
Special Issue Introduction

Getting Beyond Marginality and Ethnicity: The Challenge for Race and Ethnic Studies in Leisure Research

Myron F. Floyd

Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

Over the past 30 years leisure scholars have produced a substantial literature around the dynamics of race and ethnicity in leisure behavior. Two major social forces have impelled research questions involving race and ethnicity to the foreground of leisure studies. During the 1960s, the marginal social and economic conditions of racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. and abroad arrested attention of public policymakers and social scientists. In the U.S., the Civil Rights movement climaxed, leading to the dismantling of longstanding institutional barriers to political participation and public accommodations, including specific actions targeted at public parks and other recreation areas (Murphy, 1972). The heightened awareness of racial inequality during this period brought about sharper focus on "black-white" differentials in outdoor recreation participation and leisure activity preferences. Initial research questions dealing with race and ethnicity were contextualized by the socio-political agenda of this era. Thus, it is not surprising that differential rates of participation in public recreation and leisure programs exhibited by different ethnic groups, primarily between the black minority and white majority, received the greatest scrutiny from researchers.

More recent demographic changes in North America represent the second major factor drawing attention to racial and ethnic issues. Numerous books, articles, and governmental reports have called attention to the rate of growth and projected increase of ethnic minorities relative to non-Hispanic whites (e.g., Murdock, 1995; O'Hare, 1992; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1994). Using detailed cohort-projection techniques, Murdock and associates (1990, 1991, 1996) and Dwyer (1994) have examined how growth of ethnic minority populations is likely to impact participation in a variety of outdoor recreation activities. Their analyses suggest that racial and ethnic minority population growth will be reflected in the composition of activity participants. Specifically, they project that growth in the number of participants in several leisure activities will be due primarily to increases among non-white populations.

Direct correspondence to the author at 311 Francis Hall, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77845-2261. E-mail: mfloyd@rpts.tamu.edu. The author is assistant professor in the Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism at Texas A&M University.

While only in the last several years have these trends been reported in the scholarly literature, practitioners have witnessed the shift in demographic trends up-close and have been challenged to re-orient programs and services to meet the needs of a more racially and ethnically diverse clientele. Largely in response to such factors, researchers have sought to understand ethnic patterns in leisure participation, attempting to make sense of the race and ethnicity dynamic in leisure settings.

It is fitting that the *Journal of Leisure Research* would devote a special issue to race and ethnicity some 30 years removed from the Civil Rights era and in the midst of the current ethnic transformation of North America. Coincidentally, this issue appears exactly 20 years after Randel Washburne's (1978) seminal article on "black underparticipation" in wildland recreation in *Leisure Sciences*. Washburne's piece was not the first empirical study of race and ethnic effects on leisure participation. Several research reports, symposium papers, books, and book chapters predate his publication (e.g., Jones, 1927; Mueller & Gurin, 1962; Meeker, Woods, & Lucas, 1972; Cheek, Field, & Burch, 1976). His contribution was the articulation of a conceptual basis—marginality and ethnicity—for interpreting race and ethnic effects in leisure participation. This special issue provides an opportunity to evaluate the extent of progress in understanding race and ethnic effects in leisure. Moreover, the marginality-ethnicity framework stands as a useful benchmark to gauge where the current literature is positioned both theoretically and empirically with respect to race and ethnic concerns.

As part of the special issue, several observations about the state of the race and ethnic studies literature within the leisure field will be discussed. The intention here is not to be encyclopedic, providing an exhaustive review and critique of the literature. Rather, I broadly address a series of fundamental problems and challenges facing scholars engaged in race and ethnic leisure research. The discussion centers on three specific points: (1) limitations of current theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches, (2) conceptual definitions of race and ethnicity and their implications for leisure research, and (3) specification of relevant dependent variables. Some of these points have been articulated in other critical reviews (e.g., Hutchison, 1988; Allison, 1988) and individual articles (e.g., Phillip, 1994). Given the importance of the topic, these issues are certainly worth revisiting.

Theoretical Approaches and their Limitations

Perhaps the most critical issue currently facing the race and ethnic studies literature is the absence of viable theoretical frameworks. In general, little systematic thought has been directed to race and ethnic issues. While a substantial literature has emerged over the years, it is difficult to identify consistent and programmatic streams of research targeting specific theoretical and methodological issues. At least three theoretical explanations have historically been used to account for racial and ethnic variation in leisure studies: the marginality hypothesis, ethnicity or subcultural hypothesis, and per-

ceived discrimination. Minimal effort has been expended to amend, expand or supplant these explanations.

Much of the race and ethnic studies literature developed around the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses. The marginality hypothesis was developed to explain low levels of outdoor recreation participation among African Americans. This view simply holds that black participation patterns result from limited socioeconomic resources, which in turn are a function of historical patterns of discrimination (Washburne, 1978). Alternatively, the ethnicity hypothesis explains differences in participation as reflecting divergent norms, value systems, and social organization between majority and minority populations. As an initial set of alternative explanations, the two hypotheses served to bring attention to the role of poverty and historical discrimination and cultural influences as major determinants of intergroup differences.

Several reasons can be offered to explain why marginality and ethnicity have been ineffective explanatory concepts in subsequent research. First, as a concept or theoretical perspective, marginality has really never been adequately defined. A review of the literature suggests that it has been largely defined by examples and its empirical referents. What appears as a straightforward explanatory concept is actually ambiguous in its content. Washburne (1978) stated that:

[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).

This descriptive assessment of what marginality indicates served a useful purpose by orienting researchers and policy makers to various socioeconomic factors associated with lower levels of outdoor recreation participation among African Americans. It fails however to map out how "marginality" operates to impact leisure choices. For example, it is likely that marginality as presented by Washburne represents the impact of racial stratification and its effects channeled through institutional forms of racism and discrimination (e.g., residential or employment discrimination), socioeconomic stratification, and interpersonal racism and discrimination. Unfortunately, researchers have uncritically accepted the concept of marginality (Hutchison, 1988) with its ambiguities without considering its specific components, how racial stratification effects were channeled, and how they should be measured.

