

IS LEISURE ON THE LEVEL: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE LEISURE
PREFERENCES OF WHITES, BLACKS AND HISPANICS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Kay Newling, B.S.A.S.

San Marcos, Texas
August 2007

COPYRIGHT

by

Kay Newling

2007

"And the day came when the risk to remain tight in a bud was more painful than the risk
it took to blossom." *Emily Dickinson*

For MMH

and

For my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Sally Caldwell, for her resilience and guidance. In her hands, the process of writing and statistical analysis appears deceptively clear and unobstructed. I have appreciated her generous support and insights.

I am very grateful to Dr. Audwin Anderson, and Dr. Audrey McKinney, for their careful reading of my work, their encouragement, suggestions and time given over to discussion.

I would also like to thank Dr. Susan Day who has been a constant and extraordinary mentor during my sojourn at Texas State University-San Marcos.

I wish to thank Michele, for giving me the time to complete this thesis, and for her unwavering kindness and support.

This thesis was submitted on July 5, 2007.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
Background	3
Research Perspectives	5
Classical Theorists	8
Current Theoretical Perspectives	13
A Statement of the Research Questions	20
3 METHODOLOGY	21
Data Collection	21
Description of Data	25
Statistical and Interpretive Method of Analysis	29
4 FINDINGS	32
5 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	45
Summary of Findings and Conclusions	45
Limitations of the Research	47
APPENDIX	48
REFERENCES	56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Demographic Profile of the Data Set.....	26
2 Leisure Activities Selected for the Study	27
3 Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities for Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation	33
4 Blacks Compared to Whites – Activities for Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation	33
5 Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities in Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation for Both Blacks and Hispanics When Compared to Whites	34
6 Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities in Which There is Significant Difference in Levels of Participation for Both Blacks and Hispanics When Compared to Whites	35
7 Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities in Which There is Significant Difference in Levels of Participation – Highest Participation Level Identified by Race	36
8 Blacks and Hispanics – Activities in Which There is Significant Difference in Levels of Participation	37
9 Blacks and Hispanics – Activities in Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation.....	38
10 Marginality Model – Participation Rates of Whites, Blacks and Hispanics (i.e. the proportion within each race who participated at least once in the last 12 months).....	44

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

TABLE	PAGE
11 Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Significance of Activities in the Original Analysis	49
12 Blacks Compared to Whites – Significance of Activities When Further Specified by Sex and Age.....	50
13 Hispanics Compared to Whites – Significance of Activities When Further Specified by Sex and Age.....	51
14 Blacks Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age – Activities compared to Whites	52
15 Blacks Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age – Number of Activities that were Similar to Whites in the original analyses that are now Significantly Different from Whites.....	52
16 Blacks Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age – Number of Activities that changed from being Significantly Different to become Similar to Whites	52
17 Hispanics Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age – Activities Similar to Whites	52
18 Hispanics Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age – Number of Activities that changed from being Similar to become Significantly Different from Whites.....	52
19 Hispanics Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age – Number of Activities that changed from Significantly Different to become Similar to Whites	53
20 Fear of Discrimination Model (Martin 2004).....	53
21 Ethnicity/Sub-Cultural Model: (Marsden and Swingle 1993).....	54
22 Racialization Model: (based on Kaplan’s Taxonomy of Leisure Activities)	55

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1 Distribution of Blacks' Participation in Activity X Compared to the Distribution for Whites.....	30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Time spent in relaxation and enjoyment is universal in human populations and gives rise to an extraordinary array of activities and experiences. These activities are usually referred to as leisure, and they have attracted the interest of social scholars throughout history. For example, social theorists such as Marx, Veblen, and Weber, wrote about the changing value of leisure in capitalist, industrializing societies. In doing so, these theorists set a framework for understanding leisure as “work versus leisure”. Although this theme continues to influence thinking about leisure, work related factors are no longer considered to be the primary determinants of leisure participation. As Rapoport and Rapoport (1974) comment,

As leisure interests become less closely tied to gross occupational characteristics they become more variable, more determined by a wide range of personal and social experiences, more part of life rather than merely antithetical to work (P. 222).

Consistent with that observation, one notes a trend in the more recent leisure research studies, namely a focus on the non-work elements such as gender, age, place of residence, education, race and ethnicity. Kelly (1975), for example, explored the effect of life stage factors such as age and parenthood on leisure participation. Aitchison (1999), on the other hand, explored the link between the appeal of tourist destinations and gender/sexuality variables.

As might be expected, the continued salience of race/ethnicity as a social marker naturally led some to focus on its relationship to participation in leisure pursuits. In some cases, the research focus is upon a single leisure pursuit, with the researcher typically comparing differential rates of participation on the part of Blacks and Whites. For example, a researcher might focus on the differences between Blacks and Whites in terms of attendance at a particular type of sporting event. In other cases, researchers have focused on differential levels of participation by Blacks and Whites across a variety of leisure activities. For example, a researcher might look at the differential rates of participation on the part of Blacks and Whites in playing tennis, as well as jogging and camping and a host of other activities. The material that follows serves to further summarize the evolution of and approaches to leisure research focusing on race and ethnicity.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Background

In America, over the past 40 years, there has been considerable interest and scholarly research around the axis of leisure behavior and race and ethnicity. The initiating dynamic was the Civil Rights movement during the 1960s with its attention on social inequities between Whites and ethnic and racial minorities; in particular it heightened awareness of the “Black-White” social divide (Floyd, 1998). Accordingly, much of the research interest of the period reflected a concern on the part of public policy makers about the under-representation of Blacks, and to a lesser degree other minorities, in outdoor public recreation areas. This early period was followed by yet another look at the topic, primarily during the 1970s, but this time the focus and framing of the relationship of race/ethnicity to leisure participation was affected by the growing popularity of the environmental movement. The result was a substantial body of research dominated by a focus on differences in Black-White participation in publicly financed outdoor wilderness areas such as national parks and waterways (Washburne, 1978; Woolcott, 2000).

Today, the arena has been expanded even further, and contemporary research seeks to increase knowledge about the interaction of race and leisure activities to include a wider range of leisure interests, locations and minority groups. The transition to the present day research efforts, however, has not been without difficulties (Hutchison 1988; Floyd 1993; Gramann & Allison 1999; Philipp 1999; Winant 2000). In part, the difficulties can be attributed to the many and varied definitions that exist for race or ethnicity, as well as definitions of leisure. For example the classification *Hispanic* is sometimes defined as those whose first language is Spanish; at other times, however, it may be defined on the basis of country of origin (Aguilar and Hurst 2006). As to definitions of leisure, some studies include only those activities of an extremely active nature (e.g., jogging, playing tennis, exercising, etc.), but other studies may include more passive activities such as reading a book, listening to music, watching television, attending a movie, etc.

Despite such challenges, many leisure scholars continue to focus on connections between variations in participation in leisure activities and broader social stratification, particularly as it relates to racial or ethnic categories. The scope and methodological approaches used in such studies include qualitative and quantitative techniques, and they range from comparisons of race/ethnic group participation patterns for individual activities to a focus on differences in patterns over a wide range of activities. They also reflect a wide variety of research perspectives.

Research Perspectives

Typical of the approach that focuses on a singular activity, Scarboro and Husain (2006) found there was little or no news reporting of the presence or performance of African American golfers on elite courses in the community of Augusta, Georgia. Using a content analysis approach, with a focus on the Augusta Chronicle newspaper, the researchers discovered that the first mention of a Black golfer was a reference to John Russell in an article that appeared in 1942. The emphasis of the story, however, was upon Russell's arrest for murder. As Scarboro and Husain noted:

...neither Russell's golf accomplishments nor golf at all was the focus of the article. Rather, the writer reports, Russell, a "caddy...and one of Atlanta's best Negro golfers," was a murderer: [he] "was today charged with the murder of George H. A. Thomas, a 57 year-old manager of the Black Rock Country Club....Russell went through the safe and stole some cigarettes and golf balls" (P. 242-243).

On the other hand, Shinew, Glover and Parry (2004) found that the element of elitism or segregation was absent in the case of urban community gardening. Using a methodology based upon telephone interviews in the St. Louis area, Shinew discovered, among other things, that the two groups (i.e., Blacks and Whites) were highly similar in terms of the motivations that fueled their participation on community gardening.

The two racial groups responded similarly and positively to many of the motivations (i.e., improve my neighborhood, enjoy nature, relax), with only one racial difference. African Americans were more likely to agree that the garden provided them with the opportunity to "provide food for others." ... Interestingly, there was not a significant difference in their response to "feed my family" (P. 351).

In a study of 300 university students (150 Black and 150 White), Pittenger and Hunt (1984) focused on a variety of leisure activities and administered a Work-Leisure Attitude Inventory to measure the meanings that students gave to their leisure pursuits.

Among the more interesting findings was the notion that there were more similarities among Black and White students than differences in terms of their concepts of leisure. Equally interesting was the observation that all students gave “Time-killing Activity” the lowest score of all activities, suggesting that college students of both races prefer meaningful leisure pursuits.

In another study along those lines, Philipp (2000) found that middle-class African Americans and middle-class European Americans ascribed similar values to leisure activities. However, there were many activities that African Americans were less likely to participate in because they felt unwelcome in the leisure settings. The study found that,

...both racial groups share a very similar basic understanding of where African Americans will find the most racial acceptance during their leisure time. This finding seems to suggest that many, if not most, leisure activities have embedded racial “information” associated with them in some way (i.e., Blacks are likely to “fit” these activities, and not likely to “fit” other activities). This kind of racial information appeared to be readily known and understood by most people in the present study (P. 397).

