

**What People Want From Their Leisure**  
*The Contributions of Personality Facets in Differentially  
Predicting Desired Leisure Outcomes*

**Lynn A. Barnett**  
University of Illinois

**Abstract**

This study explored how personality predicts the types of experiences one wants to have during free time. The importance of six free time outcome factors was predicted from the facets of the Big Five personality dimensions for university students. Results indicated that personality facets were highly predictive, and differentially so, depending on desired free time outcomes. Findings provide evidence for the interrelationships between the intricate and multiple linkages between personality and desired free time outcomes and demonstrate consistency of interrelationships for male and female students and Caucasian and minority students. The study extends the literature on the Big Five model of personality to leisure and furthers understanding of and encourages future research on personality predispositions as salient predictors of desired leisure experiences.

KEYWORDS: *Personality, free time, Big Five, leisure outcomes*

---

Lynn A. Barnett is an associate professor in the Department of Recreation, Sport, and Tourism at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Please address correspondence to Dr. Lynn A. Barnett, Department of Recreation, Sport and Tourism, 104 Huff Hall, 1206 S. Fourth Street, Champaign, IL 61820. Office phone: (217) 244-5645, Fax: (217) 244-1935, [lynnbm@uiuc.edu](mailto:lynnbm@uiuc.edu)

*You can discover more about a person in an hour of play  
than in a year of conversation.*

—Plato

The observation that our play and leisure<sup>1</sup> provide a unique and insightful reflection of our individuality has long been promulgated. A number of authors have postulated that the creation, definition, and experience of leisure are situated within the personality of the individual (Barnett, 2006; Hills & Argyle, 1998; Tinsley, Hinson, Tinsley, & Holt, 1993), and many scholars have demonstrated that an individual's personality is more likely to influence their behavior in leisure compared to other settings (Brandstatter, 1994; Diener, Larsen, & Emmons, 1984; Emmons, Diener, & Larsen, 1986). However, efforts to map personality onto leisure experience have been successful, and others either have been met with criticism or have produced inconsistent findings. For example, several empirical studies attempting to extend Holland's ordering of personality types into the leisure domain have been largely successful (Hansen & Scullard, 2002; Melamed, Meir, & Samson, 1995), and others have yielded weak or absent relationships (Miller, 1991). Additional empirical efforts have detected relationships between measures of personality and the specific leisure activities in which people participate (Barnett, 2006; Hou, Tu, & Yang, 2007; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1991; Krcmar & Keyan, 2005; Wilkinson & Hansen, 2006), yet others have failed to demonstrate connections (Allen, 1982; Shaw, 1985; Unger, 1984).

Much of this inconsistency can be attributed to differences in operationalizing the leisure construct. Leisure has been viewed as activity that occurs during time free from obligatory or imposed activities (Hansen, 1998; Hansen & Scullard, 2002; McKechnie, 1975; Neulinger, 1981), or as obligatory or imposed activities with the added proviso that they must be social, that is, shared with others (Barnett, 2006; Deci & Ryan, 1991; Kleiber, Larson, & Csikszentmihalyi, 1986; Larson, Mannell, & Zuzanek, 1986). Additional research has focused on the drive states that impel the individual to pursue one or a range of activities (Tinsley & Eldridge, 1995; Tinsley & Johnson, 1984; Tinsley & Kass, 1978; Tinsley & Tinsley, 1986), and still other research has focused on the specific motivations arising from these drive states (Driver, 1983; Graef, Csikszentmihalyi, & Gianinno, 1983; Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990; Reid & Mannell, 1993; Shaw, 1985; Watkins & Bond, 2007; Weissinger & Bandalos, 1995). Although this "motivational orientation" literature has focused on the antecedents that predispose participants to engage in a leisure activity, a number of studies have similarly laid importance on antecedents but have instead focused on the anticipated outcomes that are desired from leisure experiences prior to engagement (cf. Gibson & Chang, 2012; Shores & Scott, 2007). This latter perspective on exploring an individual's leisure was used to investigate relationships with the specific personality attributes of the individual. In previous research on this topic, personality has been examined at a more global dimensional level, but recent research has shown that a more fine-grained examination at the facet level produces more clear and explanatory, and in some cases divergent, findings (Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Paunonen, Haddock, Fosterling,

& Keinonen, 2003). In line with these recent conclusions, this study represents the first attempt to more specifically explore the predictive power of personality facets in accounting for the different outcomes that individuals desire from their free time experiences.

### **The “Big Five” and Leisure**

A voluminous archive of evidence has led to the conclusion that most of the consistencies in our behavior can be represented as a hierarchical organization of five basic personality dimensions (labeled the *Big Five*): Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1985, 1988; McCrae & Costa, 1987, 1999; McCrae & John, 1992). A wealth of research has consistently found that these five dimensions are accurate representations of individuals across variety of ages, settings, cultures, and methods of administration (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1996; McCrae, Costa, del Pilar, Rolland, & Parker, 1998; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006). These five personality dimensions represent the topmost level of a hierarchy in which narrower traits and even narrower behaviors represent the lower levels (Costa & McCrae, 1995; McCrae & John, 1992). These personality “facets” (i.e., six stand-alone subscales within each dimension) share common elements. These common elements define the personality dimension and each facet’s communality with the dimension. Definitions and literature relating to the Big Five dimensions will only be briefly reviewed here; the reader is referred to the wealth of information that makes up this literature and that is more extensively reviewed elsewhere (Costa & McCrae, 1992, 1995; McCrae & Costa, 1999, 2003; McCrae & John, 1992; McCrae et al., 1998; Roberts et al., 2006). A summary of descriptors that depicts the facets underlying each dimension is presented in Table 1 to provide the reader with a concise representation. The literature reviewed below is restricted to studies that have investigated relations between the personality facets and leisure, or if there is little evidence available, speculation is offered on which linkages might be found.

#### **Neuroticism**

The dimension of Neuroticism (**N**) has been regarded as negative emotionality or negative affectivity (Lucas & Fujita, 2000; Watson & Clark, 1997), reflecting the finding that **N** predisposes people to experience more negative emotions and life events (Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993). Research has found relationships between **N** personalities and leisure. People who are high on **N** dislike playful activities, experience less pleasure from the individual and social activities in which they choose to engage, and have difficulty in achieving a deeper level of involvement that leads to enhanced enjoyment (Kirkcaldy, 1989).

**Table 1**

*Personality Dimensions and Descriptors of Underlying Facets  
(adapted from McCrae & Costa, 1999; McCrae & John, 1992)*

<b>Personality Dimensions and Facets</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
<b>Neuroticism</b>	
N1. Anxiety	anxious, fearful, nervous, high strung, tense, prone to worry, thin-skinned, dwells on what might go wrong
N2. Hostility	hostile, angry, irritable, ill tempered, difficult to get along with, self-pitying
N3. Depression	depressed, sorrowful, sad, hopeless, lonely, guilty, low self-worth, tense
N4. Self-consciousness	self-conscious, shameful, embarrassed, sensitive to teasing and ridicule, inferior, touchy
N5. Impulsivity	impulsive; gives into temptations; overwhelmed by desires; little control; tendency to overeat, overspend, drink, smoke, gamble, and use drugs; unstable; concerned with adequacy
N6. Vulnerability	vulnerable, easily stressed, panicky, dependent on others, worrying, fluctuating moods
<b>Extraversion</b>	
E1. Warmth	warm, friendly, cordial, intimacy in personal interactions, informal, affectionate, easily forms close attachments to others
E2. Gregariousness	gregarious, desires to be with others, likes crowds, wants lots of social interaction, skilled in play and humor
E3. Assertiveness	assertive, readily expressive of feelings and desires, easily takes charge in situations, makes up own mind, dominant, forceful, socially ascendant, "natural leader"

**Table 1 (cont.)**

<b>Personality Dimensions and Facets</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
E4. Activity	active, talkative, energetic, forceful, leads fast-paced life, needs to keep busy
E5. Excitement-Seeking	seeks stimulating environments and people, searches for excitement, risk taker, craves excitement and stimulation
E6. Positive Emotion	positive emotionality predominates, joyful, finds pleasure and delight in situations and others, zestful, jocular
<b>Openness to Experience</b>	
O1. Fantasy	imaginative, elaborate daydreams, fantasies, active and elaborate fantasy life, vivid imagination
O2. Aesthetics	sensitive to art and beauty, preference for artistic activities, deep appreciation for art and beauty, moved by poetry and music
O3. Feelings	strongly expressive of feelings, values experience to derive meaning in life
O4. Actions	open to trying new things, going new places
O5. Ideas	curious, values knowledge for its own sake, intellectual curiosity, open-minded, enjoys brainteasers
O6. Values	open to possibilities, empathetic; liberal; able to see contextual differences and situations in designating "right" and "wrong"; readiness to reexamine social, political, religious values
<b>Agreeableness</b>	
A1. Trust	trusting of others, belief in best of others, not suspicious, rarely suspects hidden intents
A2. Straightforwardness	trustworthy, candid, straightforward
A3. Altruism	altruistic, selfless, considerate, desire to help others, active concern for others' welfare, willingness to assist others in need