Second, the concept of marginality can not account for socioeconomic differentiation within ethnic minority groups. It basically assumed a monolithic class structure among African Americans. As a result, marginality may explain the leisure patterns of socioeconomically disadvantaged minorities,

but it does not lend itself to examining the behavioral patterns of minorities in higher socioeconomic strata. While one could argue that as a group African Americans occupy a common subordinate position based on race, there is considerable spatial (e.g., rural-urban) and socioeconomic differentiation within this population (Johnson, Horan, & Pepper, 1997; Woodard, 1988). This also applies to other ethnic minority groups.

Third, while the marginality hypothesis suggests that discrimination is a determinant of racial and ethnic participation differences, with few exceptions modeling the impact of historical and contemporary discrimination on racial and ethnic minority leisure patterns has been largely neglected (e.g., West, 1989; Floyd, Gramann, & Saenz, 1993; McDonald & McAvoy, 1997; Blahna & Black, 1993). Outside of the exceptions just cited, marginality has been operationalized strictly as socioeconomic in its effects, employing variables such as income and availability of transportation. Consequently, the marginality explanation is nearly identical to the opportunity hypothesis tested by Lindsay and Ogle (1972). The opportunity hypothesis holds that the higher the cost and the further removed leisure opportunities are from low income groups, the availability of opportunities declines. This essentially reduces marginality to a "class-based" explanation of racial and ethnic variation, when the original discussion implied "race-based" discrimination as a component of marginality.

A final point concerning marginality considers its implications for criterion variables. As will be discussed later, there is a wide range of behavioral, cognitive and affective outcomes (choices, preferences, attitudes, meanings, etc.) which may or may not be subject to racial and ethnic influences. To date, most studies examine participation rates associated with recreational areas or participation in different activities with specific emphasis on explaining "under-participation." Research studies emerging from forest recreation areas in the U.S. Southwest suggest that participation may not be the most relevant dependent variable. It is not clear how marginality accounts for a wider range of behavioral or affective outcomes beyond participation and preferences.

The subcultural (ethnicity) hypothesis has been plagued by similar problems. Researchers have tended to be content with accepting ethnicity and subculture as givens rather than as concepts in need of definition and explication. This is reflected in the reliance on racial categories and ethnic labels as measures of "culture" to test for ethnic differences (Hutchison & Fidel, 1984). The conventional approach has been to interpret significant differences in participation rates that remain after controlling for socioeconomic factors as cultural differences, without specifying which aspects of ethnic culture affect leisure behavior. Thus, this perspective does not provide insight into specific ethnic determinants of leisure participation. Unamended, it perpetuates a static and monolithic view of minority groups by neglecting not only diversity within race and ethnic labels, but also masks emergent properties of ethnicity. The current literature on race and ethnic

relations indicates that ethnicity is more dynamic than is represented in the leisure literature.

There have been attempts to overcome such weaknesses. These efforts focus primarily on identifying specific indicators of ethnicity and relating them to leisure participation or style of participation. For example, ethnic assimilation theory has been used to internally differentiate ethnic groups along meaningful concepts, such as primary group assimilation, acculturation, and ancestral status (Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Carr & Williams, 1993). Even this conceptual approach has its shortcomings. While the assimilation perspective may capture the experiences of recent immigrants and their interactions with the dominant society, it may not apply to ethnic groups with a longer history in North America (Gramann & Allison, in press). Recent theoretical and empirical research has also challenged the inevitability of the complete absorption of ethnic and racial minorities into mainstream society (Portes, 1993; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996). Additionally, it is not clear whether or how the assimilation/acculturation perspective applies to African Americans or Native Americans.

Finally, both the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses are undergirded by biased ideological assumptions. According to the former, the reduction of socioeconomic barriers should lead racial and ethnic minorities to exhibit leisure preferences valued by the dominant group (Allison, 1988). The latter suggests that assimilation in its later stages weakens ethnic ties and produces behavioral styles similar or identical to mainstream society. Both explanations contain an Anglo-conformity bias. These assumptions reflect a normative viewpoint specifying how differences in racial and ethnic leisure patterns should be addressed rather than a more objective assessment of their actual causes.

While discrimination is often cited as a source of racial and ethnic differences in leisure patterns, significant theoretical and empirical work in this area remains underdeveloped. As suggested earlier, Washburne's (1978) formulation does not address the inhibiting effects of discrimination as perceived by individual minority group members. Neither does it indicate how structural or institutional factors channel discrimination effects. In recent years, several studies have raised these issues (e.g., West, 1989; Blahna & Black, 1993; Floyd, Gramann, & Saenz, 1993; Phillip, 1994; Stoldoska & Jackson, 1998 this issue) providing preliminary evidence of discrimination. West (1989) reminds us that leisure service programs and agencies are not immune to interracial conflict found in other spheres of social and economic life. More work elaborating the the types and range of discrimination and how they impact leisure choices and constraints should be pursued.

Limitations of Methodological Approaches

Criticism directed at methodological strategies will be directed to three areas of concern: measurement issues involving race and ethnicity, the logic of controlling for socioeconomic status, and sample size limitations.

Measurement Issues

Past studies have not been careful in conceptualizing race and ethnicity, nor in operationalizing these concepts. The most serious shortcoming is the treatment of race as a surrogate for ethnicity. Researchers have been content with accepting race and ethnicity as given categories, choosing not to develop specific measures of ethnic factors. Hutchison (1988) suggests two reasons for lack of progress in developing measures of ethnic factors. He cites use of secondary data sets where race or ethnicity questions were not central to the original study and inattention to the broader race and ethnic relations literature. Analyses using such data sets are limited by the race and ethnic identifier used in the original study. Ultimately, the measurement issue flows directly from conceptual limitations. When the central exogenous concepts are not clearly defined and understood, there is inherent difficulty in deriving meaningful measures.