Although far less prevalent in the literature, there are some studies that focus on Hispanic/White leisure participation. Typically, such studies include an assimilation perspective in the sense that they tend to focus on differential rates of leisure participation as related to length of residence in the United States. The work of Shaull and Gramann (1998), for example, is representative of that approach. In their telephone survey of Hispanic households in central and southern California, they explored the effects of cultural assimilation on attitudes toward family and nature-oriented recreation. The assimilation theme was particularly salient with respect to one of the major findings:

A strong Anglo-conformity pattern was found in the perceived importance of nature-related benefits from outdoor recreation participation. The more assimilated the Hispanic respondents, the more similar they were to Anglos in the importance of those benefits (P. 47).

As the previously cited research reflects, there is no shortage of investigations that focus on race/ethnicity and participation in leisure pursuits, particularly those of a comparative sort (i.e. Black and White or Hispanic and White). What appears to be missing, however, are those studies that offer a more comprehensive approach to the matter of ethnicity — namely investigations of levels of leisure participation by Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics in a single study.

As noted in the work by Shinew et al. (2006), there is an obvious need to go beyond the conventional “Black–White” divide that dominates the literature of race/ethnicity and leisure research:

We are already witnessing the restructuring of the American society along racial and ethnic lines. Before the 2000 Census, the black-white “color” line was the primary cleavage in American society. The recent emergence of Hispanics as the largest “minority” subpopulation, supplanting African Americans, has led to theorizing on this new racial and social structure (P. 404).

Against the background of the research outlined above, as well as the call for a more comprehensive consideration of race/ethnicity in the field of leisure research, the present investigation examined the variation of levels of participation in leisure pursuits across three demographic categories: Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics.

Classical Theorists

Early social theorists typically contemplated leisure as it related to work, and the broader social implications of changing work roles and situations. Perhaps most reflective of this orientation are the works of Marx, Weber and Veblen.

Marx continued the project of the Enlightenment thinkers who rejected the positivist notion that truth is to be sought only in the form of what is immediately observable and verifiable,

Enlightenment thought was not merely reflective, nor was it satisfied to deal solely with axiomatic truths. It attributed to thought a creative and critical function, the power and the task of shaping life itself (Zeitlin 1981: 5).

He took from Hegel the dialectical conception of reality, and held that any existing order is a mere aspect of its whole potentiality that requires criticism and opposition in order to be revealed. Hegel viewed social reality as the materialization of ideas, whereas for Marx it was the material circumstances that gave rise to ideas. Society, according to Marx, is a constantly changing reality dependent on human consciousness and will.

Marx believed that all human beings are inherently a universal being with an entitlement to act as a consciously purposive agent, and to the freedom to pursue their full potentiality in objective activity (Duquette 1989). In the Marxian view, the economic structure of society is the foundation upon which social relationships are formed, and in which such individual freedoms are realized. Marx was critical of the capitalist mode of production because it creates a social hierarchy in which the individual freedom of workers is constrained by a dominant property owning class.

According to Marx the social structure of capitalist economies develops within a material environment that alienates workers from both the means of production, and the goods and services they produce. Individuals who do not own the means of production lose the freedom to realize their human potentiality in work.

Marx observed that individuals working in alienating and unfulfilling factory jobs sought true self-fulfillment in leisure time activities, rather than their work (Arnold 1989). According to Marx ([1864] 1982):

... [the worker] does not fulfil himself in his work but denies himself, has a feeling of misery rather than well-being, does not develop freely his mental and physical energies but is physically exhausted and mentally debased. The worker, therefore, feels himself at home only during his leisure time, whereas at work he feels homeless. His work is not voluntary but imposed, forced labour. It is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs (P. 17).

The Marxian approach to the study of leisure activities reflects concern about social stratification and alienation, and the degree to which participation may be constrained due to membership in a minority or oppressed group. For example, many leisure studies in the mid 20th century focused on the under-representation of women and Blacks in professional sports (Theberge 1993). In this context it was held that leisure behavior was part of a complex social system; it was subject to the interaction of capitalist economics and to a political system that was seen as racist, unjust and dysfunctional. This more complex view of leisure behavior introduced a more pluralistic and functional theoretical framework into the sociological study of leisure. The functional approach was built upon Weberian premises.

For Weber ([1905] 1978), in contrast to Marx, the emphasis was on the non-economic aspects of social life. Weber noticed that there were differences in life circumstances that could be attributed to factors outside the economic structure.

...within the broad categories of propertied and propertyless, other important distinctions exist, not only in income, but in prestige, or social honor, as well. Prestige, for Weber, is associated with the style of life of a status group. Within any given class, one will find several status groups. The relative prestige accorded them may rest on the size and source of their income, their political positions in the community, their education, their specialized training, or other evaluated social characteristics (Zeitlin 1981: 162).

As well as the notions of lifestyle and status, Weber was interested in the concentration of power associated with the bureaucratization of modern society. He noticed that any where power concentrates in the hands of a minority, there is a consequent separation of the majority from those means (Weber 1962). He expands the idea of alienation and the concentration of power beyond the realm of economic production, to include other social institutions. The question for Marx is: who controls the means of production? For Weber, in order to understand social processes, the question must go further than that raised by Marx, and ask who has control of non-economic means of dominating people. The bureaucratization of social institutions including politics, the military, education, health and scientific research, conveys legitimate power to key bureaucratic positions. In this way all aspects of social life, including leisure, are subject to concentration of the means of power, and the subsequent alienation of the majority from the process.

Through his concept of the Protestant Work Ethic, Weber was able to show that work and the accumulation of wealth had acquired a positive moral value in the American capitalist system. Leisure or unproductive time, on the other hand, was judged to be idleness and a sign of individual turpitude.

Riches are only dangerous as a temptation to idle repose and sinful enjoyment of life, and the endeavour to acquire them is only suspect when its purpose is to enable one later to live a life of frivolity and gaiety. When it is engaged in as part of the duties of the calling, however, it is not only morally permissible but positively commanded (P. 148).

The Weberian approach to race relations and leisure held that inter-group conflict resulted in racially categorized groups being distinctly located within an overall system of social stratification, including the arena of leisure. In America, as in Britain and other western capitalist countries, it gave rise to a framework that analyzed differences in Black-White life-chances and concluded that racial discrimination resulted in Blacks being located at the bottom of, and outside the main white class structure (Jarvie and Reid, 1997).

To the extent that these forces created a distinctive form of race consciousness, they were integral to the process of forming a Black underclass, and separate patterns of participation in leisure activities between races. Weberian concepts of lifestyle and status are found in studies of leisure patterns that use ethnic/sub-cultural theory and take into account the effect of race on life-chances in other social domains (Katz-Gerro 2006; Stephenson and Hughes 2005; Walker and Courneya 2006; Wolch and Zhang 2004).

The last of the classical theorists being considered is Veblen. Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class* ([1899] 1931) drew attention to what he termed conspicuous leisure and its role in the definition of status. As Veblen theorized:

Conspicuous abstention from labour therefore becomes the conventional mark of superior pecuniary achievement and the conventional index of reputability; and conversely, since application to productive labour is a mark of poverty and subjection, it becomes inconsistent with a reputable standing in the community. . . . (P. 38)

He further stated that:

. . . the term "leisure", as here used, does not connote indolence or quiescence. What it connotes is non-productive consumption of time. Time is consumed non-productively (1) from a sense of the unworthiness of productive work, and (2) as an evidence of pecuniary ability to afford a life of idleness (P. 43).

In contrast to Marx who asked who has economic power, and Weber who focused on who had power to dominate, Veblen asked, why is wealth desired? Like Weber, he was most interested in the non-economic functions of wealth in social systems. Weber and Veblen both outline value patterns in Western capitalist societies where the chief criterion of success is wealth. Weber argues that the Protestant ethic assisted the success of capitalism as it bestowed prestige as a measure of hard work, and the accumulation of wealth coupled with restraint in consumption. Veblen, however, treats conspicuous consumption as the principal symbol of wealth and the means of acquiring status,

...Writing from the evidence of the late nineteenth century, Veblen treats conspicuous consumption as an end in itself, a normative pattern for nearly all classes in the population (Davis 1944).

Weber contends that wealth continues to confer prestige even when the religious connection is lost, because it maintains its association with the value of "occupational calling" and hard work. Veblen, on the other hand, argues that wealth, as a symbol of status, became an end in itself and is valued independently of how it is acquired. He characterizes the 'leisure class' as a culture-bearing elite who set patterns of behavior and consumption that others in society seek to emulate (Veblen [1899] 1912). The association of leisure with the formation of identity and status groups ties Veblen's theory of Conspicuous Consumption to the ethnicity/sub-cultural view. According to this theory, the voluntary participation in leisure activities is a major factor in creating an identity.

Current Theoretical Perspectives

While early theorists such as Marx, Weber, and Veblen provided us illuminating commentary in the grand theory tradition, more recent theorists have offered perspectives that speak more directly to the issue of racial/ethnic variation in leisure pursuits. Perhaps most representative of this more contemporary theoretical focus are the following concepts: 1) The marginality perspective; 2) the ethnicity/sub-cultural perspective; 3) the fear of discrimination model; and 4) racialization theory.

Marginality Theory

The marginality perspective, which entered the literature at the end of the Civil Rights era, was first articulated in Washburne's (1978) seminal article. In essence, Washburne's major theoretical contribution was his suggested link between leisure constraints and constraints in other areas of social life. Writing about the lack of participation by Blacks in leisure pursuits in general, Washburn argued that the barriers are deeply rooted and are class-based.

[t]he *marginality* perspective, suggesting that Blacks do not participate because of poverty and various consequences of socioeconomic discrimination, seems to be reflected in many current programs that aim at overcoming barriers to Black participation. Thus, the general marginal position of Blacks in society, as concerns their access to various amenities commonly enjoyed by whites could have resulted in a life style constrained by unmet basic needs, poor transportation, and limited opportunities due to their urban "ghetto" residence (P. 176-177).