**Table 1 (cont.)**

<b>Personality Dimensions and Facets</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
A4. Compliance	compliant, meek, nonaggressive, deferential to others
A5. Modesty	modest, humble, downplays own abilities and importance
A6. Tendermindedness	tender-minded, sentimental, susceptible to others' requests, shows sympathy and concern for others, moved by others' needs
<b>Conscientiousness</b>	
C1. Competence	competent, rational, informed
C2. Order	organized, efficient, orderly, neat, keeps things in their proper places
C3. Dutifulness	dutiful, inhibited, scrupulously adheres to moral precepts
C4. Achievement Striving	strives for achievement, pursues excellence in everything they do
C5. Self-Discipline	self-disciplined
C6. Deliberation	deliberate, advanced planning, careful thought before action, goal-directed, tendency to think carefully before acting, cautious

Research has not explored relationships between the more specific **N** facets (*Anxiety, Hostility, Depression, Self-Consciousness, Vulnerability, Impulsiveness*) and leisure; however, a few related studies suggest that connections might be found. High scores on the *Anxiety* facet imply the prevention of failures, which should lead to such individuals desiring noncompetitive experiences and searching for new opportunities in their leisure that allow them to feel successful. *Hostility* has been found to relate to a hypercompetitive approach—the desire to win at all costs (Ross, Rausch, & Canada, 2003)—and we would thus expect this to be reflected in desired free time outcomes. Research has also shown that individuals who have chronic *depression* engage in fewer pleasant activities and experience less enjoyment of those activities (Droomers, Schrijvers, van de Mheen, & Mackenbach, 1998; Lewinsohn & Graf, 1973), suggesting they might seek outcomes that maximize fun and gratification. Individuals who are *self-conscious* might avoid situ-

ations where others would unfavorably judge them (Costa & McCrae, 1988), as might those who are easily discouraged or embarrassed in social groups (*vulnerable*; Caughlin, Huston, & Houts, 2000; Donnellan, Conger, & Bryant, 2004; Rogge, Bradbury, Hahlweg, Engl, & Thurmaier, 2006). Finally, research has shown that *impulsive* people tend to drink, smoke, gamble, overeat, overspend, and use drugs to excess, having little ability to curb their desires or resist temptations (McCrae & Costa, 2003). The outcomes they desire from their free time experiences might reflect this lack of inhibitory control.

### **Extraversion**

Extraversion (**E**) taps primarily into sociability or the motivation to form interpersonal bonds, to be warm and affectionate, and to seek excitement and attention (Costa & McCrae, 1995; Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao, 2000). Theoretical and empirical work has pinpointed three possible central features that are at the core of this trait: the tendency to experience frequent positive moods (Fleeson, Malanos, & Achille, 2002), sensitivity to potential rewards (Lucas et al., 2000), and the tendency to evoke and enjoy social attention (Ashton, Lee, & Paunonen, 2002). Extraversion has been shown to be nearly identical to positive affect/emotionality (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Lucas & Fujita, 2000; Watson & Clark, 1997). **E** leads people to exhibit trust and affiliation tendencies that allow them to create and take advantage of social opportunities and to develop more and better relationships. These relationships, in turn, likely satisfy the innate need for belonging and social connection (Ryan & Deci, 2000). This internalized sense of connectedness explains why extraverted people are able to regulate their interpersonal and emotional needs and feel happy and satisfied with their lives. It enables people to feel positive and good about themselves even when alone, in non-social situations, or in novel social settings.

The **E** dimension has received the most attention and shown the most consistency in demonstrating relationships with leisure. Research has shown that extroverts and introverts differ in their leisure preferences and experiences. Individuals who are high on **E** are likely to choose social activities and to have more enjoyable experiences when in the company of others than when alone (Argyle & Lu, 1990a, 1990b; Diener, Sandvik, Pavot, & Fujita, 1992; Lucas & Diener, 2001; Lucas & Fujita, 2000). They are more energetic than introverts (Caspi, Roberts, & Shiner, 2005; Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008) and seek activities that provide a high level of stimulation and excitement and that often carry elements of risk (Brandstatter, 1994). Introverts, alternately, prefer solitary recreational activities and experience greater enjoyment through them.

Although this dimension has been more extensively studied in relation to play and leisure than the others, its facets (*Warmth, Gregariousness, Assertiveness, Activity, Excitement-Seeking, Positive Emotions*) have received less attention (see Costa & McCrae, 1988). The various **E** facets have appeared at higher levels in several studies in specific leisure activities (Clark & Watson, 1988; Hills & Argyle, 1998; Kirkcaldy, 1989; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Watson, Clark, McIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992; Wilkinson & Hansen, 2006), but investigations with other aspects of leisure experience have been absent. However, the nature of each of the facets, and the extant research with specific activities, points to the strong conjecture that desired

leisure outcomes should be strongly related to each facet. Part of the characterization of the *gregarious* individual is that he or she feels a strong yearning to be with others, to seek and enjoy social situations, and to be a “joiner” rather than a “loner” (Ashton et al., 2002). We would thus expect this type of individual to desire outcomes in which social relationships can be formed, and perhaps those with an element of competition (*Assertiveness*) reflecting the greater appearance of extraverts in these types of activities (Hills & Argyle, 1998; Kirkcaldy, 1989). People high on the *Activity* facet should seek more dynamic, energetic, novel, and varied experiences. *Positive Emotions* can also be seen in most, if not all, of the definitions and theoretical models of leisure, referring to the positive affect, pleasure, or joy consistently observed. Research has shown that such individuals position themselves in positive life situations (McCrae & Costa, 1991) and report more pleasant affect than introverts, even when alone (Lucas & Diener, 2001; Pavot, Diener, & Fujita, 1990), so this facet might not relate as specifically to leisure outcomes as the others. Finally, those high in *Excitement-Seeking* crave high levels of stimulation, adventure, arousal, and risk—elements they cannot find in their rule-governed work life or mundane home life (Brandstatter, 1994). Fast cars, flashy clothes, and risky undertakings are particularly attractive to them (McCrae & Costa, 2003).

### **Openness to Experience**

The Openness to Experience (O) dimension is seen in the need for novelty, variety, and complexity and an intrinsic appreciation for experience. High O individuals prefer more open-ended discussions, more diversity of opinion, more equality of participation, and more complexity of thought (Sidanius, 1985; Tetlock, 1983). In contrast, closed people have a preference for familiarity and simplicity and often have interpersonal problems. They find it hard to understand and adapt to others' perspectives, thus appearing to be inflexible, and they lack a strong sense of self and are easily swayed by others (Gurtman, 1995; McCrae, 1996). Research exploring connections with leisure and the O facets (*Fantasy, Aesthetics, Feelings, Actions, Ideas, Values*) has been relatively sparse, and the studies that have been conducted have focused on specific activities such as television viewing, movies, music, and pleasure reading preferences (Krcmar & Greene, 1999; Krcmar & Keyan, 2005; Paunonen, & Ashton, 2001). However, we can again suggest from this research, in combination with other O-related literature and facet definitions, where relationships with desired leisure outcomes might be found.

People who are imaginative, curious, novelty seeking, and broad-minded in their judgments (high O) should prefer new situations or intellectual stimulation and be eager to engage in situations offering learning opportunities (Sidanius, 1985; Tetlock, 1983). It might thus be anticipated that their desired leisure outcomes would reflect opportunities to be challenged and to be open to new experiences and potential involvements. In addition, the findings that people who are high on O were particularly open to novelty and a varied set of experiences in their media preferences (Krcmar & Keyan, 2005) could be extended to suggest similar desired leisure outcomes. Building on the demonstrated relationships between O and learning and intelligence (Ackerman & Heggstad, 1997; Nofle & Robins, 2007), it would be expected that several of the facets (*Fantasy, Actions, Ideas, Values*) would predict leisure experiences that afford opportunities to learn and grow.



We would also expect to find that those high on *Aesthetics* would want creative and absorbing leisure experiences and that high *Feelings* individuals would seek occasions to be able to express their feelings and desires (Gurtman, 1995; McCrae, 1996).

### **Agreeableness**

Agreeableness (**A**) encompasses our more humane aspects: characteristics such as altruism, nurturance, caring, and emotional support at one end of the dimension and hostility, indifference to others, self-centeredness, spitefulness, and jealousy at the other. Agreeableness is seen in selfless concern for others and in trusting and generous sentiments. Those who score high on **A** are more likely to be nurturing and less likely to be aggressive, and they are also more likely to exhibit empathy for others (Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991). Agreeableness includes a variety of traits that foster congenial relationships with others (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). People high in **A** are cooperative, considerate, empathetic, generous, polite, and kind, whereas those low in **A** are aggressive, rude, spiteful, stubborn, cynical, and manipulative. **A** has also been found to be related to human values: It is associated with conformity, security, and tradition and negatively with power (von Collani & Grumm, 2009).