This shortcoming has been overcome to some degree by using ethnic markers such as language preference and use, ancestry, and nativity to develop acculturation scales. Acculturation scales have been widely used in sociology and psychology to examine the impact of ethnic factors on social behaviors. This strategy works well with ethnic groups having distinctive and readily identifiable cultural characteristics (e.g., language, ancestry, nationality) such as Hispanics or Asian American groups. They also readily lend themselves to immigrant groups, including Black ethnic groups (e.g., Haitian Americans). Such strategies have not been applied to African Americans. Part of the problem, Hutchison (1988) suggests, is the difficulty of identifying a distinctive "Black ethnicity". He acknowledges the long running debate concerning the existence of a distinct African American culture, concluding that it is "questionable how much of a distinct black ethnic subculture exists" (p. 20). While it is beyond the scope of this paper to challenge this conclusion, there have been several significant contributions in identifying the structural and cultural parameters of African American ethnicity (Taylor, 1979; Yancey, Ericksen & Juliani, 1976; Jackson, McCullough, Gurin, & Broman, 1991; Landrine & Klonoff, 1994). Taylor (1979) argued that black ethnicity derives from the same structural conditions (occupational concentration, residential segregation, dependence on local institutions and services) which gave rise to ethnicity among other groups. What was necessary, according to Taylor, was to "show how blacks, within an urban context of structured inequality, have sought not only to develop and sustain group cohesiveness and identity but also to establish social networks and communication patterns as the bases of their institutional and communal life" (p. 1405). Jackson et al. (1991) have employed measures of group identity among African Americans, measuring ingroup and outgroup orientation. Landrine and Klonoff (1994) developed what they call an "African American Acculturation Scale" to measure traditional cultural orientation (immersed in own culture), bicultural (immersed in own and majority culture), and acculturated cultural orientation (immersed in majority culture). Such ap-

proaches should not be uncritically accepted and applied. They serve as examples to demonstrate the possibilities for developing theoretically meaningful measures of African American ethnicity for use in leisure studies. The possibilities go beyond psychometric approaches. Social network analysis and qualitative approaches hold potential as well. The former holds potential for making tangible the structural aspects of intragroup and intergroup dynamics (Stokowski, 1990). The latter provides insight into the meaning of ethnicity and the meaning of leisure in relation to ethnicity (Allison, 1988). Ultimately, measurement strategies (regardless of the specific group under study) should seek to tap the dimensions of ethnicity to establish specific links to leisure choices rather than inferring ethnic effects based on nominal measures.

Controlling for Socioeconomic Status

In comparative analyses, ethnicity or subcultural effects are detected if differences between ethnic groups in leisure participation persists while socioeconomic status (SES) is held constant. While controlling for SES is a standard practice in social science research, the rationale for this procedure should be made more explicit. In general controlling for SES considers the fact that African Americans and Hispanic Americans (the two largest ethnic groups in the U.S.) are disproportionately represented in lower socioeconomic categories (Farley, 1987; Maril, 1996). The source, however, of socioeconomic differences between the majority and ethnic minorities is often not considered. In the case of African Americans, as a group, they are not overrepresented in lower socioeconomic categories by chance. Differences in the socioeconomic standing of African Americans and the white majority arise from what it means to be a minority in a system where a numerical majority controls access to power and wealth. In short, black-white differences in leisure participation are not only confounded with socioeconomic status, historical and contemporary racism and discrimination are not accounted for. Therefore, as indicated earlier, the potential exists for majority-minority differences to be reduced to socioeconomic explanations without acknowledging the various levels and types of discrimination in society.

In addition, the reliance on education, income, or employment status as control variables leaves unmeasured the extent of socioeconomic differentiation between groups. Inequalities in access to educational and occupational opportunities, accumulated wealth, and intergenerational sources of socioeconomic advantages have not been used to capture more fully the extent of socioeconomic differences between majority and minority groups. This leaves open the possibility of "side effect" discrimination (Feagin, 1980). The side effect model recognizes that discriminatory practices in one institution have negative impacts because they are linked to discrimination in another sphere. The theoretical implication suggested here is that research must recognize the sources of socioeconomic differences between groups

before controlling for SES and consider how these factors condition leisure choices and constraints.

Sample Size Limitations

Small sample sizes and small subsamples represent a persistent problem in the race and ethnic literature based on the survey method (Floyd, Shinew, McGuire & Noe, 1994). Several limitations are associated with this problem. Smith (1987) questioned results from subsamples of African Americans from "statistically valid" national survey samples. He estimates that in most national cross sectional studies percentages from whites will have a 3 percent margin of error, while percentages from blacks will have a 10 percent margin of error, assuming a 95 percent confidence limit on a proportion of .50 (p. 442). Second, limited sample and subsamples may not be of sufficient size for subgroup analysis, sophisticated multivariate techniques and statistical controls common in social science research. Additionally, small subsamples truncate socioeconomic and demographic variability potentially leading to "false homogeneity" within the ethnic minority portion of the sample (Smith, 1987). Percentages and ratios based on individuals in a small sample are also sensitive to numerical increases and decreases making them less stable than those derived from large samples. Also germane to this issue is the potential for small sample and subsample sizes to compromise protection against Type II errors associated with difference tests (e.g., t-tests) involving between and within group comparisons (Gregorie & Driver, 1987). These problems stem from use of secondary data for analyses where control over sample design is lost and lack of sophistication regarding common sampling techniques or post-weighting procedures.

In summary, the race and ethnic studies literature reflects a lack of significant progress in the measurement of racial and ethnic factors. The rationale for controlling for socioeconomic status when SES itself can be a function of race or ethnic status has not been made explicit. Finally, sample size limitations present a number of difficulties ranging from restrictions on data analysis strategies and techniques to concerns related to Type II errors.

Clarifying Central Concepts

Movement toward a broadened theoretical understanding of race and ethnicity influences should be guided by a reconsideration of the fundamental nature of the central concepts and questions of interest. The fundamental question in the study of race and ethnicity and leisure can be stated as "How do race and ethnicity affect the leisure choices and constraints of individuals and groups?" What is the nature of race and ethnicity? And why are they consequential to leisure choices and constraints?

