda de Tony (Tony Grove)
Manantial Caliente de Cristal (Crystal Hot Springs)
Zoológico de Willow Park (Willow Park Zoo)
Piscina de Logan (Logan Aquatic Center or Water Park)
The Fun Park
Lago de Hyrum o Hyrum State Park
Canyon Verde (Green Canyon)
Canyon de Logan (Logan Canyon)
Montañas de Wellsville (Wellsville Mountains)
Parques de la Ciudad (City Parks)
  Willow Park
  The Skate Park
  Merlin Olsen Park
  Second Dam Park
  Adams Park
  Northwest Park
Campo de Golf de Logan River  (Logan River Golf Course)
Centro Recreativo de Logan  (Logan Recreation Center)
Refugio de Pájaros Migratorios de Bear River  (Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge)
Lago del Oso  (Bear Lake)
Pista de Patinaje (Eccles Ice Center)
Museo de antropología de la Universidad  (USU Anthropology Museum)
Rancho de Hardware (Hardware Ranch)
Orilla de Bonneville  (Bonneville Shoreline)
Centro de la Naturaleza  (Stokes Nature Center)
Bosque Nacional de Wasatch-Cache  (Wasatch-Cache National Forest)
Pantanos de agua
  Pineview (Pineview Reservoir)
  Manuta (Mantua Reservoir)
  Cutler (Cutler Reservoir)
  Newton (Newton Reservoir)
Río de Logan  (Logan River)
Río del Oso  (Bear River)
Pequeno Río del Oso  (Little Bear River )
Su propio barrio o patio  (Your own neighborhood/yard)
*Otros Lugares
Spanish - Activities

Caminar
Ir de caminata en las montanas
Ir en bicicleta
Andar a caballo
Patín de rueda
Skate board
Nadar (en piscine o no)
Jugar deportivas
(béisbol, fútbol, baloncesto, fútbol americano, voleibol, tenis, softbol, golf)
Pescar
Cazar
Collectar plantas, frutas, champiñones o hongos
Paseo en barca
Navegación a vela
Esquiar de agua
Moto-esquiar
Canoa o kayak
Ir al lago
Acampar
Manejar en las montañas sin calles
Escalar montañas
Mountain Climbing
Viajar con la mochila al hombro (en las montañas)
Espeleología
Ir de bicicleta de montaña
Esquiar de nieve
Usar motonieves
Usar raqueta de nieve
Ir a las parques de la ciudad
Ir de picnic
Jugar partidas o juegos en casa
Observación de animales
Observación de aves
Buscar fósiles
Jardinería
Ir al museo
Visitar el zoológico centro de naturaleza
Asistir to pruebas deportivas

*Otras actividades
Appendix D: Hispanic/Latino Resident Interview Questions

English

1. I’d like to start by asking you about the meaning of a couple words. People define recreation many different ways. What is recreation to you?
   Do you think of “recreation” differently than “free time”, or “pastime”? Can you explain that to me?
   Take a look at these lists of activities and locations. What word would you use to describe them?

2. When do you engage in recreation activities?
   **Prompts:**
   a. Which recreation activities do you engage in all year round?
   b. Which recreational activities do you engage in on a seasonal basis (just certain times of the year)?

3. Who do you usually recreate with?

4. When you recreate with other people, who usually decides where to go and what to do?

5. How do you usually travel to recreation locations?

6. When you participate in recreation activities outside your home, where do you go?

7. Explain why you choose to go to these places and what you do when you are there.

8. What places would you like to go for recreation, but do not?

9. Explain why you don’t go to these places you are interested in.

10. Are there places that you will not go to, or have no interest in going?

11. Explain why you don’t want to go to those places.

12. What would have to change, or what could be done in order for you to go a place you do not go to now for recreation?

13. I want to talk a little bit more about factors that, for many people, constrain their participation in recreation activities. I want to find out how they how they influence you. You might have mentioned some of these things, but you might have some additional comments so I would like to ask about them.
How does _________________________ affect you in your recreation choices?
   a. Distance
   b. Time
   c. Money
   d. Knowledge
   e. Language
   f. Interest
   g. Fear

14. How does being Latino in Cache Valley affect your choices in recreation, if at all?

15. Do you have any other comments about recreation that I didn’t think to ask about?
Spanish

1. Me gustaría empezar al preguntarle acerca de la definición de unas palabras. La gente define la palabra recreación en muchas maneras. ¿Qué es recreación para usted? ¿Es recreación diferente de “tiempo libre” o “pasatiempo”? ¿Me puede explicar eso?

Mire a estas listas de actividades y lugares. ¿Cuál palabra usará para describirles?

2. ¿Cuando hace más sus actividades recreativas? ¿Cuáles actividades hace todo el año? ¿Cuáles actividades recreativas hace solo durante ciertas partes del año?

3. ¿Con quién usualmente hace sus actividades recreativas?

4. ¿Cuando participe en recreación con otros, quién normalmente decide a donde van y que hacen?

5. ¿Cómo llegue normalmente a los lugares de recreación?

6. ¿Cuando participe en actividades recreativas fuera de su casa, a dónde va?

7. Explique por qué usted escoje estos lugares y que hace cuando está allí.

8. ¿Cuáles lugares le gustarían visitar para recreación, pero no visita?

9. Explique por qué usted no va a esos lugares en que tiene interés.

10. ¿Hay lugares que usted no visitará, or en que no tiene interés en visitar?

11. Explique por qué usted no va a esos lugares.

12. ¿Qué tendría que cambiar, o que podría pasar para hacer que usted visite a un lugar que ahora no visita para recreación?

13. Quiero hablar un poco más acerca de las cosas que, para muchas personas, les prohíben en participar in actividades recreativas. Quiero averiguar como le afectan a usted. Tal vez usted ya ha hablado de unas de estas cosas, pero es posible que tendrá comentarios adicionales y me gustaría preguntarle.

¿Cómo le afecta _________________ en sus decisiones en recreación?

a. Distancia
b. Tiempo
c. Dinero
d. Conocimiento
e. Idioma
f. Interés
g. Miedo

14. ¿Cómo le afecta (si le afecta) el ser Hispano/Latino en Cache Valley, en sus decisiones en recreación?

15. ¿Tiene otros comentarios acerca de recreación que no pensé en preguntar?
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