Additionally, the marginality view suggests that structural discrimination (e.g., occupational, educational, political, etc.) persists and is manifested in a wide spectrum of activities, including freely chosen activities such as private leisure pursuits of African Americans. Leisure research that uses the marginality perspective generally takes a

critical view of the status quo. Studies typically expose inequalities and have the objective of motivating change for the better. A study of long distance running exposed the way that activity uses body type (the image of a slender muscular body) and clothing to exclude people based on age, social class and sex (Abbas 2004). Amesty (2003) analyzed epidemiological data regarding levels of leisure time physical activity and exercise in the Hispanic community and demonstrated that Hispanics participated less than Whites because of structural barriers including language, poverty, and distance of residence from leisure sites, and fear of danger in public spaces. Another study looked at organizational barriers to the inclusion of minority groups in public recreation areas. It was found that decisions concerning tax supported recreation sites cater for majority interests (Allison and Hibbler 2004). By basing decisions on surveys of existing users alone, public officials exclude consideration of non-users needs and thereby continue to disenfranchise them.

Ethnicity/Sub-Cultural Theory

In contrast to the marginality view, the ethnicity/sub-cultural theory minimizes the notion that differences in patterns of leisure participation are influenced by structural opportunities or impediments. Rather, the ethnicity/sub-cultural perspective emphasizes differences in values, norms and socialization patterns as the bases for racial/ethnic variation in leisure participation. Floyd et al. (1994), in a recent study of leisure activity preferences and race, make the following reference to the ethnicity perspective:

...the ethnicity or subcultural hypothesis, states that minority underparticipation or intergroup variation results from differences between racial or ethnic groups in value systems, norms, and socialization patterns. This explanation suggests that regardless of socioeconomic standing,

cultural processes are more important in explaining variation between blacks and whites in leisure participation patterns (P. 159).

In short, the ethnicity/sub-cultural model tends to emphasize the cultural basis of leisure pursuits by defining leisure activities as a form of cultural marker. In the extreme, the ethnicity/sub-cultural model would suggest that participation in some forms of leisure activity can represent a form of cultural resistance, at least in terms of a minority group acting in resistance against the normative structure of the dominant society. An underlying assumption is that individuals have autonomy in making choices about which activities they will participate in. The decision is more likely to be based on “pull” factors than “push” factors. As Collins (1988) observes, group solidarity can be an important outcome of leisure participation, and makes choice of leisure time companions perhaps even more important than the activity itself. Extending this idea,

...solidarity is the result of the interactional (social) and symbolic (moral) density of a group. Through these interactional and symbolic processes, people’s common interests and experience coalesce, they become a group by constructing a meaning system for action, and can diffuse this ideological or religious system throughout society (Kane 1991).

The work of Shaul and Gramann (1998) demonstrates that Hispanic-Americans continue to use outdoor recreation spaces as a way of maintaining kinship ties and as means of connecting to family members who live in other places. This is especially true of those with relatives in Mexico. The study found that Whites typically visit recreational areas in groups of two or three for the purpose of physical activity, whereas Hispanic-Americans visit in large family-related groups for the primary purpose of spending time with extended family, for immersion in language and the opportunity to learn and express their cultural practices.

Fear of Discrimination Theory

As to the fear of discrimination perspective, it suggests that minority participation in leisure activities can be predicted on the basis of the extent to which a given leisure activity is identified with the dominant group. The theory proposes that leisure behavior, as a freely chosen activity, will reflect the patterns of dominant/subordinate positioning found in the larger society. According to Martin (2004) key elements of the fear of discrimination theory are that,

...the likelihood and fear of discrimination increase as a person travels further from comfortable or familiar surroundings, outside of places where one feels a sense of belonging. The logical extension of this is that the fear of discrimination is greatest in settings in which one feels uncomfortable or with which one is unfamiliar....The social identity associated with certain leisure activities may influence their appeal for different populations due to fear of discrimination, harassment, and/or physical harm (P. 5).

The fear of discrimination model, as originally enunciated, includes six leisure activities intended to represent a variety of social settings (indoor, outdoor, at home and away from home) and dispositions (individual and group). They were classified in terms of the extent to which they reflect dominant group identity as follows:

Strong White Identity:	Camping/hiking and attend auto races
Moderate White Identity:	Attend classical music concert/opera and visit art gallery/museum
Race Neutral Identity:	Attend movies and attend athletic events

According to the fear of discrimination perspective, members of racial/ethnic groups would be more inclined to distance themselves from those activities having a strong or moderate White identity. One of the first studies to explore the concept of fear

of discrimination was a qualitative study by Lee (1972) who proposed that low levels of participation by Blacks in outdoor recreation activities such as camping and hiking was due to such spaces being constructed as “White space.” Other studies have found that Blacks travel considerable distances to avoid racial discrimination and harassment (Craig 1972; Philipp 1994). Philipp found that Blacks were more likely than Whites to prefer familiar destinations, known travel routes, and planned itineraries, while Whites were more likely to prefer novel destinations and spontaneous schedules (Martin 2004). Feagin (1994) focuses on the probability of encountering discrimination, and finds that the likelihood of meeting with prejudice, even hostility, increases the further one is distanced from familiar territory. He also finds that Blacks use a range of coping mechanisms including avoidance of places and activities where discrimination is most likely to occur.

Martin uses data from the culture model of the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS) for his study. As the first step he used Chi Square tests to assess the bivariate relationships between race and participation. Next, logistic regression was used to determine the effect of race on participation in each of the selected activities. Martin found that the results of his analysis supported the model,

...the results were as I predicted they would be using hypotheses based on the typology, and the typology was able to account for results that could not be explained by using other [Marginality and Ethnicity] perspectives (P. 16).

This is the only empirical support for Martin’s typology. It is used in this study to further test its ability to predict participation patterns for Hispanics, as well as Blacks, using DDB Survey data.

Racialization Theory

The racialization theory is based on the notion that the matter of race, as a socially constructed category, but one based on physical characteristics, is a central element in the shifting and sorting that takes place with the process of stratification. It is, moreover, the essential element that gives rise to exploitation, whether it is political, financial, legal or otherwise. As applied to American society, a central tenet of the racialization theory is that exploitation of Blacks is embedded in the system of stratification. As it relates to patterns of leisure participation, the theory of racialization would suggest that the patterns of various groups are, in fact, expressions of deeply embedded inter-group social relationships.

According to Bonilla-Silva (1996), who is perhaps the major contemporary proponent of the racialization perspective, American society is founded on racialized principles; therefore, racialization will be perpetually embedded in the structure of American social relationships. More importantly, at least in the present context, Bonilla-Silva makes an important distinction between ethnicity and race in considering group association.

Ethnicity has a primarily sociocultural foundation, and ethnic groups have exhibited tremendous malleability in terms of who belongs (Barth 1969; Leach [1954] 1964); racial ascriptions (initially) are imposed externally to justify the collective exploitation of a people and are maintained to preserve status differences (P. 469).

This distinction is important to the concept of racialization. Racialized social systems place individuals in a hierarchy based on arbitrarily chosen phenotypical traits. The race placed at the top of the hierarchy tends to receive better life-chances and status than other races. At the bottom end of the hierarchy is the race characterized as least like

the dominant race, and the race most likely to receive the fewest life-chances and social rewards. “Generally, the more dissimilar the races’ life chances, the more racialized the social system, and vice versa” (P. 470). Once set in place in the hierarchy, the racial groups develop different interests in opposition to one another which in turn gives rise to relationships and practices that support the racial structure.

Ethnic groups are primarily defined by the cultural and social practices that make them different to the dominant racial group. For example, Turkish people in America are distinct from the dominant White race, because they speak a different language, eat different foods, listen to different music, have different religious beliefs and marriage rites. Over time, they may choose to relinquish their distinctive practices in favor of adopting those of White Americans and thereby rise in the hierarchy. For those Turkish individuals (and other ethnic groups) who look like White Americans, rising in the hierarchy can be a matter of choice. For those who look like African Americans, however, there is no choice. They are classified with African Americans at the bottom of the social ladder.

Applying racialization to the realm of participation in leisure activities, the racialization perspective would suggest that there is a continuum with respect to levels or degrees of participation on the part of racial/ethnic groups. Further, the polar extremes of the continuum would be represented by Blacks on the one hand, and Whites on the other. Ethnic groups and racial groups that are neither Black nor White, are placed in the continuum according to how dissimilar their phenotypes and social practices are to those of Whites. Returning to the Turkish ethnic group, those Turks who are most like White

Americans would be placed at the top end of the racial hierarchy, and those who are most like African Americans would be placed at the bottom end.

It may be that some leisure activities are more likely to reflect the structure of racialization than other activities. For example, applying Veblen's notion of conspicuous consumption as a symbol of wealth and status, it may be that expensive activities like golf will have extremely low participation by Blacks and others who are located at the bottom of the racialization continuum.

In summary, there are several theoretical perspectives that can serve as prisms for the examination of race/ethnicity variation in leisure participation. The present study considered four such perspectives: marginality, ethnicity/sub-cultural, fear of discrimination, and racialization. The relative merit of each, however, is a matter of evaluation — an evaluation based on empirical findings and in the context of specific research questions.

A Statement of the Research Questions

Based upon the review of the literature and consideration of the various theoretical perspectives, the following research questions were advanced:

- Question 1: Are patterns of leisure participation of Hispanics similar to those of Whites?
- Question 2: Are the patterns of leisure participation of Blacks similar to those of Whites?
- Question 3: Are the patterns of leisure participation of Hispanics similar to those of Blacks?
- Question 4: Do patterns of leisure participation and race/ethnicity align with the theoretical frameworks of fear of discrimination, ethnicity/sub-cultural, marginality and racialization? Is one theory better supported by the data than any other?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

In an effort to answer the foregoing questions, a study design based upon existing data was adopted. It should be noted, however, that there are certain limitations associated with much of the existing data when the area of interest is leisure or recreation pursuits. These limitations range from the singular focus of many of the studies (i.e., the tendency to focus on a singular recreational or leisure pursuit) to the failure of some studies to give adequate attention to leisure as an element of social or cultural life, even though the studies might include some reference to leisure as a component of social or cultural life.