It is ironic that race and ethnicity are the central variables in this area of research, yet there is so little theoretical discussion of their relevance to leisure. This has not gone unnoticed. A frequently mentioned criticism is

that race and ethnicity are ill defined or confounded (Hutchison, 1988; Gramann & Allison, in press) making it difficult to attribute intergroup variation to race or ethnicity (or both) or socioeconomic factors. Hutchison (1988) raises this issue and provides a distinction accepted by most social scientists: "Ethnicity is usually defined as membership in a subcultural group on the basis of country of origin, language, religion, or cultural traditions... Race, on the other hand, is based on socially constructed definitions of physical appearances (p. 18)." Given this distinction, why do race and ethnicity matter for leisure outcomes?

What is the nature of race? Why does it matter?

Few would argue that skin color, hair color and texture by themselves bear any relation to leisure choices and constraints. At the same time, phenotypic characteristics demarcate social boundaries and structure social interaction (Ridgeway, 1991). Such characteristics carry meaning and provide cues about social standing and behavioral expectancies relative to others who possess similar and dissimilar phenotypic traits. Thus, the meaning society ascribes to the phenotype and the societal rewards and privileges allocated to persons based on their phenotypic characteristics can have a profound on leisure choices and constraints. Race, as a social construct, matters because of its stratification implications. It should be understood that, in contrast to biological conceptions of race, individuals do not occupy membership in a given racial category because they are actually of race x or y ; rather, they are identified as x and y because society has defined x and y as racial categories (Bonilla-Silva, 1996). Historically, racial ascriptions were imposed externally to justify the collective exploitation of people by powerful actors and maintained to preserve status differences (Bonilla-Silva, 1996).

Even a superficial glance at the history of race relations in the U.S. demonstrates the importance of race as a social construct and principle of social organization and stratification. For African Americans the institutions of slavery and Jim Crow (*de jure* segregation) undergirded by white supremacist ideologies are extensively documented. Also well documented is the subjugation and internal colonization of American Indians (Thorton, 1987) as is the displacement of Chicano landowners by Anglo American settlers in the 19th century (Knowlton, 1972; Barerra, 1979). Other race-based exclusionary policies include the anti-Chinese immigration and labor laws of the 19th and early 20th century (Feagin, 1989).

For most of the 20th century, race has been a major factor in access to social power and privileges. And for more years than not leisure services have been provided on a "separate, but equal" basis (Murphy, 1972). While some scholars (e.g., Wilson, 1980) have argued that the importance of race as a determinant of quality of life has been superseded by economic conditions, there is substantial evidence that it continues to be a significant determinant of quality of life for African Americans. For example, Massey and Denton (1993) provide extensive documentation of how historical and contem-

porary interpersonal and institutional discrimination have produced persistent residential segregation patterns fostering the social isolation of an urban African American underclass. African Americans historically have been ranked at or near the bottom on social standing and social distance polls (Smith & Dempsey, 1983). In their analysis of social distance over seven decades, Kleg and Yamamoto (1995) found social distance separating ethnic groups remains "remarkably stable" since 1925, concluding that "certain perceived physical features continue to function as the signal for negative social attitudes, and such nonwhite peoples as Turks, Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, and African Americans remain among the more clearly distanced" (p. 66). Keith and Herring (1991) show how American society has historically accorded social and economic privileges to Blacks with lighter skin tones and that skin tone continues to be a significant predictor of stratification outcomes (educational attainment, occupation, and income) in the present day. The primacy of race over class will continue to be debated. However, these findings provide compelling reasons for a more explicit treatment of race as a major stratifying principle in the study of racial and ethnic factors in leisure research. Given the nature of race, the question of how race affects leisure choices and constraints remains. By what mechanisms or processes do race factors affect leisure outcomes? And what are the behavioral consequences of these mechanisms or processes? How are they reflected in leisure choices? How do individuals and groups cope with or negotiate discrimination? How do these issues influence the meanings associated with leisure experiences?

Feagin and Eckberg's (1980) work on the types and effects of racial discrimination provide some perspective on addressing these kinds of questions. By law, public leisure service agencies cannot discriminate on the basis of race or ethnicity. Nevertheless, Feagin and Eckberg's model of institutional discrimination suggests that while policies and practices of organizations may not have been originally established to have discriminatory effects they can have differential and negative impact on racial and ethnic minorities. Feagin and Eckberg's research suggests two pathways (side effect and past-in-present discrimination) that could be studied in leisure service organizations and in interpersonal interaction. (Only two variants of institutional discrimination from their model are mentioned here. Readers are encouraged to see the entire discussion in Feagin and Feagin [1986] and Feagin and Eckberg[1980]).

Side effect discrimination "involves practices in one institutional or organizational area that have an adverse impact because they are linked to intentionally discriminatory practices in another" (p. 13). With this type of discrimination, patterns of discrimination may be cumulative or mutually reinforcing because discrimination is not isolated to one social or economic setting (Baron, 1969). Patterns of discrimination in education and labor markets can be linked to income differentials between groups which can lead to discrimination in housing and residential markets. It is likely that these linkages also extend to the delivery of leisure services and programs. For example, movement by leisure service agencies toward higher fees and priva-

tization may make good economic sense, but it may have an adverse impact on minorities faced with discriminatory barriers in other economic sectors (see Bowker & Leeworthy, 1998).

Past-in-present discrimination "involves apparently neutral present practices whose negative effects derive from prior intentional discrimination practices" (p. 12). For example, recreation management policies believed to be color-blind or culturally neutral can have unintended discriminatory effects. Consider that reliance on needs assessments and service quality surveys is widespread among public leisure service agencies. Further, consider that the results of these surveys are used as inputs to management policy (e.g., willingness-to-pay schedules for price preferences). If the results of such studies are based on current users, neglecting non-users and users with historically low rates of utilization, such efforts are likely to systematically perpetuate past exclusionary policies.