Relationships between the general **A** dimension and specific leisure activities have been found, although studies exploring connections with the individual **A** facets (*Trust, Straightforwardness, Altruism, Compliance, Modesty, Tender-Mindedness*) have been relatively sparse. For example, individuals high in **A** have been found to be higher in leisure satisfaction in a sample of young adult online gamers (Hou et al., 2007), as have those who are adept at playing a musical instrument (Krcmar & Keyan, 2005; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001). The *Altruism* and *Compliance* facets have been shown to describe people who seek opportunities for personal growth (Ross et al., 2003). This suggests that people high on these facets might similarly seek such fulfillment opportunities in their leisure. The *Trust* and *Tender-Mindedness* facets characterize people who are eager to learn from others (Costa et al., 1991), and it might be hypothesized that this tendency would be reflected in their desired leisure outcomes such as seeking new social experiences. The interpersonal aspects of **A** (*Straightforwardness, Compliance, Modesty*) imply relationships between certain facets and norm-oriented people (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997), for example, the willingness to accommodate other's wishes in activity choices.

### **Conscientiousness**

The dimension of conscientiousness (**C**) relates to the capacity for behavioral and cognitive control and can be regarded as the propensity to follow socially prescribed norms and rules and to be goal directed, planful, and able to delay gratification (John & Srivastava, 1999; Roberts, Walton, & Bogg, 2005). People high on **C**—who typically consider themselves more conventional in orientation, reflecting their propensity to adhere to society's norms—are much less likely to commit crimes, have risky sex, eat unhealthy, use tobacco, drink alcohol excessively, engage in risky driving, use drugs, be violent, or lead an inactive lifestyle (Bogg & Roberts, 2004; Roberts et al., 2005). People high in **C** are also more likely to be committed to and involved with their work, family, and community (Lodi-Smith

& Roberts, 2007). They tend to have greater marital stability (Cramer, 1993; Tucker, Kressin, Spiro, & Ruscio, 1998) and to be higher in religiosity (McCullough, Hoyt, Larson, Koenig, & Thoresen, 2000), both of which have been found to predict longevity (Roberts et al., 2005; Tucker, Friedman, Wingard, & Schwartz, 1996). In contrast, people low on **C** are more irresponsible, unreliable, careless, distractible, lackadaisical, and easygoing and less exacting with themselves or others (McCrae & Costa, 2003). Low **C** people are impulsive, and consequently, they are likely to suffer from procrastination (Steel, 2007), poor health (Bogg & Roberts, 2004), drug and alcohol abuse (Walton & Roberts, 2004), or financial debt (Versplanken & Herabadi, 2001).

Virtually no research has explored relationships between **C** or its facets (*Competence, Order, Dutifulness, Achievement Striving, Self-Discipline, Deliberation*) and leisure, and it is only a small stretch to hypothesize that such connections might be found. People who view themselves as *competent* and efficacious might seek leisure experiences that afford opportunities to demonstrate or enhance their skills or to increase their knowledge. The high degree of focus, planning, and caution characteristic of several of the **C** facets (*Competence, Order, Deliberation*) might lead us to speculate that outcomes related to spontaneity and overindulgence would either be negatively related or not be detected. People who strive to *achieve* high standards and to pursue goals in a persistent, determined manner would be expected to be focused more on skill perfection and attainment than on social interactions or affective outcomes. We might also hypothesize that *self-disciplined* individuals and/or those high in *Dutifulness* would avoid consumptive outcomes and seek those that require organization and order. Finally, the conventionality characteristic of high **C** individuals relates to the tendency to uphold traditions and societal norms (Bogg & Roberts, 2004) and should be a strong predictor of avoiding risky leisure experiences.

## **Possible Demographic Influences on the Personality–Leisure Relationship**

### **Gender**

Gender has consistently emerged as an influential moderating variable in much of leisure research and has been the focus of a great deal of theorizing, conceptualizing, and speculation about this impact. From a quantitative approach, a number of studies have found sizeable differences between men and women in what they like to do, why they like to do it, the time they devote to it, and with whom they prefer to engage (for reviews, see Henderson, 1996; Henderson & Hickerson, 2007; Russell, 2009; Shaw, 1999). Furthermore, a number of scholars have argued that leisure is qualitatively different for men and women, and because of the nature of their roles, constraints, societal expectations, and socializing forces, a simple quantitative comparison using a single underlying continuum is insufficient and inaccurate (Helgeson, 1994; Henderson, 1991, 1996, 2009; Shaw, 1994, 1997). Research that has employed a qualitative perspective has indeed supported this assertion, demonstrating substantive qualitative differences between men and women in how they view leisure, as well as their preferences, their types and

modes of participation, and the outcomes they desire and sometimes attain (for reviews, see Henderson, Bialeschki, Shaw, & Freysinger, 1996; Henderson, Hodges, & Kivel, 2002; Shaw, 1999). Hence, gender is an important variable to consider in designing research studies to investigate leisure-related constructs, and it should be particularly influential in examining desired free time outcomes.

In contrast, personality researchers have found that gender plays an insignificant role in determining the factor structure and underlying facet of the organization of personality. A wealth of research using the Big Five personality dimensions and underlying facets has found that gender accounts for a statistically trivial amount of the variance and that where differences are found they are all of the nature of women possessing a little more or less of a facet than men (for reviews, see Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001; Feingold, 1994; Schmitt, Realo, Voracek, & Allik, 2008). In other words, from a methodological design point of view, gender is not a moderating variable and need not be considered as exerting a substantial influence on studies involving personality, whether at the dimension or facet level of analysis (Caspi et al., 2005).

The two literatures on personality and leisure appear to present a dilemma in deciding whether to include gender. It was decided to include gender in research investigating interrelationships between personality and leisure constructs. It was decided to include gender in this study to investigate its unique variance in predicting each of the desired free time outcomes and then partial out its contribution to the personality facets. We acknowledge that a more thorough test of the role of gender would entail its more exact role as an influential variable, but the decision was made to maintain the focus on the analysis of personality-desired leisure outcomes and their interrelationships.

## **Race**

A number of authors have questioned whether personality is the same for African Americans as for Caucasians (Azibo, 1991; Gaines, 1995; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). These authors have suggested that the structure of personality is different for African Americans than for other racial and ethnic groups and have advocated for a theory of "Black Personality" (Mosby, 1972). Empirically addressing this question, researchers have tested the Big Five dimensions with samples of African Americans and Caucasians across a number of age and socio-economic groups and lifestyles, and most found that the five-factor NEO solution fit well for both groups (Chan, 1997; Collins & Greaves, 1998). Although minor differences were detected (e.g., African Americans scored higher than Caucasians on the *Agreeableness* factor [Day & Bedeian, 1995; Houston, 1990]), this research concluded the Big Five model of personality can be used with both racial groups across a number of age ranges, including young adults/college students (Graham, 1994; Mitchelson, Wicher, LeBreton, & Craig, 2009).

Currently, explanations and perspectives on racial differences in the use and meaning of free time and leisure pursuits are clearly still evolving (Arai & Kivel, 2009; Floyd, 2007; McDonald, 2009), with the lack of any one single perspective demonstrating strong explanatory power. The one clear conclusion that can be gleaned from the history of research on racial differences in leisure is that the construct of race remains critical to continue to examine and include in investigations

of leisure-related phenomena, such that empirical findings can contribute to and advance explanation and prediction. For this reason, we initially included race as a predictor in the study; its influence was estimated by its unique predictive variance, and then, like gender, it was partialled out to examine the extent to which personality facets predicted desired leisure outcomes.

### **Focus of This Research**

This study was designed to make a number of contributions to several literatures. Although numerous authors causally position what and why people choose their free time endeavors within internal attributes and personality, there is a lack of systematic and comprehensive investigations to support this contention. The studies that have been empirically conducted have largely not adopted the now widely accepted Big Five framework, and most have not operated at the facet level of investigation. In the present study, personality is represented as the facets underlying the Big Five personality dimensions, following the conclusion by a number of researchers that it is far more parsimonious, predictive, and ecologically valid to investigate their underlying facets in place of the more global Big Five dimensions themselves (Ashton, Jackson, Paunonen, Helmes, & Rothstein, 1995; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Paunonen et al., 2003). In the present study, young adults (university students) provided detailed information about their individual personality facets within the Big Five dimensions as well as what outcomes they desire from their free time experiences. The predictive power of each of the personality facets in accounting for unique variance in desired leisure outcomes was investigated to further attempt to detail the relationship between one's personality and aspects of desired leisure experiences.

In addition, in light of the previous research that has shown that young men and women and those of different races and ethnicities view their leisure differently, the study also sought to explore the extent to which gender and race might account for distinct variances in what individuals seek to derive from their free time experiences. The contributions of gender and race were partialled out, and it was hypothesized that the interrelationships between the specific facets of personality and desired leisure outcomes and meanings would emerge and thereby represent a significant contribution to the leisure and personality literature. In accomplishing these goals, this investigation also aspired to extend the literature on the Big Five to incorporate leisure more systematically and comprehensively, in recognition of the lack of attention devoted to this realm of behavior and experience.