While it is certainly true that there are numerous data bases regarding participation in specific leisure or recreation pursuits, most are typically linked to a commercial/marketing effort. For example, there is a substantial amount of information on the characteristics of tennis players, runners, basketball players, and the like, but most of the data sets are produced on behalf of, or, for use by industrial sources (e.g., equipment manufacturers, facility operators, sporting associations, etc.). On balance, such studies tell us quite a bit about expenditures and preferences of customers in a certain segment of the overall leisure industry. What they generally lack, however, is a

focus on a variety of pursuits in a single research effort or much information concerning the level or degree of participation.

For a non-commercially based source of data, some researchers have turned to the American Community Survey, an annual effort on the part of the U. S. Census Bureau. While the American Community Survey occasionally includes questions relative to leisure activities, it typically falls short in terms of yielding truly useful data. As a rule, questions about participation in leisure pursuits, when included, are typically few in number.

In response to such limitations, many social researchers have turned to the General Social Survey (the “GSS”), frequently basing their research upon the 1993 version of the GSS. It is the 1993 version of the GSS that includes a panel of questions about respondent participation in several leisure activities. The shortcoming of the GSS data base, however, is the fact that it includes only 14 specific leisure activities, more than is typically found in the American Community Survey, to be sure, but less than a comprehensive number.

Given such limitations, the research reported here was based upon a secondary analysis of a different data set — namely, the DDB Needham Lifestyle Surveys (DDB Surveys). More specifically, the research was based on a subset of the larger DDB Survey, namely the lifestyle section of the 1998 data set. Within the lifestyle section are questions related to a wide range of social behavior, such as reading, travel, sports, and other leisure activities, family life and community involvement. The DDB data set was selected because it provides a more recent and far more comprehensive look at participation in leisure activities.

By way of background, the DDB Survey effort began in 1975 and has been carried out on an annual basis using a national panel of American households. The annual survey typically yields a sample of 3,500 to 4,000 respondents. The DDB data, which represented a substantial amount of the data used by Putnam (2000) in his now famous study, *Bowling Alone*, are accessible on-line via the *Bowling Alone* website (<http://www.bowlingalone.com>).

As to the sampling method behind the DDB Survey, the annual effort is based on a quota sampling method that involves “mail panels.” The sampling process for the survey begins at the panel recruitment stage when a commercial contractor contacts list brokers who maintain lists of names, addresses, and sometimes demographic characteristics of very large numbers of the American population. These lists are built from a variety of sources, including vehicle license bureaus, telephone directories, voter registration lists, etc. Large numbers of potential respondents from these lists are then invited by mail to participate in future surveys. In order to be recruited into the panel, a person must be willing to respond periodically to mail and phone inquiries about commercial products and services, as well as other current issues. The pre-recruited national panel may number up to as many as 500,000 potential respondents at any one time.

A random, demographically balanced sample is then drawn from the mail panel pool for the DDB Survey. Respondents are mailed questionnaires that they are asked to complete and return within several weeks. The response rate on the part of those receiving a questionnaire is generally reported as being between 70% - 80% — a figure that is noticeably higher than for conventional random samples.

Certainly the use of questionnaires has recognized drawbacks, and the DDB effort is subject to those. The DDB survey, in common with other mail surveys, suffers from non-response bias arising from the self-selected nature of panel participants and the fact that respondents must be literate in English. Putnam notes the following potential drawbacks:

1. Because the initial recruitment is by mail, literacy in English is an essential requirement, and thus the bottom of the educational ladder is underrepresented, as are non-English speakers.
2. Effective response rates are much lower among racial minorities.
3. Adults under twenty-five are slightly underrepresented, probably because their mobility makes them harder to track. (P. 423).

The underrepresentation of Blacks (and other racial minorities) is a salient problem that pervades the literature on race and leisure, as noted by Floyd, Shinew, Noe and McGuire in their 1994 study of race and ethnicity and leisure activity preferences. They remark that studies of this type use secondary data from publicly available national data bases, and that these conventional surveys consistently report Black representation in their samples that is 3% below the census count. In the case of the study mentioned above, Blacks comprised 9% of the sample compared to their 12% presence in the population as reported in the proximate census count. In the data set used for this study Blacks comprise 9% of the sample, and Hispanics comprise 8%. It is recognized that this imposes limitations on the ability to generalize from the results of the study.

Even with non-random sampling bias, the DDB Survey is generally considered to be a reliable gauge of trends and behavior when compared to conventional national random samples. In *Bowling Alone*, for example, Putnam outlines a scientific comparison between the DDB Survey data and General Social Survey data, noting that there is “astonishing similarity,” well within the limits of sampling error, on responses to a series

of comparable questions regarding leisure or recreational activities. He further notes that, "... the profiles of leisure activities represented in the mail panel of the DDB Survey and in the random sample of the General Social Survey were essentially identical" (Putnam, 424).

Description of Data

The data set initially selected for the present research included 3,350 cases and 63 variables. Because the racial/ethnic focus of interest for this study was based on Whites, Hispanics and Blacks, respondents classified as "Other" were excluded from the analysis. There were 100 such cases; therefore the final sample was based on 3,250 cases. Of the 63 variables, 58 related to levels of participation in specific leisure activities; five variables were classified as demographic control variables. In an effort to limit the scope of the inquiry, the list of 58 leisure activities was reduced to 43, based upon a random selection of 75% of the original list. There was one question regarding leisure participation — namely that of hunting — that was not asked of female respondents. Therefore, that activity was dropped, leaving the final listing of 42 activities. The variables selected for analysis are described in more detail below.

Race/Ethnicity

The variable of race/ethnicity was a primary variable in the study. It was originally operationalized on the basis of response to the following question:

What race do you consider yourself to be?

1. White
2. Black
3. Hispanic
4. Other

A preliminary examination of the dataset revealed that responses to that question were as follows: *White* n = 2713, *Black* n = 292, *Hispanic* n = 245. As noted above, those responding as *Other* (n = 100) were dropped from the analysis. In terms of the percentage representation of each group in the final sample, the distribution was as follows: 83% White; 9% Black; 8% Hispanic.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Data Set

Variable	Whites		Blacks		Hispanics		Totals	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Race	83%	2713	9%	292	8%	245	100%	3250
Sex								
Females	55%	1495	63%	183	55%	134	56%	1812
Males	45%	1218	37%	109	45%	111	44%	1438
Age								
18-34 years	22%	598	30%	88	38%	92	24%	778
35-54 years	43%	1158	44%	128	41%	100	43%	1386
55+ years	35%	957	26%	76	22%	53	33%	1086
Work Status								
Full time	49%	1339	52%	152	50%	123	50%	1614
Part time	9%	250	9%	25	8%	18	9%	293
Self Employed	9%	235	4%	13	10%	25	8%	273
Retired/Not employed	33%	889	35%	102	32%	78	33%	1069
Marital Status								
Married	70%	1908	43%	126	71%	173	68%	2207
Not Married	30%	805	57%	166	29%	72	32%	1043
Place of Residence								
Rural and Towns <50k	21%	584	14%	42	17%	41	21%	667
Cities 50-500k	19%	515	14%	40	18%	45	18%	600
Cities 500k-2m	29%	785	32%	92	30%	74	29%	951
Cities >2m	31%	829	40%	118	35%	85	32%	1032

Leisure Participation

The original data set included 58 leisure activities. The 42 selected activities are identified as follows:

Table 2: Leisure Activities Selected for the Study

Amateur/College Athletic Event	Golf
Auto Race	Health Club
Beer/Bar or Tavern	Hiking
Bicycle	Jogging
Book – finished reading	Lecture
Bowling	Movies
Camping	Picnic
Cards	Home Video Games
Casino	Musical Instrument
Church	Pop-Rock Concert
Class or Seminar	Professional Athletic Event
Classical Music Concert	Rollerblading
Club Meeting	Skating
Collection	Swimming
Community Project	Team Sport
Craft Project	Tennis
Dinner Party	Art Gallery/Museum
Do-It-Yourself Project	Volunteer Work
Exercise Class	Walk for Exercise
Exercise at Home	Zoo
Fishing	
Gardening	

In each instance, the level of participation in the activity was operationalized in terms of the response to the following question: How many times in the last year did you (filled in with specific activity, e.g. go to a bar or tavern)?

1. None
2. 1-4 times
3. 5-8 times
4. 9-11 times
5. 12-24 times
6. 25-51 times
7. 52+ times

A cursory examination of the data suggested that the upper categories of data should be collapsed so as to create 5 categories, as follows:

1. None
2. 1-4 times
3. 5-8 times
4. 9-11 times
5. 12 times or more

(refer to Table 1, and Tables in Appendix)

Control Variables

The control variables selected for the analysis, along with their operational definitions, were as follows:

Age: Respondent's age given at time of panel recruitment. Responses were initially collected and classified into 6 categories, but they were later collapsed into 3 categories, as follows:

1. 18-34 years
2. 35-54 years
3. 55 years and over

Sex: Response to the question, "What is your sexual identity?"

1. Male
2. Female

Employment Status: Response to the question, "What is your employment status?"

1. Full Time
2. Part Time
3. Retired
4. Not Employed

Marital Status: Response to the question, “What is your marital status?”

1. Married
2. Divorced
3. Separated
4. Never Married

An initial review of the data suggested that these categories should be collapsed to create a dichotomous variable, as follows:

1. Married
2. Not Married

City: Respondent’s addresses were confirmed and updated as required. The original seven categories were aggregated to form the following four groups:

1. Rural and towns <50k
2. Cities/SMAs 50-500k
3. Cities/SMAs 500k-2m
4. Cities >2m

Statistical and Interpretative Method of Analysis

Given the categorical nature of the data, the primary statistical techniques used in the study were the Chi Square tests. To answer Questions One and Two, the Chi Square Goodness of Fit test was used. Question Three was examined on the basis of results from the Chi Square Test of Independence.