At the interpersonal level, Feagin (1994) suggests that discrimination can be understood by examining its spatial dimension (private to public), range of discriminatory actions, and responses by the targets of discrimination. Spatially, he suggests that the probability of discrimination increases as one moves from the most private settings (e.g., friendships) to the most public (e.g., on the street). The range of discrimination can be expressed as avoidance (by the outgroup), exclusion, physical threats, and blatant attacks. These dimensions have received implicit treatment in leisure studies (West, 1989; Blahna & Black, 1993; Floyd et al. 1993; Phillip, 1994). The responses to discrimination, i.e., how it alters behavior, has received less attention. Feagin suggests that primary responses on the part of the victim might include withdrawal, resigned acceptance, verbal responses, and counterattacks. He adds that middle-class status provides some resources for responding to discrimination. Gramann (1996) and McDonald and McAvoy (1997) hypothesize that discrimination might also lead to recreational displacement and substitution behaviors. This brief discussion serves to highlight that discrimination (perceived or actual) is consequential to leisure behavior on a levels yet to be considered.

The elaboration of discrimination mechanisms and effects is important for several reasons. First, it incorporates in explicit terms what is actually implied by the term race and its implications for how social advantages (and disadvantages) are allocated. Second, it opens up possibilities for understanding mechanisms and behavioral outcomes associated with discrimination to a significant degree. Third, adopting concepts from established models connects leisure models with other frameworks in the race and ethnic relations literature. Possibilities for moving beyond black-white comparisons to situations involving other phenotypically distinct groups are presented. Finally, regarding institutional discrimination, there is an opportunity to bring attention to how dominant groups hold power and exercise control over institutions (Yetman, 1985). The perspective afforded by this consideration is captured in Bierstedt's (1948) statement regarding the need for understanding majority groups:

It is the majority group which requires conformity to custom and which penalizes deviation—except in ways in which the majority sanctions and approves. It is the majority which is the custodian of the mores and which defends them against innovation. And it is the inertia of majorities, finally, which retards the processes of social change (p. 709).

What is the nature of ethnicity? Why does it matter?

Drawing upon Barth's (1969) classic work, Allison (1988) provided an insightful discussion on the nature of ethnicity and its implications for leisure interactions. Her contribution is significant because it provides great insight into the dynamic nature of ethnicity. Specifically, Allison indicated that ethnic boundaries are "processual and dynamic, and must be studied as such" (p. 253).

A recent elaboration of Barth's ideas by Nagel (1994) provides additional insight into the nature of ethnicity and why it matters for leisure behavior. The critical features of Nagel's perspective on ethnicity lie in ethnic identity ascription processes (internal and external) and cultural construction.

Nagel views ethnicity as a process of constructing boundaries (i.e., identities) and culture (meaning). She states:

Ethnicity is socially constructed out of the material of language, religion, culture, appearance, ancestry or regionality. The location and meaning of particular ethnic boundaries are continuously negotiated, revised, and revitalized, both by ethnic group members themselves as well as by outside observers (p. 152-154).

Consistent with Barth's theoretical approach, ethnic identity is the result of internal and external ascriptions. Internal ascriptions represent self-ascribed or chosen identities taken on by the individual. A chosen ethnic identity is determined by the individual's perception of its meaning to different audiences, the salience of its meaning in different situational contexts and its utility in different situational contexts. As a result, individuals may have access to multiple or "layered" ethnic identities as they move from one audience or situation to another. For example, depending on the context one individual can have access to the following labels, *Hispanic*, *Mexican American*, *Chicano*, *Latino*, and *Tejano* with each possibly having distinct implications for social interaction in contexts where the label is used.

External ascriptions refer to the extent ethnic identity is constructed by outside agents and organizations. These can assume two forms: informal and formal. Informal ascriptions are enforced externally by such means as day to day interpersonal interaction (e.g., prejudice and interpersonal discrimination). More formal ascriptions are constructed out of governmental/political policies (e.g., official ethnic categories, assimilation policies, affirmative action). While an individual can choose among a set of ethnic identities, Nagel suggests that the set is generally limited to socially and politically defined ethnic categories with varying degrees of stigma or advantaged attached to

them. In other words, individuals have a range of ethnic options available, but are constrained by legal or less formal normative structures.

These processes may hold important implications for understanding the role of ethnicity in leisure choices and constraints. For example, the functional meaning of leisure for individuals may vary by type of ascription, along an internal-external ascription continuum. A range of relevant leisure outcomes associated with such a continuum might include status or identity enhancement, personal and group identity expression, and group solidarity.

While identity circumscribes ethnic boundaries, "culture provides the content and meaning of ethnicity" (Nagel, 1994, p. 162). The construction of culture occurs similarly to the structuring of ethnicity. That is, culture is a product of interactions of individual actors and reference groups within the context of the larger society. It is equally as dynamic, being more than a shared history, but continuously constructed via the selection, negotiation, acceptance, and discarding of cultural symbols which give meaning to ethnicity. Nagel indicates

We can think of ethnic boundary construction as determining the *shape* of the shopping cart (size, number of wheels, composition, etc.); ethnic culture, then, is composed of the things we put into the cart—art, music, dress, religion, norms, beliefs, symbols, myths, customs. It is important that we discard the notion that culture is simply an historical legacy; culture is *not* a shopping cart that comes to us already loaded with a set of historical cultural goods. Rather we construct culture by picking and choosing items from the shelves of the past and the present (p. 162).