## **Method**

### **Participants and Procedures**

Participants were undergraduate students from two large Midwestern universities. Students in a range of lower and upper division classes were invited to participate in the study, for which extra credit could be earned. The classes were open to the general university, and students could obtain credit for fulfilling a social and behavioral science requirement. Those who wished to volunteer were e-mailed a cover letter and the instruments and were asked to download and complete

the forms and return them to a secure drop box in an office. When completed, forms were submitted and a graduate assistant flipped through the pages to ascertain the instruments were completed and separated the cover page containing the student's name and class. Of the 751 students who were initially contacted, 639 volunteered to be in the study (85.09%). Of those who volunteered, a near perfect response rate was obtained—only one individual did not return the completed instruments. Thus, the final response rate was 84.95%. Initial multilevel variance analyses (classes within universities) indicated no differences on any of the measures in this study (all  $p > .05$ ), and thus these distinctions were removed in all subsequent analyses.

In the final sample of student participants, 44.60% ( $n = 285$ ) were male and 55.40% ( $n = 354$ ) were female. Sixty-two percent ( $n = 397$ ) of the sample self-identified themselves as Caucasian American (192 male, 205 female), 20.97% ( $n = 134$ ) reported being African American (69 male, 65 female), 11.58% ( $n = 74$ ) said Asian American (35 male, 39 female), and 5.32% ( $n = 34$ ) labeled themselves non-White Hispanic American (23 male, 11 female). One third of the sample (36.93%) were seniors ( $n = 236$ ), 40.85% juniors ( $n = 261$ ), 20.19% sophomores ( $n = 129$ ), and 2.03% were in their first year ( $n = 13$ ); all of the final sample members were single. The mean age of the sample was 21.43 years ( $SD = 1.93$ ), with an age range of 18 to 24 years. Four percent ( $n = 26$ ) of the sample was employed full time, while they were also full-time students; 40.06% ( $n = 256$ ) were employed part time; and 55.87% ( $n = 357$ ) were not currently employed. Of those that were employed, the range in the number of hours worked in a typical week was from 4 to 36 hr.

## Instruments

**Personality.** The Big Five personality dimensions and facets were assessed through the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1985, 1992). The instrument is a 240-item questionnaire consisting of 30 eight-item facet scales. Respondents rate items on a 5-point scale (*strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree*). The reliability and validity of the NEO-PI-R has been widely demonstrated across numerous ages, cultures, and settings (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Costa et al., 2001; Schmitt et al., 2008). The facets are typically summed to yield the higher order personality dimension; however, a number of authors have recently shown that arithmetically combining the narrow trait or facet measures to derive the broad dimension measure is less accurate in predicting and understanding the behavior under study (Ashton et al., 1995; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Paunonen et al., 2003). For this reason, and to build on previous research linking leisure with the Big Five personality dimensions (Barnett, 2006), the recommended facet-level approach was adopted.

Before conducting statistical analyses to explore relationships between personality and free time, it was deemed important to first demonstrate that the personality measure possessed psychometric properties with this sample that were consistent with the literature. To this end, two analyses were conducted, in line with procedures that have been employed in a wealth of other studies using the NEO-PI-R (cf. Costa & McCrae, 1992). Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha within each of the 30 facets and then across facets within each of the five dimensions was calculated. These internal consistency coefficients ranged from .77 to .86, were

all highly significant at the dimension and at the facet level, and were consistent with those found in previous studies with this population (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

To further replicate the characteristics of this sample with those found previously with the same population, independent *t* tests were computed on the sample means to examine gender differences. Past research has generally detected minimal gender differences in mean personality dimensions (cf. Schmitt et al., 2008), but differences in facets were detected in the present data. The divergences have been largely in the direction of female college students having higher mean scores than males, although on a few facets the reverse has been noted (e.g., *Excitement-Seeking* and *Openness to Ideas*; Costa et al., 2001). For other facets, males and females were found to be equivalent (e.g., *Activity*, *Compliance*, *Order*, *Achievement Striving*, *Deliberation*). The findings obtained in this study were consistent with those that have been reported in previous research studies with members of this population (Costa et al., 2001; Schmitt et al., 2008) and thus provided a form of validation for the use of the NEO-PI-R in this study.

**Desired free time outcomes.** An initial assessment of the outcomes individuals desire from their free time experiences, termed the *Recreation Experience Preference scales* (REP; Driver, 1977, 1983), found 19 domains, based on a lengthy list derived from studies that questioned outdoor enthusiasts engaged in specific activities, at specific settings, and/or at specific points in time. Manfredro, Driver, and Tarrant (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of these studies, and one of their conclusions was that “one prominent validity issue that merits further examination is whether or not the REP scales are content valid for applications other than outdoor recreation” (p. 209). Because of the lack of construct validity and the age (adults) and specificity (outdoor enthusiasts) of the samples that make up the research upon which the REP was based, an alternative scale that assessed desired leisure outcomes for college students was used (Barnett, 2011). Its items are based more generally on statements of possible outcomes and are not tied to specific activities, venues, or times. In addition, the activity list spans a wider range by extending beyond outdoor-related experiences. Finally, they are high in content validity because the items were derived from focus groups drawn from members of the population under study and thus represent the more current recreational interests of young adults rather than those who are older and whose interests represent activities more popular in the 1970s and 1980s (that were used in the development and refinement of the REP scales).

An instrument was developed (“Your Free Time”), and its psychometric characteristics investigated, that assessed what outcomes were deemed important to college students in their free time (Barnett, 2011). The development of the instrument began with focus groups of university students who were asked to talk about what was important to them to experience in their leisure or free time and culminated in a final list of 32 items following a series of pilot tests (see Barnett, 2011, for a more complete description of the development of the instrument). A 5-point Likert-type scale (*extremely important*, *very important*, *somewhat important*, *not very important*, *not at all important*) was used for each item in response to the header “In Your Free Time How Important Is (item)?” Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) indicated that five items be removed: four that related to the individual’s home that

focus group members suggested were confusing to college students because it was not clear whether the referent to home was their local or permanent home and one that was virtually the exact opposite of another item (“be with my family” and “get away from my family”) and the negative version was removed. The final 27 items (retained from previous research; Barnett, 2011) identified the existence of six underlying factors, accounting for 62.4% total explained variance. The factors were *New Experiences, Challenges and Skills, Intrinsic Rewards, Social Interaction, Feel Good, and Active Engagement*. Table 2 presents the factor analysis showing the items that make up each factor, as well as the unique variance and internal consistency coefficient (coefficient alpha) for each factor. In addition, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was employed for the items that make up each of the factors and ranged from .87 to .61 (only one item, *build things*, fell below the recommended alpha; Carmine & Zeller, 1979). As items within each factor were further inspected, it was determined that the alpha coefficient did not increase with the deletion of any one item. Hence, the same factors were retained and subjected to further analyses to address the research questions of the study. Table 2 presents each of the items that make up each factor, as well as their factor loadings, and the eigenvalues, unique variance, and internal consistency coefficients for each of the resulting factors.

To ensure that all but the home-related factor obtained in the original study were confirmed with this sample, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was employed on the 28 Your Free Time items as a means of validating the findings from the EFA (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). One half of the sample was randomly drawn to undergo this cross-validation. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used as the specific confirmatory procedure. Kline (2005) recommended that four types of fit indices all needed to yield acceptable findings to confirm the fit of the model, and these were computed to test the goodness-of-fit for the six factors that were obtained from the EFA. The results of the SEM produced all four indices and demonstrated their convergence in accepting the six-factor solution as stated above: (a)  $\chi^2 = .0171$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p > .05$  (Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988); (b) root mean square error of approximation = .0466, 90% confidence intervals = -.0233 to .1481 (RMSEA; Steiger & Lind, 1990); (c) Comparative Fit Index = .9858 (CFI; Bentler, 1990); and (d) standardized root mean square residual = .0410 (SRMR; Bentler, 1995). From this psychometric testing, coupled with the findings from previous research, the Your Free Time instrument was deemed appropriately sound for use in this study.