As to the use of the Chi Square Goodness of Fit test in answering the first two questions, the underlying logic was as follows:

Both questions really involve the same sort of comparison — namely that of a comparison of leisure participation patterns of a minority racial/ethnic group to the leisure participation patterns of the dominant racial or White group, using assimilation theory as a point of reference.

Accordingly, the pattern of participation exhibited by the White group was set as the basis for comparison. In terms of the Chi Square application, this meant establishing the White participation pattern (for each activity) as the expected pattern. For example, consider the following illustration related to Black and White levels of participation for Activity X.:

	Levels of Participation (Times Per Year) Expressed as % of Respondents Participating in Activity X by Level of Participation				
	0	1-4	5-8	9-11	12+
White	24%	13%	7%	5%	51%
Black	13%	10%	7%	11%	59%

Figure 1: Distribution of Blacks' Participation in Activity X Compared to the Distribution for Whites

The White distribution is taken as the base or used as the expected distribution. The Black distribution is taken as the observed distribution.

The Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test measures the difference between observation and expectation. If the calculated Chi Square Test results were found to be significant, then one could conclude that, indeed, there was a difference in the pattern of participation on the part of Whites and group that was being compared to Whites. If, on the other hand, the calculated Chi Square Test results were not found to be significant, then one could conclude that, indeed, there was no difference in the pattern of participation on the part of Whites and the group that was being compared to Whites.

The Chi Square Test of Independence was used to answer Question Three, with a comparison of Hispanics and Blacks in terms of leisure participation patterns on each of the 42 activities. Similar to the analysis described above, the discovery of significant

calculated Chi Square Test results would be indicative of a difference between the two groups (with respect to patterns of participation). Conversely, the failure to discover significant results would be indicative of no difference between the two groups (with respect to patterns of participation).

As to Question Four, the appropriate analysis is more a matter of interpretation of the results of the Chi Square Tests (both the Goodness of Fit and the Test of Independence) in light of four possible explanatory paradigms. As noted previously, those paradigms are identified as follows: fear of discrimination, ethnicity/sub-cultural model, racialization, and marginality model.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Question 1: *Are the patterns of leisure participation of Hispanics similar to those of Whites?*

By way of review, it was noted in the previous chapter that the Chi Square Goodness of Fit test would be used to provide an answer to the first and second questions. Simply stated, the significance or lack of significance of the calculated test statistic would provide the answer. The discovery of a significant calculated Chi Square value would be indicative of a difference between the participation patterns of the two groups. Conversely, the failure to find a significant calculated Chi Square value would indicate no difference between the groups in terms of their participation patterns. Returning to the research questions, then, the analysis, using the goodness of fit test, provided a comparison of Hispanics to Whites and Blacks to Whites, with respect to each of the 42 activities.

If Question One is expressed in the most general terms — that is, are Hispanics similar to Whites in terms of participation in leisure pursuits, and if so, what are the activities — there were 25 such activities identified by the analysis. Those activities are as follows:

Table 3: Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities for Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation

List of Activities (n=25)

Amateur athletic event	Dinner party
Beer bar	Exercise – home
Bicycle	Fishing
Book	Health club
Bowling	Hiking
Camping	Professional athletic event
Cards	Picnic
Casino	Race auto
Church	Skating
Classical music	Tennis
Collection	Art gallery/museum
Community project	Zoo
Craft	

Question 2: *Are the patterns of leisure participation of Blacks similar to those of Whites?*

Similarly, if the previous question is then asked with respect to the leisure participation patterns on the part of Blacks, a rather different picture emerges. First, there were only 14 activities for which the comparison of Black to White patterns of participation were not significantly different. Those activities are as follows:

Table 4: Blacks Compared to Whites – Activities for Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation.

List of Activities (n=14)

Amateur athletic event	Jogged
Bicycle	Movies
Casino	Musical instrument
Classical music	Pop rock
Club meeting	Team sport
Collection	Volunteer work
Community project	Zoo

Question 1 and Question 2: *A look at these questions together:*

There is no question as to the overall finding when combining the two questions. Simply stated, Hispanics have similar patterns of participation to Whites in far more activities than is the case for Blacks. If one were to go so far as to suggest that patterns of leisure participation constitute a measure of assimilation, the results reported here would certainly suggest that Hispanics are assimilated to a greater degree than Blacks. At the same time, however, there are some activities for which both the Hispanic and Black patterns mirror the patterns of Whites, and a focus on the commonalities between the two lists provides important information in that regard. For example, there were seven activities that appeared on both lists. In other words, there were seven activities for which there was no significant difference in the participation patterns of Hispanics (in comparison to Whites), as well as in the participation patterns of Blacks (in comparison to Whites). Those seven activities are identified as follows:

Table 5: Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities in Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation for Both Blacks and Hispanics When Compared to Whites

List of Activities (n=7)

Amateur athletic event
 Bicycle
 Casino
 Classical music
 Collection
 Community project
 Zoo

On the other hand, there were seven activities for which the participation rates of both Blacks and Hispanics were significantly different from those of Whites. The activities are listed below:

Table 6: Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities in Which There is Significant Difference in Levels of Participation for Both Blacks and Hispanics When Compared to Whites

List of Activities (n=7)

Class or Seminar
 Exercise Class
 Home Video Games
 Rollerblade
 Do-It-Yourself Project
 Swimming
 Walk for Exercise

When looking at the activities in Table 6 it is important to be aware that, although each of the seven activities recorded White patterns of participation that were significantly different to the other racial groups, it doesn't mean that White levels of participation are always greater than those of Hispanics and Blacks. In fact, the opposite is true in some instances. Blacks and Hispanics had higher levels of participation than Whites in Rollerblading, Attending Exercise Classes and Playing Home Video Games. One activity, Attending a Class or Seminar, showed Blacks have higher participation levels than Whites, however, Hispanics have lower levels of participation than Whites. The remaining activities were significantly different because of higher participation rates for Whites. These activities were Do-It-Yourself Project, Swimming, and Walking for Exercise.

Table 7: Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites – Activities in Which There is Significant Difference in Levels of Participation – Highest Participation Level Identified by Race

List of Activities (n=8)

Whites have the Highest Levels of Participation

Do-It-Yourself Project

Swimming

Walk for Exercise

Blacks have the Highest Levels of Participation

Class or Seminar

Church

Hispanics have the Highest Levels of Participation

Home Video Games

Rollerblade

Exercise Class

Question 3: *Are the patterns of leisure participation of Hispanics similar to those of Blacks?*

The results of the analyses presented to this point, strongly suggest that the patterns of leisure participation on the part of Hispanics and Blacks are different. They do so by demonstrating that the comparison of Hispanics to Whites does not yield the same results as a comparison of Blacks to Whites. At the same time, however, there were seven of the 42 activities in which both Black and Hispanic levels of participation were similar to those of Whites — an observation that clearly suggests that a difference between the groups (i.e., Hispanics compared to Whites and Blacks compared to Whites) is not always a certainty.

While the comparison of each racial/ethnic group (i.e., Hispanics and Blacks) to the White group provides one picture, a very different view emerges if the focus is simply on the differences in patterns of leisure participation, if any, between Hispanics and Blacks. That, of course, is the essence of Question Three.

As noted previously, the Chi Square Test of Independence was selected for the analysis of Question Three. A separate Chi Square Test was run for each of the 42 leisure activities. This approach, in effect, allowed a comparison of the patterns of participation on the part of Blacks and Hispanics on each activity.

In the context of the present investigation, and as done previously, it is extremely important to consider both sides of the coin, so to speak — those instances in which a significant difference is found, as well as those instances in which there is no significant difference. Therefore, the results from the Chi Square Test of Independence are presented as separate tables. First, there is a listing of those activities for which there is a significant difference between Hispanics and Blacks in terms of their levels of participation (11 such activities). Secondly, there is a listing of those activities for which there is no significant difference between Hispanics and Blacks in terms of the levels of participation (31 such activities).

Table 8: Blacks and Hispanics – Activities in Which There is Significant Difference in Levels of Participation

List of Activities (n=11)

Bowling	Camping
Church	Class
Club Meeting	Craft
Garden	Hiking
Lecture	Do-It-Yourself Project
Swimming	

Table 9: Blacks and Hispanics – Activities in Which There is No Significant Difference in Levels of Participation

List of Activities (n=31)

Amateur Athletic Event	Jogged
Beer/Bar Tavern	Lecture
Bicycle	Movies
Book	Musical Instrument
Cards	Professional Athletic Event
Casino	Picnic
Classical Music	Pop-rock Concert
Auto Race	Rollerblade
Community Project	Skiing
Dinner Party	Team Sport
Exercise Class	Tennis
Exercise at Home	Art Gallery/Museum
Fishing	Volunteer Work
Golf	Walk for Exercise
Health Club	Zoo
Home-Video Game	

As a means of summarizing the first part of the analysis, the following observations are relevant:

1. When Hispanics were compared to Whites, they had similar levels of participation for 25 activities, and they were significantly different for 17 activities.
2. When Blacks are compared to Whites, they had similar levels of participation for 14 activities, and they were significantly different for 28 activities.
3. When comparing Blacks to Hispanics, Blacks are similar to Hispanics in 31 activities, and they are significantly different for 11 activities.

In one sense, Questions One through Three merely lead up to Question Four. As it was previously stated, the question dealt with the utility of the various theoretical perspectives. The reader will recall Question Four as follows:

Question 4: *Do patterns of leisure participation and race align with the theoretical frameworks of marginality, ethnicity/sub-cultural, fear of discrimination, and racialization? Is one theory better supported by the data than any other?*

An answer to Question Four is obviously based upon an interpretive analysis of the data in light of four theories regarding patterns of leisure participation. As noted previously, the theories or models may be restated as follows: marginality; ethnicity/sub-cultural; fear of discrimination; and racialization. As to the content of the various theories or models, each may be described and summarized in terms of what it would hold for the present analysis.