A straightforward implication of this viewpoint is that leisure—time, activities, experiences, and settings—apparently figures prominently in the construction of ethnic culture. As Allison (1988) suggests there may be an array of leisure-related activities that take place within ethnic communities which have particular relevance to the creation and sustenance of ethnicity. These activities possibly assist in the construction of collective identities when shared meanings (i.e., common symbolic vocabularies) are generated and may serve as a basis for collective mobilization and action (Nagel, 1994). Furthermore, the importance placed on leisure-related activities in the creation, maintenance, and recreation of culture might not be the same for individuals and groups asserting a "symbolic ethnicity" vis-a-vis individuals and groups asserting a more "substantive ethnicity". Gans (1979) suggests that later generation white ethnics only possess "symbolic identification" with their ancestry. He maintains that this symbolic identification is basically a leisure-time activity serving expressive rather than substantive needs. Individuals may only assert their ethnicity during certain ethnic holidays or festivals (e.g., being Irish on St. Patrick's Day). This symbolic culture, according to Gans, does not require face-to-face interaction, but can persist through the use of historical and contemporary symbols. In short, symbolic ethnicity is a matter of choice and may present few consequences for everyday life. In either case (symbolic or substantive), leisure-related activities are likely to be

part of the mix of materials from which ethnicity is created, recreated, and asserted. This places leisure in a different role, in contrast to previous ethnicity-leisure formulations. In the context of culture creation, leisure becomes more of an explanatory variable rather than a dependent variable as is it commonly employed. Choices of leisure activities, co-participants and settings could be important determinants of, or at least contributors to, ethnic identity and cultural meaning. What role does leisure play in the creation, maintenance and expression of ethnicity? How is leisure organized to meet the needs of different ethnic groups? In pursuing these kinds of questions, we might discover that one of the central functions and benefits of leisure is contributing to the preservation and maintenance of ethnic identity and culture.

To conclude, ethnicity and its attributes are dynamic features of social organization. Leisure researchers have failed to elaborate the components of ethnicity from a constructionist perspective in the tradition of Barth and Nagel or from other conceptual approaches (e.g., Taylor, 1979; Yancey, et al., 1976). The consequence is a limited understanding of the nature of ethnicity and its consequences for leisure behavior. A consideration of the dynamic properties of ethnicity should lead to a wide range of new theoretical and empirical possibilities for examining the relationship between ethnicity and leisure.

Issues Related to Dependent Variables

As noted previously, early studies of black-white differences in leisure participation focused primarily on a rate of participation in different recreation activities, or use and non-use of certain types of outdoor recreation areas, such as national parks (Bultena & Field, 1978). In light of concerns about equality and equity (especially during the 60's and 70s) in public recreation resource allocation, the focus on participation rates, particularly, disproportionate use patterns, is understood. In some situations, disproportionate use patterns may not be the most relevant issue (Ewert, Gramann, & Floyd, 1990). In a growing number of locales, non-Anglo ethnic groups comprise a majority of users in certain outdoor recreation areas. For example, Hispanics (Mexican and Central Americans) represent up to 64% of users in national forest recreation areas in Southern California (USDA Forest Service, 1990). In these situations, the issue is one of differences in "style" or "mode" of participation rather than participation rates per se. In this regard, research to date indicates that Hispanic recreationists tend to visit recreation in larger groups that are more varied in their composition than "typical" Anglo groups (Irwin, Gartner, & Phelps, 1990; Hutchison, 1987), and tend to be more socially motivated in use of recreation areas compared to Anglos (USDA Forest Service, 1990).

From both research and managerial standpoints, there is much to be gained from examining a wider range of dependent variables. In recent years there has been progress on this front. Researchers are beginning to consider

ethnic variation in social group size and composition (e.g., Irwin, et al., 1990; Hutchison, 1987), motivations and perceived benefits (Gramann et al., 1993; Phillip, 1997; Toth & Brown, 1997; Shaull & Gramann, 1998 this issue) and place meaning and setting preferences (Irwin et al. 1990; Carr & Williams, 1993).

Apart from studies of leisure in formal settings such as parks, forests and other outdoor settings, every day leisure and home centered experiences have not received a balanced share of research attention. Investigation of informal home-centered activities may provide important insights into behavioral patterns of racial and ethnic minority group members not likely to be discovered elsewhere.

Leisure, as freely chosen and intrinsically rewarding activity, may be the lifestyle aspect in which ethnicity is most freely expressed (Ewert, Gramann, & Floyd, 1990; Floyd & Gramann, 1993). Leisure itself may be subdivided into different types of social experiences (Samdahl, 1989). Some activities are individual or centered around primary relationships with family and friends, while others are centered around secondary relationships (e.g., co-workers, professional or voluntary associations). Leisure centered around primary relationships may be less constrained by social pressures compared to activity centered around secondary relationship. As a result the extent to which ethnicity is expressed in leisure may vary according to type of leisure setting (primary or secondary). Primary relationships may provide opportunities for identity expression due to less social pressure. Leisure in primary settings may also provide a significant degree of autonomy serving as a site of resistance against dominant social and cultural forms (Dawson, 1988). This suggests that the social contexts of leisure interactions must be better understood. One avenue for understanding the dynamic of race and ethnicity in local contexts may be to deemphasize national and regional surveys in favor of more focused case studies of particular communities.

Two principal benefits are associated with an expanded set of dependent variables. The first is that race and ethnicity research becomes relevant to situations in which racial and ethnic diversity exists, but "under-participation" is not an issue. Second, there is an opportunity to further understanding by systematically "sorting out" the dependent variables which are more or less relevant to race and ethnic factors. This will be facilitated by a clearer understanding and recognition of the dynamic properties of race and ethnicity and their relationships to leisure-related phenomena.