**Table 2**

*Factor Loadings\*, Eigenvalues, Explained Variance, and Internal Consistency Reliability for Desired Leisure Outcomes, and Means and Standard Deviations by Factor*

	NE**	CS**	IR**	SI**	FG**	AE**
try new things	<b>86</b>	17	08	24	19	20
meet new people	<b>80</b>	16	21	35	-14	17
do new things	<b>75</b>	21	-06	25	07	14
go new places	<b>75</b>	17	08	24	19	20
create things	<b>72</b>	39	09	11	04	-19
take risks	<b>72</b>	12	29	-14	06	26
build things	<b>61</b>	32	04	14	-13	-06
be physically challenged	01	<b>79</b>	25	22	-14	32
be mentally challenged	18	<b>78</b>	01	-11	22	05
practice my skills	10	<b>73</b>	12	14	07	24
develop new skills	28	<b>72</b>	03	18	09	15
feel a sense of accomplishment	27	<b>71</b>	-16	33	28	-03
do things I enjoy	-04	10	<b>77</b>	-00	24	-18
have fun	07	-03	<b>83</b>	23	14	20
be able to laugh	19	03	<b>79</b>	39	20	-12
play my favorite games	29	17	<b>76</b>	-06	-15	26
express how I feel	11	22	<b>72</b>	24	22	19
be with my friends	12	-05	32	<b>82</b>	-05	27
be with my family	10	07	17	<b>74</b>	-00	17
help others	24	22	02	<b>74</b>	33	06
do things to feel good about myself	14	15	19	15	<b>75</b>	-02
relieve stress	-01	-03	10	-01	<b>74</b>	-18
be alone	23	11	-27	-06	<b>72</b>	06
feel good	-06	25	25	27	<b>71</b>	04
do something active	19	30	11	21	-03	<b>87</b>
get rid of extra energy	23	02	-05	08	28	<b>75</b>
find new energy within myself	20	21	17	-04	28	<b>74</b>
Eigenvalue	7.66	2.50	1.71	1.35	1.29	1.18
% of common variance	30.70	10.00	6.80	5.40	5.20	4.30
Cumulative % explained variance		40.60	47.50	52.90	58.10	62.40
Internal Consistency Reliability	.8681	.7700	.7021	.6484	.6555	.6394
Mean	4.13	3.80	3.49	3.43	3.41	3.86
Standard Deviation	.59	.74	.67	.70	.80	.55

\* Numbers in bold indicate item membership for the indicated factor; decimals omitted

\*\* Factor labels: New Experiences (NE), Challenges and Skills (CS), Internal Rewards (IR), Social Interaction (SI), Feel Good (FG), Active Engagement (AE); omitted items: "be in my house," "be around my house," "be away from my house," "get away from my family"



## Data Analysis

Hierarchical regression analyses were employed to determine the relative contribution of each of the six facets within each of the five personality dimensions, as well as gender and race, in predicting desired free time outcomes. The first block input into each regression analysis was race in order to partial out its unique variance and estimate its contribution in accounting for differences in desired free time outcomes. The relatively small sample size for all but the Caucasian males and females did not allow for a more detailed assessment of the predictors as a function of the range of race, so all non-White students were labeled *minority* members (coded 1 and contrasted with Caucasians coded 0). The second block was gender, with males as the comparison group (i.e., females were coded 1 and males 0). The facets that made up each dimension were then input as separate blocks, in the order determined by their likely causal or direct relationship (based on previous literature) with the free time outcome factors (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003): **E, O, C, A, N**. To control for family-wise type I errors given the large number of statistical tests being conducted, the significance level for discussion and interpretation was set at an alpha level of .01 throughout rather than adopting adjustments using the Bonferroni or Holm method, which have been criticized as being too severe (Aickin, 1999; Perneger, 1998).

## Results

Descriptive information (means and standard deviations) for each of the Desired Free Time Outcome factors is presented at the bottom of Table 2 and reveals that the highest desired outcome was New Experiences ( $M = 4.13$ ), and the lowest was Feel Good ( $M = 3.41$ ). The rank ordering of the desired outcomes was the same for men and women and for Caucasian and minority students (New Experiences, Active Engagement, Challenges and Skills, Internal Rewards, Social Interaction, Feel Good). In addition, the relatively low standard deviations across these outcome factors demonstrated consistency in the ratings assigned by group members.

Tables 3 through 8 present the results of the hierarchical regression analysis for each of the desired free time outcome factors. The narrative reports of the findings in this section represent unique contributions ( $R^2$ ) to explained variance as percentages to facilitate ease of reading and interpretation. In general, the combination of predictors of personality facets, gender, and race yielded a range in total explained variance from a low of 27.58% (Feel Good) to a high of 41.66% (Intrinsic Reward). The personality facets, collectively, were most strongly predictive of the desired free time factors, ranging from a total explained variance of 41.01% (Social Interaction) to 23.85% (Active Engagement). The Extraversion personality dimension was a highly significant predictor across five of the six desired free time outcome factors (all  $p < .000$ ) and collectively accounted for the highest amount of unique explained variance (72.26%). Openness to Experience also resulted in strong predictive power across all six factors (all  $p < .000$ ), explaining a total of 58.52% of the variance alone. Gender was found to solely account for a wide range in variance among the factors, ranging from a low of .12% for Social Interaction to a high of 6.02% for Active Engagement. Race was less predictive of desired free time outcomes than personality or gender, ranging in unique explained variance

from .04% for Challenges and Skills to 2.26% for Active Engagement. Although gender explained more of the variance than race in five of the six factors—the exception being Social Interaction—for all factors the personality facets explained the vast majority of the variance.

### **Desiring New Experiences in Free Time**

The quest for New Experiences in free time (Table 3) was almost wholly explained by personality (32.79% of the total variance of 34.27%), with gender contributing only an additional 1.38% of the variance and race showing virtually no predictive power at all (.10%). Of the six personality dimensions, three were highly statistically significant, with Openness to Experience accounting for more than twice as much of the variance (15.88%,  $p < .000$ ) as Extraversion (7.42%,  $p < .000$ ) and Conscientiousness (6.28%,  $p < .000$ ). Three of the six Openness to Experience facets accounted for the highly significant finding (all  $p < .000$ ): Individuals who were appreciative of aesthetic beauty and the arts (*Aesthetics*), were open to trying new things and going new places (*Actions*), and were fairly conservative (*Values*) were those who desired to encounter New Experiences in their free time. For the other two personality dimensions, a single facet each accounted for their high level of significance. Individuals who desired New Experiences in their free time were also characterized as joyous—finding pleasure in situations and in other people—and were fairly impulsive and disliked following set rules, reflecting the *Positive Emotions* facet in Extraversion (positive;  $p < .001$ ) and the *Competence* facet (negative;  $p < .001$ ) in Conscientiousness.

### **Desiring Challenges and Development of Skills in Free Time**

The search for Challenges and an interest in Developing Skills was significantly more preferred by males than females as a free time pursuit (Table 4), with gender surprisingly contributing only a small but significant amount (2.40%) to the total variance (39.75%) for this factor. Personality was again found to be highly predictive (collectively explaining 37.31% of the total variance), with the same three dimensions as in the previous factor responsible for this finding. However, although the dimensions were the same, only some of the facets within those dimensions predicted this free time pursuit. Within the significant Extraversion dimension (*Positive Emotions*;  $p < .000$ ), individuals high on this factor were joyful and sought pleasure ( $p < .001$ ) and were also energetic and liked to be active in their free time (*Activity*;  $p < .014$ ). Three of the facets for the highly significant Openness to Experience dimension ( $p < .000$ ) indicated that those who sought Challenges and Skills enhancement were creative (*Aesthetics*;  $p < .003$ ), conservative (*Values*;  $p < .000$ ), and also were not particularly attuned to the depth of their own emotions (*Feelings*;  $p < .000$ ). The two significant facets on the Conscientiousness dimension ( $p < .000$ ) also indicated that these individuals were impulsive (*Competence*;  $p < .003$ ) and, not surprisingly, strived to accomplish tasks in a perfectionistic way (*Achievement Striving*;  $p < .000$ ). Males were consistent in their desire to Develop Skills and to be challenged in their free time, with race contributing virtually no unique variance (.04%) to this leisure outcome.

**Table 3**

*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses on Desired Free Time Outcome Factor: New Experiences*

<b>Regression Block</b>	<b><math>\Delta R^2</math> (%)</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
1. Gender	1.379 (p < .056)	-.172	.090	-.117	.056
2. Race	.095 (p < .615)	.024	.048	-.031	.615
3. Extraversion	7.421 (p < .003)**				
E1. Warmth		.005	.014	.026	.745
E2. Gregariousness		-.006	.012	-.039	.636
E3. Assertiveness		-.011	.010	-.077	.276
E4. Activity		.013	.014	.064	.370
E5. Excitement-Seeking		.004	.011	.029	.702
E6. Positive Emotion		.041	.013	.256	.001**
4. Openness to Experience	15.880 (p < .000)**				
O1. Fantasy		.018	.010	.129	.062
O2. Aesthetics		.030	.009	.243	.001**
O3. Feelings		.002	.011	.013	.841
O4. Actions		.051	.012	.282	.000**
O5. Ideas		-.009	.009	-.066	.332
O6. Values		-.055	.012	-.302	.000**
5. Conscientiousness	6.281 (p < .002)**				
C1. Competence		-.058	.016	-.289	.000**
C2. Order		-.012	.011	-.072	.278
C3. Dutifulness		.019	.012	.114	.132
C4. Achievement Striving		.022	.014	.139	.125
C5. Self-Discipline		-.011	.013	-.072	.379
C6. Deliberation		-.017	.012	-.107	.156
6. Agreeableness	2.080 (p < .287)				
A1. Trust		-.011	.013	-.061	.391
A2. Straightforwardness		-.004	.012	-.028	.726
A3. Altruism		.035	.016	.192	.033
A4. Compliance		-.008	.012	-.044	.529
A5. Modesty		-.021	.013	-.114	.105
A6. Tendermindedness		.004	.014	.019	.800