The marginality model, as it applies to participation in leisure activities, suggests that, the proportion of Whites participating in an individual leisure activity, and the range of activities in which they participate, would be higher when compared to the participation of minority and subordinate groups. At least, it is to be expected that this statement would hold true when the model is applied to participation in lists of activities that are defined as leisure using the dominant White perspective (e.g. the DDB Survey, the GSS, etc.).

The ethnicity/sub-cultural model suggests that there are certain groupings or clusters of activities that are peculiar to certain social groups because those clusters of activities serve as ethnic or sub-cultural markers. An extreme expression of this model

would suggest that (1) there are some clusters of activities that draw participants from only one ethnic/sub-cultural group and (2) ethnic/sub-cultural groups tend to participate only in certain narrowly defined activities.

The fear of discrimination model, as it relates to participation in leisure activities, states that different leisure pursuits have different levels or degrees of white affinity or white identity. Therefore, one would expect that there would be some activities for which the levels of participation of Whites would be higher than the levels of participation on the part of Blacks and Hispanics. Moreover, the failure of certain groups to participate would be seen as an expression of fear of discrimination. Indeed, an extreme view of the theory would suggest that there are some activities that are exclusively White, at least in terms of levels of participation.

Finally, the racialization model could be construed as similar to the fear of discrimination model in the sense that the lack of participation on the part of some groups in certain leisure pursuits is viewed as a reflection of an underlying continuum – a continuum on which Blacks and Whites represent polar opposites. The racialization model differs, however, in that it clearly identifies Blacks as the singular starting and lowest point of the continuum. Accordingly, an extreme expression of this model would suggest that there are some activities that are exclusively non-Black, at least in terms of levels of participation. Such activities might or might not include participation on the part of Hispanics, but the bottom line, so to speak, would be the existence of some identifiable non-Black activities.

In the present context, the evaluation of the models began with the assumption that the utility of a particular theory is judged, in part, by its applicability to a large

number of situations. In other words, a theory or model is good or appropriate or useful to the extent that it can explain findings in a variety of circumstances. In the literature, most studies of race/ethnicity and patterns of leisure participation consider quite narrow ranges of leisure activities, and tend to limit comparisons to two racial groups; commonly comparisons are made between a dominant group and a minority group. Problems of over-generalization, and research designs that use selective data, make it difficult to carry out reliable research. This is true in the field of race and leisure which is concerned with especially complex phenomena and the operation of multiple social factors (Babbie 2002). With that taken as a starting point, the analysis suggests that, in general, the data in this study do not provide strong support for any of the models that were used to represent the theories of marginality, ethnicity/sub-culture, fear of discrimination and racialization.

As noted previously, each of those models would, at some point, suggest that there would be some activities that were exclusive to the domain of the dominant White group. Such was not the case. The general picture is one in which there are many leisure activities for which there is no significant difference between Blacks and Whites or Hispanics and Whites in terms of levels of participation. That general picture, in and of itself, is enough to call into question the applicability of the various models.

The same general finding held when the control variables of Sex and Age were introduced. When the focus is on Hispanics in comparison to Whites, the introduction of the control variables of Sex and Age simply increases the number of activities for which there is no significant difference in levels of participation. When the focus is on Blacks in comparison to Whites, the introduction of the control variables of Sex and Age has the

same effect. The number of activities for which there is no significant difference in levels of participation simply increases. Finally, a separate analysis of the rates of participation for each activity within each racial/ethnic group underscored the same result as that noted previously, namely, there are no exclusively White or exclusively Non-White activities (see Table 10 on the following page).

Two models appear to offer the most potential: The *Fear of Discrimination Model* uses Martin's typology which comprises a brief list of nine activities, and the *Ethnicity/Sub-Cultural Model* that uses a short list of 14 activities devised by Marsden and Swingle. If the original Chi Square Goodness of Fit results are applied to these models they show patterns of participation for Blacks that tend to conform to those that would be predicted by the models.

In the *Fear of Discrimination Model* Blacks and Hispanics had similar patterns of participation to Whites in two of the three activities classified as 'Race Neutral', however, for those activities classified as having 'Strong White' identity Hispanics were similar to Whites for all three activities, while Blacks, as would be predicted, were significantly different to Whites for all three. When *Age* and *Sex* are introduced as controls, however, significant difference for Blacks disappears for the activities with 'Strong White' identity for all groups except those 55 years and over.

The *Ethnicity/Sub-Cultural Model* offers the strongest expression of theoretical conformity. The 15 activities that are included in this model produce a distinct difference between the patterns of participation of Blacks and Hispanics when compared to those of Whites. These patterns of participation, for the most part, remain unchanged from the original Chi Square analysis to the analysis controlling for *Age* and *Sex*. Hispanics are

similar to Whites in 11 out of 15 activities, whereas Blacks are similar to Whites for only four out of 15 activities. In fact, this model produces results that also seem to conform to patterns that Racialization Theory would predict (Blacks being at one end of the Racialization continuum, Whites at the opposite end and Hispanics somewhere in between). The Hispanic pattern could be explained as a reflection of the fact that Hispanics in the sample looked and behaved more like Whites than Blacks and therefore faced less structural barriers to participation. It may also be that Blacks in the sample used leisure activities as a site of cultural identity, or that their distance from the White pattern may symbolize resistance to White hegemony. It may also be true that problems of relativism are at work here, where the activities selected in the model are considered to be leisure for some, but not for others. In other words, the model appears to have good predictive power, but lacks explanatory power (see Table 10 on the following page).

Table 10: Marginality Model - Participation Rates of Whites, Blacks and Hispanics (i.e. the proportion within each race who participated at least once in the last 12 months)

Activity	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
Do-It-Yourself Projects	82%	62%	73%
Book – finished reading	81%	75%	75%
Church	72%	84%	69%
Movies	72%	70%	81%
Cards	70%	63%	69%
Garden	70%	44%	67%
Dinner Party	69%	63%	65%
Walk	69%	60%	64%
Exercise at Home	65%	74%	71%
Craft Project	61%	41%	60%
Swimming	59%	34%	50%
Picnic	58%	46%	56%
Volunteer Work	55%	50%	46%
Beer/Bar or Tavern	54%	44%	47%
Class or Seminar	52%	59%	41%
Art Gallery/Museum	46%	37%	42%
Club Meeting	41%	38%	28%
Casino	38%	39%	36%
Lecture	37%	40%	32%
Bicycle	37%	30%	32%
Zoo	36%	31%	42%
Home Video Games	34%	42%	49%
Amateur/College Athletic Event	34%	28%	27%
Fishing	33%	21%	29%
Hiking	33%	13%	27%
Community Project	32%	34%	27%
Professional Athletic Event	28%	21%	24%
Camping	27%	10%	29%
Bowling	26%	28%	26%
Collection	21%	17%	24%
Musical Instrument- played	21%	22%	20%
Golf	19%	7%	11%
Pop-Rock Concert	19%	17%	24%
Team Sports	19%	23%	27%
Exercise Class	18%	27%	21%
Jogging	17%	22%	27%
Classical Music Concert/Opera	17%	11%	11%
Health Club	16%	22%	21%
Auto Race – attend	9%	9%	6%
Skating	8%	9%	8%
Tennis	7%	10%	9%
Rollerblading	5%	9%	12%

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The present analysis sought to explore differences between leisure pursuits on the part of three racial/ethnic groups: Whites; Blacks; and Hispanics. Unlike many previous studies of recreational or leisure participation, the study behind the analysis presented here involved a variety of leisure activities (as opposed to a singular activity), and it included a focus on Hispanics, in addition to Blacks.

As is often the case, the secondary analysis nature of the research posed certain limitations, but there were advantages, as well. For example, the study was able to go forward with a very strong sample size, and the number of activities covered by the underlying questionnaire was extensive. With that as a background, the results are summarized below.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

A variety of findings, some general and some more specific, emerged in the analysis. As to the overall findings, the first general finding may be asserted as follows:

There are many types of leisure activities for which there are no significant differences in the levels of participation when comparing Blacks to Whites or when comparing Hispanics to Whites.

In contrast, the second general finding may be asserted as follows:

There are many types of leisure activities for which there are significant differences in the levels of participation when comparing Blacks to Whites or when comparing Hispanics to Whites.

While the first statement sounds like a rather unremarkable finding, at least in the sense that it points out a failure to find significant differences in some areas, the present context is one in which just such a finding may be quite important. In short, there is a lot about theories connected with race/ethnicity that might cause us to simply expect differences. The theories posit differences, and we come to expect them. When we fail to find the differences, it is as though we have somehow failed in a larger sense.

A more realistic or refined conclusion — one that more accurately reflects all of the findings — would be that whether or not we find a difference is highly dependent upon the activity in question, the race/ethnicity under consideration, and the presence of Sex and Age as potential antecedent variables. If nothing else, the findings mirror what we typically observe with respect to a variety of life-styles. In a sense, it was the introduction of the control variables that helped to illuminate that point. In short, the introduction of controls for Sex and Age had the effect, in general, of producing even longer lists of activities for which there were no significant difference in levels of participation. That is simply another way of saying that Sex and Age matter when it comes to the topic of participation in leisure activities.

Limitations of the Research

The research reported here suffered from some of the typical inadequacies associated with the use of existing data sources. The utility of a large sample was, to some extent, offset by having to rely on predetermined operational definitions. For example, had the data been available in raw or uncategorized fashion, more sophisticated (and potentially revealing) analyses might have been undertaken.

Also, as noted previously, the mail panel technique could have easily had an effect on producing differential return rates based on language fluency. In the simplest of terms, the recruitment technique had a strong potential for excluding non-English literate respondents.