Conclusions

The field of leisure studies will face two important challenges in the coming decades. There will be greater demand for social science research concerning race and ethnicity. Pressures created by increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-racial populations (in North America and beyond) for diversity considerations in policy making and service delivery are expected to intensify. Second, the field lacks coherent theoretical structures to frame questions

and to guide systematic inquiry to meet this demand. For the past 20 years the marginality-ethnicity framework has served as the point of reference for race and ethnic studies. It has been useful in providing the field with general research directions. It is clear however that a more viable and elaborated framework will be needed to meet the challenges of the future. The position taken here is that scholarship on race, ethnicity and leisure will advance if past approaches are reconsidered and alternative theoretical and methodological possibilities are explored. Three critical areas were addressed. Specifically, the lack of theoretical and conceptual development and over-reliance on the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses was identified as a fundamental problem. Second, past research has neglected dynamic elements of race and ethnicity. Namely, the implications of racial stratification and subordination for leisure choices and constraints have been largely ignored. Similarly, the emergent properties of ethnicity have been overlooked. Finally, I argued that there is a need to investigate a wider range of dependent variables, and in exploring re-casting leisure as an explanatory variable. These issues are put forward for consideration in subsequent research and are summarized in the following fundamental questions:

1. What is the nature of race and ethnicity, and why is it relevant to leisure choices and constraints?
2. How should race and ethnic factors be represented empirically to specify and isolate their linkages to leisure choices and constraints?
3. What class of events (behaviors, choices, constraints, benefits etc.) are closely associated with or subject to race and ethnic influences? In other words, what is the most relevant dependent variable?
4. What role does leisure interaction play in the creation, maintenance and expression of racial and ethnic identity? How is leisure organized to meet the needs of different racial and ethnic groups?

More broadly, the question of how the study of race and ethnicity advances the understanding of leisure might be considered? And, can the study of race and ethnicity in leisure contexts contribute to what is known about race and ethnicity more generally?

At this juncture, leisure researchers are positioned to meet these challenges and to make significant contributions to the current knowledge base, practitioner efforts and the publics they serve. A substantial body of literature developed over the last three decades is available to draw upon. The availability of and receptivity toward alternative theoretical approaches (e.g., interpretive paradigms, feminism, postmodernism, post-colonial theories) and methodological approaches (e.g., case studies, surveys, in situ designs, experience sampling) is increasing. There is substantial breadth and depth in disciplinary perspectives that scholars can bring to these issues. To this end, the opportunity to harness this potential and bring its synergistic effects to bear on race/ethnicity issues is unprecedented. Despite this opportunity, the paucity of active researchers addressing such concerns may limit this potential. A lack of diversity within the corpus of current scholars also exists. Per-

haps as the field matures more diverse theoretical, methodological, and disciplinary approaches, along with a growing body of diverse and dedicated scholars will converge on questions involving race, ethnicity and leisure. As a group, the manuscripts contained in this special issue take up some of these challenges by engaging major theoretical and conceptual issues and in employing diverse methodological strategies. They offer strong encouragement for the future.

Acknowledgements

This special issue could not have been realized without manuscript submissions and the authors' careful attention to the compressed schedule required for a special issue. Sincere appreciation is extended to the four individuals who agreed to serve as Associate Editors: Gary Chick (University of Illinois), John Dwyer (USDA Forest Service), Kim Shinew (University of Illinois), and David Scott (Texas A&M University). Twenty-five colleagues came to their aid as part of the peer review process. Their contributions are also sincerely appreciated. Finally, special thanks to Ellen Weissinger, *JLR* Editor, for her support throughout this endeavor from the beginning to its completion.

References

- Allison, M. T. (1988). Breaking boundaries and barriers: Future directions in cross-cultural research. *Leisure Sciences*, 10, 247-259.
- Baron, H. M. (1969). The web of urban racism. In L. L. Knowles & K. Prewitt (Eds.), *Institutional racism in America* (pp. 134-176). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barrera, M. (1979). *Race and class in the southwest: A theory of racial inequality* (pp. 34-57). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture differences*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Bierstedt, R. (1948). The sociology of majorities. *American Sociological Review*, 13, 700-710.
- Blahna, D. J., & Black, K. S. (1993). Racism: A concern for recreation resource managers? In P. H. Gobster (Ed.), *Managing urban and high-use recreation settings* (pp. 111-118). Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 465-480.
- Bultena, G. L., & Field, D. R. (1978). Visitors to national parks: A test of the elitism argument. *Leisure Sciences*, 1, 395-409.
- Carr, D. S., & Williams, D. R. (1993). Understanding the role of ethnicity in outdoor recreation experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 22-38.
- Cheek, N. H., Field, D. R., & Burch, W. R. (1976). *Leisure and recreation places*. Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Science.
- Dawson, D. (1988). Social class in leisure: Reproduction and resistance. *Leisure Sciences*, 10, 193-202.
- Dwyer, J. F. (1994). *Customer diversity and the future demand for outdoor recreation*. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-252. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