**Table 3 (cont.)**

<b>Regression Block</b>	<b><math>\Delta R^2</math> (%)</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
7. Neuroticism	1.134 (p < .674)				
N1. Anxiety		-.011	.013	-.079	.395
N2. Hostility		-.000	.013	-.000	.999
N3. Depression		-.008	.014	-.055	.551
N4. Self-Consciousness		.015	.014	.099	.276
N5. Impulsivity		.017	.014	.097	.227
N6. Vulnerability		-.000	.016	-.003	.971

**Total Explained Variance: 34.270%**

\* p < .01      \*\* p < .001

**Table 4**

*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses on Desired Free Time Outcome Factor 2: Challenges and Skills*

<b>Regression Block</b>	<b><math>\Delta R^2</math> (%)</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
1. Gender	2.402 (p < .012)*	-.211	.083	-.155	.012*
2. Race	.038 (p < .750)	-.014	.045	-.020	.750
3. Extraversion	12.078 (p < .000)**				
E1. Warmth		.000	.013	.002	.984
E2. Gregariousness		-.007	.011	-.049	.550
E3. Assertiveness		.010	.009	.075	.276
E4. Activity		.032	.013	.171	.014*
E5. Excitement-seeking		-.006	.010	-.040	.579
E6. Positive Emotion		.039	.011	.259	.001**
4. Openness to Experience	13.907 (p < .000)**				
O1. Fantasy		.006	.009	.047	.488
O2. Aesthetics		.024	.008	.211	.003**
O3. Feelings		-.045	.010	-.281	.000**
O4. Actions		.022	.011	.131	.046
O5. Ideas		.002	.008	.019	.778
O6. Values		-.041	.011	-.242	.000**

**Table 4 (cont.)**

<b>Regression Block</b>	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
5. Conscientiousness	9.145 ( $p < .000$ )**				
C1. Competence		-.042	.014	-.228	.003**
C2. Order		-.021	.010	-.134	.036
C3. Dutifulness		.019	.011	.126	.081
C4. Achievement Striving		.047	.013	.322	.000**
C5. Self-Discipline		.013	.011	.092	.241
C6. Deliberation		.011	.011	.077	.287
6. Agreeableness	1.690 ( $p < .364$ )				
A1. Trust		-.003	.011	-.018	.793
A2. Straightforwardness		-.007	.011	-.047	.536
A3. Altruism		.019	.015	.112	.192
A4. Compliance		-.002	.011	-.010	.880
A5. Modesty		-.024	.011	-.143	.034
A6. Tendermindedness		.011	.013	.059	.409
7. Neuroticism	.485 ( $p < .932$ )				
N1. Anxiety		-.003	.012	-.019	.833
N2. Hostility		-.011	.012	-.077	.360
N3. Depression		.005	.012	.039	.660
N4. Self-consciousness		.010	.013	.071	.420
N5. Impulsivity		-.005	.012	-.032	.679
N6. Vulnerability		.001	.014	.007	.931
<b>Total Explained Variance: 39.745%</b>					

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

### **Desiring Intrinsic Rewards in Free Time**

Both gender and race significantly distinguished those who sought Intrinsic Rewards in their free time (Table 5). Gender accounted for more than twice as much (4.43%) of the total explained variance (41.66%) than did race (1.86%), although both were significant predictors on this factor. The signs of the beta weights indicated that males were higher than females and White students were higher than minority members in the importance they attributed to seeking enjoyment in their free time activity choices. Within the significant Extraversion dimension ( $p < .000$ ), it was not surprising to find that *Positive Emotions* was again a significant facet in predicting the desire for Intrinsic Rewards ( $p < .003$ ), as was the *Excitement-Seeking* facet ( $p < .001$ ). The pursuit of Intrinsic Rewards was also significantly ( $p < .000$ ) predicted for those who were highly imaginative and had an active *Fantasy* life—a single facet of Openness to Experience. This factor was the only one significantly predicted by facets within the Neuroticism dimension ( $p < .000$ ), where both low levels of *Depression* ( $p < .000$ ) and high levels of *Impulsiveness* ( $p < .003$ ) were found to be highly predictive.

**Table 5**

*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses on Desired Free Time Outcome Factor 3: Intrinsic Reward*

<b>Regression Block</b>	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
1. Gender	4.429 (p < .001)**	-.262	.075	-.210	.001**
2. Race	1.856 (p < .023)	.091	.040	.137	.023
3. Extraversion	17.755 (p < .000)**				
E1. Warmth		.003	.011	.017	.815
E2. Gregariousness		.014	.009	.115	.132
E3. Assertiveness		-.020	.008	-.166	.010*
E4. Activity		-.009	.011	-.051	.435
E5. Excitement-seeking		.029	.009	.224	.001**
E6. Positive Emotion		.030	.010	.218	.003**
4. Openness to Experience	6.392 (p < .001)**				
O1. Fantasy		.029	.008	.245	.000**
O2. Aesthetics		-.016	.007	-.153	.024
O3. Feelings		-.008	.009	-.052	.422
O4. Actions		-.017	.010	-.111	.080
O5. Ideas		.000	.008	.002	.978
O6. Values		-.020	.010	-.127	.054
5. Conscientiousness	1.720 (p < .400)				
C1. Competence		-.002	.013	-.009	.906
C2. Order		.001	.009	.010	.882
C3. Dutifulness		.010	.010	.074	.324
C4. Achievement Striving		-.009	.012	-.066	.461
C5. Self-Discipline		-.017	.011	-.126	.120
C6. Deliberation		-.005	.010	-.040	.591
6. Agreeableness	2.950 (p < .096)				
A1. Trust		-.003	.011	-.017	.811
A2. Straightforwardness		.010	.010	.077	.320
A3. Altruism		.009	.014	.057	.514
A4. Compliance		-.027	.010	-.184	.008*
A5. Modesty		-.016	.011	-.104	.134
A6. Tendermindedness		-.002	.012	-.010	.895

**Table 5 (cont.)**

Regression Block	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	B	SE B	b	p
7. Neuroticism	6.556 ( $p < .000$ )**				
N1. Anxiety		.011	.011	.093	.287
N2. Hostility		.011	.011	.088	.284
N3. Depression		-.045	.011	-.357	.000**
N4. Self-consciousness		.001	.011	.008	.925
N5. Impulsivity		.032	.011	.224	.003**
N6. Vulnerability		.024	.013	.154	.060
<b>Total Explained Variance: 41.658%</b>					

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

### Desiring Social Interaction in Free Time

Males and females and those of minority or Caucasian backgrounds were comparable in their desire for Social Interactions in their free time. Gender uniquely contributed only .12% and race only .29%, to the regression equation, and both negligible contributions were not significant (Table 6). Again, the bulk of the variance was explained by personality, which was the strongest predictor (41.01% unique variance) of the desire for Social Interaction compared to the other free time factors. Not surprisingly, facets within the Extraversion dimension were most predictive of the quest for Social engagements, with the facets within this dimension accounting for more than 3 times (25.60%;  $p < .000$ ) as much variance as any other personality dimension. Again, *Positive Emotions* was significantly predictive of this factor ( $p < .000$ ), as was *Assertiveness* ( $p < .010$ ), with those scoring high on this latter facet being individuals who naturally “take charge” of social situations and express what is commonly regarded as a tendency toward being a “natural leader.” A negative beta weight for *Values*, a facet of Openness to Experience, again indicated a significant ( $p < .000$ ) inclination for more conservative individuals to seek Social Interaction in their free time. In addition, individuals scoring low in *Modesty*, a facet within the Agreeableness dimension, were significantly ( $p < .002$ ) more prone to seek Social Interactions in their free time.

### Desiring to Feel Good in Free Time

It was interesting to find that this factor was the only one that was wholly explained by facets within only one dimension of personality: Agreeableness (Table 7). This desired free time outcome factor showed the lowest total explained variance (27.58%), which was virtually completely predicted by facets in this one personality dimension (11.84% unique variance). Both gender and race accounted for negligible amounts of the variance (.82% and .09%, respectively) in this Feel Good factor. The three facets of *Trust* (negative;  $p < .012$ ), *Altruism* (positive;  $p < .000$ ), and *Modesty* (negative;  $p < .000$ ) were significant, indicating that individuals who are suspicious of others, are unselfish, and tend to be pretentious are the most likely to seek to Feel Good in their free time.