Finally, there is a certain paradox connected with the final limitation mentioned here — namely the limitation that comes with allowing too many variables into the mix. The benefit of having a large and wide variety of leisure activities to consider is, in a sense, off-set by the sheer complexity that it introduces to the analysis. At best (and perhaps this is the real paradox), a researcher is faced with having to hold back on conclusions in the face of so many possible considerations. On the other hand, it is a situation that reminds us of the very nature of the scientific pursuit. As Popper remarked, when writing about the game of science:

The game of science is, in principle, without end. He who decides one day that scientific statements do not call for further test, and that they can be regarded as finally verified, retires from the game (1961: 173).

In the field of leisure and race research, the game is far from over.

APPENDIX

TABLES

**Table 11: Blacks Compared to Whites, Hispanics Compared to Whites –
Significance of Activities in the Original Analysis**

s=Statistical Significance ns=No Statistical Significance (at the .05 level)

Activity	Blacks/Whites	Hispanics/Whites	Blacks/Hispanics
Amateur/College Athletic Event	ns	ns	ns
Auto Race	s	ns	ns
Beer/Bar or Tavern	s	ns	ns
Bicycle	ns	ns	ns
Book – finished reading	s	ns	ns
Bowling	s	ns	s
Camping	s	ns	s
Cards	s	ns	ns
Casino	ns	ns	ns
Church	s	ns	s
Class or Seminar	s	s	s
Classical Music Concert	s	ns	ns
Club Meeting	ns	s	s
Collection	ns	ns	ns
Community Project	ns	ns	ns
Craft Project	s	ns	s
Dinner Party	s	ns	ns
Do-It-Yourself Project	s	s	s
Exercise Class	s	s	ns
Exercise at Home	s	ns	ns
Fishing	s	ns	ns
Gardened	s	s	s
Golf	s	s	ns
Health Club	s	ns	ns
Hiking	s	ns	s
Jogging	ns	s	ns
Lecture	s	ns	s
Movies	ns	s	ns
Picnic	s	ns	ns
Home Video Games	s	s	ns
Musical Instrument	ns	ns	ns
Pop-Rock Concert	ns	s	ns
Professional Athletic Event	s	ns	ns
Rollerblading	s	s	ns
Skiing	ns	ns	ns
Swimming	s	s	s
Team Sport	ns	s	ns
Tennis	s	ns	ns
Art Gallery/Museum	s	ns	ns
Volunteer Work	ns	s	ns
Walk for Exercise	s	s	ns
Zoo	ns	ns	ns
Totals	28	15	11

Table 12: Blacks Compared to Whites – Significance of Activities When Further Specified by Sex and Age

s=Statistical Significance ns=No Statistical Significance (at the .05 level)

Activity	Male	Female	18-34	35-54	55+
Amateur/College Athletic Event	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Auto Race	s	s	s	s	ns
Beer/Bar or Tavern	ns	s	s	s	ns
Bicycle	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Book – finished reading	ns	s	ns	s	s
Bowling	s	ns	s	ns	ns
Camping	s	s	s	s	ns
Cards	ns	s	ns	ns	s
Casino	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Church	ns	s	s	s	s
Class or Seminar	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Classical Music Concert	ns	s	s	ns	ns
Club Meeting	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Collection	ns	s	ns	ns	ns
Community Project	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Craft Project	ns	s	s	s	s
Dinner Party	ns	s	ns	s	ns
Do-It-Yourself Project	s	s	s	s	ns
Exercise Class	ns	s	s	ns	ns
Exercise at Home	s	s	ns	s	s
Fishing	ns	s	s	s	ns
Gardened	s	s	s	s	s
Golf	s	ns	s	s	ns
Health Club	ns	s	s	s	ns
Hiking	s	s	s	s	ns
Jogging	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Lecture	ns	s	ns	s	s
Movies	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Picnic	ns	s	s	ns	s
Home Video Games	s	s	ns	ns	ns
Musical Instrument	s	ns	ns	ns	ns
Pop-Rock Concert	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Professional Athletic Event	ns	s	s	s	ns
Rollerblading	ns	s	ns	ns	ns
Skiing	ns	s	s	ns	ns
Swimming	s	s	s	s	s
Team Sport	s	ns	ns	ns	s
Tennis	ns	s	ns	ns	ns
Art Gallery/Museum	ns	s	ns	s	ns
Volunteer Work	ns	ns	ns	s	ns
Walk for Exercise	ns	s	ns	ns	s
Zoo	ns	ns	ns	s	s
Totals	12	27	21	20	12

Table 13: Hispanics Compared to Whites – Significance of Activities When Further Specified by Sex and Age

s=Statistical Significance ns=No Statistical Significance (at the .05 level)

Activity	Male	Female	18-34	35-54	55+
Amateur/College Athletic Event	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Auto Race	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Beer/Bar or Tavern	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Bicycle	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Book – finished reading	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Bowling	ns	ns	ns	ns	s
Camping	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cards	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Casino	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Church	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Class or Seminar	ns	s	s	ns	s
Classical Music Concert	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Club Meeting	ns	s	ns	ns	ns
Collection	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Community Project	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Craft Project	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Dinner Party	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Do-It-Yourself Project	ns	ns	s	s	ns
Exercise Class	s	s	s	s	ns
Exercise at Home	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Fishing	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Gardened	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Golf	s	ns	ns	ns	ns
Health Club	ns	ns	ns	s	ns
Hiking	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Jogging	s	s	s	ns	s
Lecture	ns	s	s	s	ns
Movies	s	ns	ns	ns	ns
Picnic	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Home Video Games	s	s	ns	ns	ns
Musical Instrument	s	ns	ns	ns	ns
Pop-Rock Concert	ns	ns	s	ns	ns
Professional Athletic Event	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Rollerblading	s	s	s	ns	ns
Skiing	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Swimming	ns	s	s	ns	ns
Team Sport	s	ns	ns	ns	s
Tennis	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Art Gallery/Museum	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Volunteer Work	ns	s	ns	ns	s
Walk for Exercise	ns	s	ns	ns	s
Zoo	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Totals	8	10	12	4	6

Table 14: Blacks Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age

Activities Similar to Whites

<i>With Sex Specified</i>		<i>With Age Specified</i>	
Males	30	18-34 years	20
Females	15	35-54 years	23
		55+ years	31

Table 15: Blacks Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age

Number of Activities that were Similar to Whites in the original analysis that are now Significantly Different from Whites

<i>With Sex Specified</i>		<i>With Age Specified</i>	
Males	2	18-34 years	5
Females	2	35-54 years	1
		55+ years	1

Table 16: Blacks Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age

Number of Activities that changed from being Significantly Different to become Similar to Whites

<i>With Sex Specified</i>		<i>With Age Specified</i>	
Males	18	18-34 years	11
Females	3	35-54 years	10
		55+ years	18

Table 17: Hispanics Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age

Activities Similar to Whites

<i>With Sex Specified</i>		<i>With Age Specified</i>	
Males	34	18-34 years	30
Females	32	35-54 years	38
		55+ years	36

Table 18: Hispanics Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age

Number of Activities that changed from being Similar to become Significantly Different from Whites

<i>With Sex Specified</i>		<i>With Age Specified</i>	
Males	1	18-34 years	5
Females	1	35-54 years	2
		55+ years	1

Table 19: Hispanics Compared to Whites – Controlling for Sex and Age

Number of Activities that changed from Significantly Different to become Similar to Whites

<i>With Sex Specified</i>		<i>With Age Specified</i>	
Males	8	18-34 years	7
Females	6	35-54 years	12
		55+ years	9

Table 20: Fear of Discrimination Model (Martin 2004)

Based on original Goodness of Fit analysis comparing Blacks to Whites and Hispanics to Whites

s=statistical significance ns=no statistical significance (at the .05 level)

Participation Patterns Compared to Whites

Race Neutral Activities	Blacks	Hispanics
Movies	ns	s
Professional Athletic Event	s	ns
Amateur Athletic Event	ns	ns
<i>Similar to Whites</i>	2	2
White Moderate Activities		
Classical Music	ns	ns
Art Gallery/Museum	s	ns
<i>Similar to Whites</i>	1	2
Strong White Activities		
Auto Race	s	ns
Hiking	s	ns
Camping	s	ns
<i>Similar to Whites</i>	0	3

Table 21: Ethnicity/Sub-Cultural Model: (Marsden and Swingle 1993)

Based on original Goodness of Fit analysis comparing Blacks to Whites and Hispanics to Whites
 s=statistical significance ns=no statistical significance (at the .05 level)

Participation Patterns Compared to Whites

Activity	Blacks	Hispanics
Movies	ns	s
Garden	s	s
Swimming	s	s
Bowling	s	ns
Golf	s	ns
Skiing	s	ns
Tennis	s	ns
Professional Sport	s	ns
Art Gallery/Museum	s	ns
Craft	s	ns
Fishing	s	ns
Musical Instrument	ns	ns
Pop-Rock Concert	ns	s
Classical Music	ns	ns
Auto Race	s	ns

Total Activities: 15
Similar to Whites: 4
Similar to Whites: 11

Table 22: Racialization Model: (based on Kaplan's Taxonomy of Leisure Activities)**Activities Similar to Whites According to Situation and Disposition**

	Blacks	Hispanics
<i>By Situation</i>		
Away from Home	Amateur Athletic Event Bicycle Casino Classical Music Concert Club Meeting Community Project Jog Movies Pop-Rock Concert Team Sport Volunteer Work Zoo	Amateur Athletic Event Beer/Bar Tavern Bicycle Bowling Camping Casino Church Classical Music Concert Community Project Fishing Health Club Hiking Lecture Professional Athletic Event Picnic Auto Race Skiing Tennis Art Gallery/Museum Zoo
Totals: 32 (Whites)	12	20
<i>By Situation</i>		
At Home	Collection Musical Instrument	Book Cards Collection Craft Dinner party Exercise at Home Musical Instrument
Totals: 10 (Whites)	2	7
<i>By Disposition</i>		
Individual	Bicycle Collection Jog Musical Instrument	Bicycle Book Collection Craft Exercise at Home Musical Instrument
Totals: 12 (Whites)	4	6
<i>By Disposition</i>		
Social	Club Meeting Community Project Pop-Rock Concert Team Sport Volunteer Work	Bowling Camping Cards Church Community Project Dinner Party Picnic
Totals: 11 (Whites)	5	7