- Ewert, A. W. (1993). The wildland-urban interface: Introduction and overview. *Journal of Leisure Research, 25*, 1-5.
- Ewert, A. W., Gramann, J. H., & Floyd, M. F. (1990, August). *Ethnic patterns in recreational uses of natural resources: Rethinking the marginality-ethnicity paradigm*. Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meetings. Norfolk, VA.
- Farley, R. (1987). *The color line and the quality of life in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Feagin, J. R. (1989). *Racial and ethnic relations* (Third Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Feagin, J. R. (1994). The continuing significance of race: Antiblack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 101-116.
- Feagin, J. R., & Feagin, C. B. (1986). *Discrimination American style*. Melbourne, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.
- Feagin, J. R., & Eckberg, D. L. (1980). Discrimination: Motivation, action, effects and context. *Annual Review of Sociology, 6*, 1-20.
- Floyd, M. F., & Gramann, J. H. (1997). Effects of acculturation and structural assimilation in resource-based recreation: The case of Mexican Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research, 25*, 6-21.
- Floyd, M. F., Gramann, J. H., & Saenz, R. (1993). Ethnic factors and the use of public outdoor recreation areas: The case of Mexican Americans. *Leisure Sciences, 15*, 83-98.
- Floyd, M. F., Shinew, K. J., McGuire, F. A., & Noe, F. P. (1994). Race, class, and leisure activity preferences: Marginality and ethnicity revisited. *Journal of Leisure Research, 26*, 158-173.
- Gans, H. (1979). Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and culture in America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 2*, 1-20.
- Gramann, J. H., & Allison, M. T. (in press). Ethnicity, race and leisure. In T. Burton & E. Jackson (Eds.), *Leisure studies at the millennium*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Gramann, J. H. (1996). *Ethnicity, race, and outdoor recreation: A review of trends, policy, and research*. Misc. Paper R-96-1. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Gramann, J. H., Floyd, M. F., & Saenz, R. (1993). Outdoor recreation and Mexican American ethnicity: A benefits perspective. In A. Ewert, D. Chavez, & A. Magill (Eds.), *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 69-84). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gregorie, & Driver, B. L. (1987). Type II errors in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 19*, 261-272.
- Hutchison, R. (1987). Ethnicity and urban recreation: Whites, Blacks and Hispanics in Chicago's public parks. *Journal of Leisure Research, 19*, 205-222.
- Hutchison, R. (1988). A critique of race, ethnicity, and social class in recent leisure-recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 20*, 10-30.
- Hutchison, R., & Fidel, K. (1984). Mexican American recreation activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 16*, 344-349.
- Irwin, P. N., Gartner, W. C., & Phelps, C. C. (1990). Mexican-American/Anglo cultural differences as recreation style determinants. *Leisure Sciences, 12*, 335-348.
- Jackson, J. S., McCullough, W. R., Gurin, G., & Broman, C. L. (1991). Race identity. In J.S. Jackson (Ed.), *Life in Black America* (pp. 238-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, C. Y., Horan, P. M., & Pepper, W. (1997). Race, rural residence, and wildland visitation: Examining the influence of sociocultural meaning. *Rural Sociology, 62*, 89-110.
- Jones, W. H. (1927). *Recreation and amusement among Negroes in Washington, DC*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
- Keith, V. M., & Herring, C. (1991). Skin tone and stratification in the black community. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*, 760-778.
- Kleg, M., & Yamamoto, K. (1995). Ethnic and racial social distance: Seven decades apart. *Psychological Reports, 76*, 65-66.

- Knowlton, C. S. (1972). Culture conflict and natural resources. In W. R. Burch, N. H. Check, & L. Taylor (Eds.), *Social behavior, natural resources, and the environment* (pp. 109-145). New York: Harper and Row.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1994). The African American Acculturation Scale: Development, reliability and validity. *Journal of Black Psychology, 20*, 104-127.
- Lindsay, J. J., & Ogle, R. A. (1972). Socioeconomic patterns of outdoor recreation use near urban areas. *Journal of Leisure Research, 4*, 19-24.
- Maril, R. L. (1989). *The poorest of Americans: The Mexican Americans of the lower Rio Grande valley of Texas*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McDonald, D., & McAvoy, L. (1997, October). Racism, recreation and Native Americans. Paper presented at the 1997 NRPA Congress Leisure Research Symposium. Salt Lake City, UT.
- Mueller, E., & Gurin, G. (1962). *Participation in outdoor recreation: Factors affecting demand among American adults*. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report 20. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Murdock, S. H. (1995). *An America challenged: Population change and the future of the United States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Murdock, S. H., Backman, K. F., Colberg, E., Hoque, M. N., & Hamm, R. R. (1990). Modeling demographic change and characteristics in the analysis of future demand for leisure services. *Leisure Sciences, 12*, 79-102.
- Murdock, S. H., Backman, K. F., Hoque, M. N., & Ellis, D. (1991). The implications of change in population size and composition on future participation in outdoor recreational activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 23*, 238-259.
- Murdock, S. H., Loomis, D. K., Ditton, R. B., & Hoque, M. N. (1996). The implications of demographic change for recreation fisheries management in the United States. *Human Dimensions, 1*, 14-37.
- Murphy, J. F. (1972). *Egalitarianism and separatism: A history of approaches in the provision of public recreation and leisure services for blacks, 1906-1972*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. *Social Problems, 41*, 152-176.
- O'Hare, W. P. (1992). America's minorities—The demographics of diversity. *Population Bulletin, 47*, 2-47.
- Phillip, S. F. (1994). Race and tourism choice: A legacy of discrimination? *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*, 479-488.
- Phillip, S. F. (1997). Race, gender, and leisure benefits. *Leisure Sciences, 19*, 191-207.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530*, 74-96.
- Ridgeway, C. (1991). The social construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces, 70*, 367-386.
- Smith, A. W. (1987). Problems and progress in the measurement of black public opinion. *American Behavioral Scientist, 30*, 441-455.
- Smith, T. W., & Dempsey, G. R. (1983). The Polls: Ethnic social distance and prejudice. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 47*, 584-600.
- Stokowski, P. A. (1990). Extending the social groups model: Social network analysis in recreation research. *Leisure Sciences, 12*, 251-263.

- Taylor, R. L. (1979). Black ethnicity and the persistence of ethnogenesis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84, 1401-1423.
- Thorton, —. (1987). *American Indian holocaust and survival: A population history since 1492*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Toth, J. F., Jr., & Brown, R. B. (1997). Racial and gender meanings of why people participate in recreational fishing. *Leisure Sciences*, 19, 129-146.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1994). *Projections of the population, by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, for the United States: 1993-2050*. Current Population Report Series P25-1104. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service (Pacific Southwest Research Station). (1990). Urban recreational visitors to the Inyo National Forest. *Recreation Research Update*, 2, 1-2.
- Washburne, R. F. (1978). Black under-participation in wildland recreation: Alternative explanations. *Leisure Sciences*, 1, 175-189.
- West, P. C. (1989). Urban region parks and black minorities: Subculture, marginality, and interracial relations in park use in the Detroit metropolitan area. *Leisure Sciences*, 11, 11-28.
- Wilson, W. J. (1980). *The declining significance of race* (Second Edition). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Woodard, M. D. (1988). Class, regionality, and leisure among urban black Americans: The post-civil rights era. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20, 87-105.
- Yancey, W. L., Ericksen, E. P., & Juliani, R. N. (1976). Emergent ethnicity: A review and reformulation. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 391-402.
- Yetman, N. R. (1985). *Majority and minority: The dynamics of race and ethnicity in American life* (pp. 1-20). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.