**Table 6**

*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses on Desired Free Time Outcome Factor 4: Social Interaction*

<b>Regression Block</b>	<b><math>\Delta R^2</math> (%)</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
1. Gender	.120 (p < .573)	.054	.096	.035	.573
2. Race	.287 (p < .383)	-.045	.052	-.054	.383
3. Extraversion	25.603 (p < .000)**				
E1. Warmth		.023	.013	.126	.085
E2. Gregariousness		.026	.012	.170	.025
E3. Assertiveness		.026	.010	.166	.010*
E4. Activity		.006	.014	.029	.654
E5. Excitement-seeking		-.016	.011	-.099	.144
E6. Positive Emotion		.043	.012	.251	.000**
4. Openness to Experience	7.873 (p < .000)**				
O1. Fantasy		-.002	.009	-.015	.817
O2. Aesthetics		.012	.009	.095	.149
O3. Feelings		-.014	.011	-.076	.222
O4. Actions		-.012	.012	-.065	.294
O5. Ideas		-.000	.009	-.003	.965
O6. Values		-.051	.012	-.265	.000**
5. Conscientiousness	2.229 (p < .201)				
C1. Competence		-.011	.016	-.053	.487
C2. Order		.013	.012	.074	.249
C3. Dutifulness		.004	.013	-.024	.747
C4. Achievement Striving		-.005	.015	-.031	.721
C5. Self-Discipline		-.023	.013	-.141	.074
C6. Deliberation		.016	.012	.092	.204
6. Agreeableness	4.410 (p < .008)*				
A1. Trust		-.014	.013	-.075	.268
A2. Straightforwardness		.007	.013	.043	.564
A3. Altruism		.022	.016	.111	.185
A4. Compliance		-.020	.012	-.110	.091
A5. Modesty		.041	.013	-.212	.002**
A6. Tendermindedness		.019	.014	.094	.179



**Table 6 (cont.)**

<b>Regression Block</b>	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<i>p</i>
7. Neuroticism	.893 ( $p < .733$ )				
N1. Anxiety		.015	.013	.094	.278
N2. Hostility		.012	.013	.072	.382
N3. Depression		-.012	.014	-.073	.397
N4. Self-consciousness		.011	.014	.067	.430
N5. Impulsivity		-.002	.014	-.009	.907
N6. Vulnerability		-.003	.016	-.015	.858

**Total Explained Variance: 41.415%**

\*  $p < .01$       \*\*  $p < .001$

**Table 7**

*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses on Desired Free Time Outcome  
Factor 5: Feel Good*

<b>Regression Block</b>	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<i>p</i>
1. Gender	.824 ( $p < .140$ )	.098	.066	.091	.140
2. Race	.087 ( $p < .631$ )	-.017	.035	-.030	.631
3. Extraversion	2.109 ( $p < .473$ )				
E1. Warmth		.000	.010	.003	.969
E2. Gregariousness		.003	.009	.025	.767
E3. Assertiveness		.005	.008	.047	.517
E4. Activity		.012	.011	.080	.280
E5. Excitement-seeking		-.014	.009	-.123	.111
E6. Positive Emotion		.008	.010	.064	.429
4. Openness to Experience	7.209 ( $p < .003$ )**				
O1. Fantasy		.004	.008	.042	.575
O2. Aesthetics		.003	.007	.037	.634
O3. Feelings		.022	.009	.174	.018
O4. Actions		-.005	.010	-.039	.586
O5. Ideas		-.017	.007	-.175	.019
O6. Values		-.020	.010	-.154	.041

**Table 7 (cont.)**

<b>Regression Block</b>	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<i>p</i>
5. Conscientiousness	3.726 ( $p < .106$ )				
C1. Competence		.016	.013	.106	.235
C2. Order		-.012	.009	-.098	.185
C3. Dutifulness		.022	.010	.181	.033
C4. Achievement Striving		.008	.012	.069	.495
C5. Self-Discipline		-.015	.010	-.133	.145
C6. Deliberation		-.008	.010	-.067	.427
6. Agreeableness	11.838 ( $p < .000$ )**				
A1. Trust		-.025	.010	-.191	.012*
A2. Straightforwardness		-.017	.010	-.144	.085
A3. Altruism		.047	.013	.351	.000**
A4. Compliance		.000	.009	.007	.924
A5. Modesty		-.042	.010	-.312	.000**
A6. Tendermindedness		-.011	.011	-.080	.308
7. Neuroticism	1.788 ( $p < .454$ )				
N1. Anxiety		-.005	.010	-.049	.616
N2. Hostility		-.002	.010	-.016	.858
N3. Depression		-.005	.011	-.049	.613
N4. Self-consciousness		.020	.011	.173	.071
N5. Impulsivity		.007	.011	.053	.528
N6. Vulnerability		.010	.012	.074	.421
<b>Total Explained Variance: 27.581%</b>					

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

### **Desiring Active Engagement in Free Time**

Gender and race were significant predictors of students who sought to be Active in their free time (Table 8), with males and Caucasian students being significantly higher ( $p < .000$  and  $p < .011$ , respectively). Of all six desired free time outcome factors, this one showed the highest gender effect and was second highest for race. Personality thus played a lesser role but still uniquely contributed a significant amount (23.85%) to the total variance (32.13%), with three of the five personality dimensions yielding high levels of statistical significance (Extraversion:  $p < .001$ ; Openness to Experience:  $p < .001$ ; Conscientiousness:  $p < .010$ ). The negative *Values* facet (indicating conservative values) was a significant predictor ( $p < .000$ ), as were two of the Conscientiousness facets. A significant negative finding for the *Competence* facet ( $p < .004$ ) and a significant positive result for the *Achievement Striving* facet ( $p < .007$ ) indicated that those who were impulsive and who sought to achieve in their free time were individuals who most preferred to be physically Active.

**Table 8**

*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses on Desired Free Time Outcome  
Factor 6: Active Engagement*

<b>Regression Block</b>	<b><math>\Delta R^2</math> (%)</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>p</b>
1. Gender	6.020 (p < .000)**	-.440	.107	-.245	.000**
2. Race	2.255 (p < .011)*	-.147	.057	-.151	.011*
3. Extraversion	7.290 (p < .001)**				
E1. Warmth		.000	.016	.000	.991
E2. Gregariousness		.021	.014	.118	.141
E3. Assertiveness		.016	.012	.093	.175
E4. Activity		.029	.017	.122	.080
E5. Excitement-seeking		-.002	.013	-.009	.901
E6. Positive Emotion		.006	.014	.030	.686
4. Openness to Experience	7.257 (p < .001)**				
O1. Fantasy		-.004	.012	-.022	.755
O2. Aesthetics		.003	.011	.021	.763
O3. Feelings		-.026	.014	-.013	.065
O4. Actions		.008	.015	.035	.604
O5. Ideas		.006	.011	.035	.609
O6. Values		-.057	.015	-.259	.000**
5. Conscientiousness	4.534 (p < .010)*				
C1. Competence		-.058	.020	-.237	.004**
C2. Order		-.000	.014	-.000	.999
C3. Dutifulness		.019	.016	.097	.214
C4. Achievement Striving		.049	.018	.254	.007*
C5. Self-Discipline		-.006	.016	-.032	.704
C6. Deliberation		-.001	.015	-.007	.929
6. Agreeableness	.631 (p < .908)				
A1. Trust		-.013	.016	-.058	.432
A2. Straightforwardness		.005	.016	.025	.762
A3. Altruism		.005	.021	.024	.794
A4. Compliance		.013	.015	.061	.391
A5. Modesty		-.006	.016	-.028	.697
A6. Tendermindedness		.008	.018	.033	.669

**Table 8 (cont.)**

Regression Block	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	B	SE B	b	p
7. Neuroticism	4.142 (p < .029)				
N1. Anxiety		.013	.016	.071	.447
N2. Hostility		-.020	.017	-.109	.217
N3. Depression		-.002	.017	-.011	.902
N4. Self-consciousness		-.025	.017	-.135	.141
N5. Impulsivity		-.018	.017	-.087	.288
N6. Vulnerability		-.029	.020	-.130	.141
<b>Total Explained Variance: 32.129%</b>					

\* p &lt; .01

\*\* p &lt; .001

## Discussion and Conclusions

This study made several significant contributions to our knowledge about leisure and personality. The findings provided strong support for the conjecture that what we choose to experience in our free time is at least partially rooted in our personality. The facets within personality dimensions were found to explain the vast majority of the variance in sample members' desired leisure time outcomes. Less than one half of the total variance in desired free time outcome factors was explained by the predictors included in the study. This is consistent with the literature—predominantly from psychology—that supports close to equal roles played by personality, internal mechanisms, and characteristics of the environment, in determining our daily interactions across a wide range of situations (Plomin, 2004; Plomin, DeFries, & Fulker, 2007). Hence, these findings are consistent with this research in attributing desired free time outcomes to 40–50% of our personality (Tellegen et al., 1988). We thus conclude that what people seek to derive from their free time experiences is at least partly an extension of who they are and that personality-based individual differences account for variation between individuals in what they seek in their free time.