REFERENCES

- Abbas, Andrea. 2004. "The Embodiment of Class, Gender and Age Through Leisure: a Realist Analysis of Long distance Running." *Leisure Studies* Vol.23, No.2: 159-175. Retrieved on October 4, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Aguiar, Mark and Erik Hurst. 2006. "Measuring Trends in Leisure: The Allocation of Time Over Five Decades." *Working Papers*, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. No.06-2. Retrieved October 1, 2006 (<http://www.bos.frb.org/economic/wp/index.html>).
- Aitchison, Cara. 1999. "New Cultural Geographies: The Spatiality of Leisure, Gender and Sexuality." *Leisure Studies* Vol.18: 19-39. Retrieved October 18, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Allison, Maria T. and Dan K. Hibbler. 2004. "Organizational Barriers to Inclusion: Perspectives from the Recreation Professional." *Leisure Sciences* Vol.26: 261-280. Retrieved October 8, 2006.
- Amesty, Silvia C. 2003. "Barriers to Physical Activity in the Hispanic Community." *Journal of Public Health Policy* Vol.24, No.1: 41-58. Retrieved December 2, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Arnold, Peter. 1989. "On The Relationship between Education, Work and Leisure: Past, Present and Future." *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol.37, No.2: 136-146. Retrieved on September 29, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Babbie, Earl. 2002. *The Basics of Social Research*. 2d ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1996. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* Vol.62: 465-480. Retrieved February 10, 2007 (<http://web.ebscohost.com>).
- Collins, Randall. 1988. "The Durkheimian Tradition in Conflict Sociology." Pp. 107-128 in *Durkheimian Sociology*, edited by Jeffrey C. Alexander. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Davis, Arthur K. 1944. "Veblen on the Decline of the Protestant Ethic." *Social Forces* Vol.22, No.22: 282-286. Retrieved March 30, 2007 (<http://www.jstor.org>).

- Duquette, David. 1989. "Marx's Idealist Critique of Hegel's Theory of Society and Politics." *The Review of Politics* Vol. 51, No.2: 218-240. Retrieved February 5, 2007 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Feagin, Joe R. 1994. "The Continuing Significance of Race: Antiblack Discrimination in Public Places." *American Sociological Review* Vol.56: 110-116.
- Floyd, Myron F. 1998. "Getting Beyond Marginality and Ethnicity: The Challenge for Race and Ethnic Studies in Leisure Research." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.30, No.1: 3-22. Retrieved January 2, 2007 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Floyd, Myron F., Francis A. McGuire, Francis P. Noe and Kimberly J. Shinew. 1994. "Race, Class, and Leisure Activity Preferences: Marginality and Ethnicity Revisited." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.26, No.2: 158-173. Retrieved July 3, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Gramann, J. H. and M. T. Allison. 1999. "Ethnicity, Race, and Leisure." Pp. 283-297 in *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty-First Century* edited by E. Jackson and T. Burton. State College, PA: Venture.
- Hutchison, R. 1988. "A Critique of Race, Ethnicity, and Social Class in Recent Leisure-Recreation Research." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.20: 10-30.
- Kane, Anne. 1991. "Cultural Analysis in Historical Sociology: The Analytic and Concrete Forms of the Autonomy of Culture." *Sociological Theory* Vol.9, No.1: 53-69. Retrieved November 13, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Katz-Gerro, Tally. 1999. "Cultural Consumption and Social Stratification: Leisure Activities, Musical Tastes, and Social Location." *Sociological Perspectives* Vol.42, No.4: 627-646. Retrieved September 28, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Katz-Gerro, Tally. 2006. "Comparative Evidence of Inequality in Cultural Preferences: Gender, Class, and Family Status." *Sociological Spectrum* Vol. 26: 63-83. Retrieved January 10, 2007 (<http://www.ebscohost.com>).
- Kelly, John R. 1975. "Life Styles and Leisure Choices." *The Family Coordinator* Vol.24, No.2: 185-190. Retrieved September 29, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Lee, Robert G. 1972. "The Social Definition of Outdoor Recreational Places." Pp. 69-84 in *Social Behavior, Natural Resources, and the Environment*, edited by W. Burch, Jr., N. Cheek, Jr., and L. Taylor. New York: Harper & Row.
- Marsden, Peter V. and Joseph F. Swingle. 1993. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Culture Surveys: Values, Strategies, and Symbols." The National Opinion Research Center, University of Michigan. Topical Report 26. Retrieved June 10, 2006 (<http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/GSS/rnd1998/reports/topic26.htm>).

- Martin, Derek. 2004. "Racial Differences in Participation for Selected Leisure Activities: Marginality, Ethnicity, or Fear of Discrimination." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved November 15, 2006 (<http://web.ebscohost.com>).
- Marx, Karl. [1864] 1982. "The Process of Production." Pp. 12-19 reprinted in *Classes, Power and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates* by Giddens, A and D. Held. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Philipp, Steven F. 1999. "Are We Welcome? African American Racial Acceptance in Leisure Activities and the Importance Given to Children's Leisure." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.31, No.4: 385-403. Retrieved November 4, 2006 (<http://web.ebscohost.com>).
- Philipp, Steven F. 2000. "Race and the Pursuit of Happiness." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.32: 120-124.
- Pittenger, Judith E. and Sharon L. Hunt. 1984. "Effects of Race Upon the Meanings of Leisure Among University Students." *The Journal of Negro Education* Vol.53, No.1: 41-49. Retrieved September 29, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Popper, Karl. 1961. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Science Editions, Inc: New York, NY.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. Simon and Schuster: New York, NY.
- Rapoport, Rhona and Robert N. Rapoport. 1974. "Four Themes in the Sociology of Leisure." *The British Journal of Sociology* Vol.25, No.2: 215-229.
- Scarboro, Allen and Jonelle Husain. 2006. "Trimming the Greens, Mastering the Course." *Sociological Spectrum* Vol.26: 237-266. Retrieved August, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Shaull, Sandra and James H. Gramann. 1998. "The Effect of Cultural Assimilation on the Importance of Family – Related and Related and Nature – Related Recreation Among Hispanic Americans." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.30, No.1:47-63.
- Shinew, Kimberly J., Troy D. Glover and Diana C. Parry. 2004. "Leisure Spaces as Potential Sites for Interracial Interaction: Community Gardens in Urban Areas." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.36, No.3: 336-355. Retrieved September 3, 2006 (<http://ebscohost.com>).

- Shinew, Kimberly J., M. Stodolska, M. Floyd, D. Hibbler, M. Allison, C. Johnson and Carla Santos. 2006. "Race and Ethnicity in Leisure Behavior: Where Have We Been and Where Do We Need to Go?" *Leisure Sciences* Vol.28: 403-408. Retrieved January 22, 2007 (<http://web.ebscohost.com>).
- Stephenson, Marcus L. and Howard L. Hughes. 2005. "Racialized Boundaries in Tourism and Travel: A Case Study of the UK Black Caribbean Community." *Leisure Studies* Vol.24, No.2: 137-160. Retrieved December 12, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Theberge, Nancy. 1993. "The Construction of Gender in Sport: Women, Coaching and the Naturalization Process." *Social Problems*. Vol.40, No.3: 301-313. Retrieved on September 9th, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Veblen, Thorstein. [1899] 1912. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Reprint, New York: The Viking Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. [1899] 1931. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Reprint, New York: Macmillan Company.
- Walker, Gordon J. and Kerry S. Courneya. 2006. "Ethnicity, Gender, and the Theory of Planned Behavior: The Case of Playing the Lottery." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.38, No.2: 224-248.
- Washburne, R.F. 1978. "Black Under-Participation in Wildland Recreation: Alternative Explanations." *Leisure Sciences* Vol.1: 175-189. Retrieved July 20, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Weber, Max. 1962. *Basis Concepts in Sociology*. Translated by H.P. Secher. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Weber, Max. [1905] 1978. *Max Weber: Selections in Translation*. ed. W.G. Runciman. Translated by E. Matthews. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Winant, Howard. 2000. "Race and Race Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol.26: 169-185. Retrieved September 29, 2006 (<http://www.jstor.org>).
- Wolch, Jennifer and Jin Zhang. 2004. "Beach Recreation, Cultural Diversity and Attitudes Toward Nature." *Journal of Leisure Research* Vol.36, No.3: 414-443.
- Wolcott, Victoria W. 2004. "Integrated Leisure in Segregated Cities: Amusement parks and Racial Conflict in the Post-War North." Presented at the annual meeting of the Urban History Association, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY. Retrieved October 28, 2006 (<https://urresearch.rochester.edu>).

Zeitlin, Irving M. 1981. *Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

VITA

Kay Margaret Newling was born in Sydney, Australia on January 18, 1948. After completing High School she undertook nursing training and then worked in the real estate industry for several years. She spent 20 years raising three children and managing a family farm in North-Western, New South Wales. Before moving to live in Austin, Texas. Kay was the Queensland Government Agent in Mitchell, Queensland. She received the degree of Bachelor of Science in Applied Sociology from Texas State University-San Marcos in August, 2005. She entered the Graduate College of Texas State University-San Marcos immediately following her undergraduate degree. During her graduate studies Kay has been employed by the Department of Sociology as coordinator of the statistics tutoring program, and also worked as a researcher at DataSource Inc., San Marcos, Texas.

Permanent Address: 125 Steel Lake Drive
Kyle, Texas 78640

This thesis was typed by Kay M. Newling.