The results replicate previous work (Barnett, 2006; Brandstatter, 1994; Costa & McCrae, 1988; Hills & Argyle, 1998), noting the presence of the Extraversion personality dimension as a strong predictor of leisure activities, and also extend research by these authors. The facet-level analysis revealed that the traits within the Extraversion personality dimension are neither consistently nor equally related. Through this more detailed analysis, we found that the *Positive Emotions* that individuals largely seek in their free time underlie what they choose to do; this facet was a significant predictor of four of the six desired outcomes. This finding is in line with previous work that has found the Extraversion dimension to consist of frequent positive moods (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Fleeson et al., 2002; Lucas & Fujita, 2000), sensitivity to potential rewards (Lucas et al., 2000), and gratification

derived from social situations (Ashton et al., 2002; Pavot et al., 1990; Watson et al., 1992). Through this more specific examination within the Extraversion dimension, we also found that, in addition to *Positive Emotions*, some individuals seek to be active and others seek excitement (Brandstatter, 1994) or opportunities to express their own desires while in social settings (Lucas & Fujita, 1992). Other researchers have also noted the *Activity* facet of Extraversion, but these studies have been in reference to exercise rather than enjoyable leisure activities (Caspi et al., 2005; Steel et al., 2008). Notably, none of the Extraversion facets significantly predicted two of the six desired free time outcomes: Active Engagement and Feel Good. The findings demonstrate that people seek to be active in their free time either because they are impulsive and easily distractible or because they are trying to achieve a certain accomplishment, such as a better time or pace. The lack of Extraversion facet predictors in accounting for the Feel Good desired outcome is an interesting finding, as it appears that at least the *Positive Emotions* facet would yield a significant result. Upon closer inspection of the items that make up this factor, it appears that individuals who seek a sense of Feeling Good as an outcome in their free time are wrestling with internal issues about themselves or are attempting to de-stress from troubling circumstances. It is noteworthy that one of the items that loaded highly on this factor is *being alone*, which tentatively supports this interpretation, especially because sociability is one of the prevailing characteristics of the Extraversion dimension (Watson et al., 1992).

Consistency across the facets of two other dimensions was also obtained, thereby extending the literature (Driver & Knopf, 1977; Iso-Ahola, 1999; Knopf, 1983; Murray, 1938) and providing a deeper level of insight into those who desire certain outcomes over others from their free time pursuits. The *Values* (negative, indicating conservatism) facet within the Openness to Experience personality dimension was predictive of four of the free time outcome factors (New Experiences, Challenges and Skills, Social Interaction, Active Engagement), and other facets within this same dimension differentially predicted individual outcome factors. The preponderance of the negative *Values* facet across the four desired free time outcomes suggests that individuals who have a preference for the familiar, practical, and concrete seek free time activities that are social, active, novel, and challenging. The desire for familiar social relationships and typically enjoyed activities fits well within the negative *Values* person, but the search for novel and challenging activities appears to be discrepant. Any explanation for this latter finding would be highly speculative, and further replication is clearly mandated to further explicate the findings from this study. A qualitative approach might provide insight into the reason(s) behind this apparent inconsistency.

The finding in this study that other facets of the Openness to Experience dimension related in different ways to three of the six free time outcome factors suggests that this is a personality dimension that is highly predictive in several ways of how people want to spend their free time (McCrae & Costa, 1987, 1999). The facets descriptive of creative people (*Aesthetics*) and those who enjoy novelty and variety (*Actions*) not surprisingly predicted their search for New Experiences in their free time. These same creative individuals, and also those who, in contrast, valued *Feelings* more than *Actions*, were the most likely to seek Challenges and

opportunities to Develop and push their Skills. People who are more imaginative (*Fantasy*) were the only individuals who sought Intrinsic Rewards, striving to experience novelty, stimulation, and learning from whatever activities they chose. These findings all provide an extension to the literature regarding correlates of the Openness to Experience dimension and facets to leisure (cf. McCrae, 1996; Sidanius, 1985; Tetlock, 1983).

The second dimension in which consistency across facets was noted was Conscientiousness, where individuals low on the *Competence* facet pursued Active free time pursuits that were Challenging and pushed their Skill Level, and offered New Experiences to them. This finding is consistent with the definition of the facet in that people low on the *Competence* facet are typically less disciplined and more willing to be impulsive and seek immediate gratification (Dunn, Causgrove Dunn, & Asyrotuik, 2002; McCrae & Costa, 2003). In addition, those who looked for activities that provided *Achievement*-related feedback assigned high importance scores to the items within the Challenges and Skills and Active Engagement factors.

The Agreeableness personality dimension also yielded facets that were predictive of free time pursuits, and these were in the desire for Social Interactions and Feeling Good (see also Reis & Gold, 1993; Schrader & Wann, 1999). It was interesting to find the differences that emerged on the *Modesty* facet in predicting these desired leisure outcomes. Individuals who were less modest and enjoyed touting their abilities and accomplishments sought to Feel Good in their free time endeavors perhaps by seeking further opportunities for such self-promotion. In contrast, more modest individuals desired social experiences in their free time, perhaps focusing less on themselves and more on interactive exchanges with others (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1992). It was also not surprising to find that people who wanted to Feel Good about themselves in their free time were the most *Altruistic* and generous, often seeking to volunteer or undertake other community projects to do in their free time.

Although the Neuroticism personality dimension typically has failed to figure prominently in the few studies linking personality and leisure (Costa & McCrae, 1988; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001), facets of this dimension significantly predicted the Intrinsic Rewards free time factor. Those who were low in *Depression* and those who were high in *Impulsivity* sought Intrinsic Rewards through their free time pursuits. These findings are consistent with literature that has reliably demonstrated that one of the prevailing symptoms of depressed individuals is that they do not seek or experience pleasure (Droomers et al., 1998; Kircaldy, 1989; Magnus et al., 1993). Previous research has demonstrated that persons who are high on the *Impulsiveness* facet have little control over their own desires and have been shown to engage in substance use, gambling, overeating, spending, and smoking, among others (McCrae & Costa, 2003). Hence, it appears somewhat surprising that Neuroticism has not emerged in the few studies relating personality to aspects of leisure (Costa & McCrae, 1988; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001), and this might be largely because much of this research has not operated at the facet level of analysis. The findings here provide further endorsement for the recommendation that important findings can be masked if only the larger Big Five dimensions are considered

and that illuminating interrelationships can be uncovered by using the facets underlying the dimensions (Paunonen, 2003; Paunonen et al., 2003).

This study extends research on literature delving into the Big Five and its relationship to leisure, building on the few studies that have opened this door (Avni, Kipper, & Fox, 1987; Barnett, 2006; Courneya & Hellsten, 1998). Previous literature has operated largely by examining relationships with the Big Five dimensions (most frequently Extraversion; see Barnett, 2006; Barnett & Klitzing, 2006; Brandstatter, 1994; Kircaldy & Furnham, 1991), and the few that have undertaken a facet level of analysis have focused on a few specific activities (e.g., partying, drinking, exercising; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001). In addition, the conclusions from these earlier studies have been inconsistent, with some demonstrating modest but significant correlations (Costa & McCrae, 1988; Hills & Argyle, 1998; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Wilkinson & Hansen, 2006) and others detecting no relationships (Furnham, 1981; Kircaldy, 1989). The findings obtained here are more substantial, consistent, and meticulous in demonstrating the strong predictive power of personality facets in explaining *why* people choose to do many of the activities that they do in their free time. Future research should clearly concentrate on this level of abstraction. Moreover, additional research should test whether the facets bear an advantage in the prediction of proximal and distal aspects in approaching the varieties of leisure experience (e.g., beliefs, attitudes, antecedents, consequences).

Personality researchers have demonstrated consistently that the Big Five model, dimensions, and facets applied equally well to males and females (of college age and older) and to individuals of different racial and ethnic origins (Caspi et al., 2005; Costa et al., 2001; Feingold, 1994; McCrae et al., 1999; Schmitt et al., 2008; Soto, John, Gosling, & Potter, 2010). Although a number of leisure scholars have found that the experiences of women in a leisure setting are qualitatively different than those of a male counterpart in the same setting (see Henderson et al., 1996; Henderson et al., 2002; Shaw, 1985, 1999), there is the admonition that we need to stray from the practice of treating gender as an independent variable (Helgeson, 1994; Henderson, 2009). The findings in the present study are glaring in noting that personality plays a strong role in predicting what individuals seek to derive from their free time and that this relationship operates in similar ways for men and women. This is clearly an area for replication and further exploration, as this finding has not been detected in previous investigations in leisure research. Virtually none of the studies in which gender differences have been documented have shown consistent male–female similarities, and this could likely be attributed to the aspect of leisure under study. The motivating force underlying individuals' choices for the leisure activities in which they participate has not received much empirical attention in terms of the importance they ascribe to various potential outcomes. Another possible alternative might be that previous studies detecting large-scale differences have been predominantly qualitative in nature, in contrast to the quantitative approach used here. The recommendation that the aspect of leisure experience under study herein should be further investigated using a more qualitative or mixed method approach, to validate and provide insight into the findings of sparse gender and race differences.

These results also provide the impetus for further exploring how race might suggest different approaches to leisure/free time by different groups. Although the cell sizes for some of the groups in this study did not allow for a more complete study of this question, the findings suggest race plays a significant role in what one wants to derive from his or her leisure experiences. Some quantitative evidence supports these qualitative findings in providing support for the contention that race plays a role in mediating the relationship between personality and desired free time outcomes (see also Barnett, 2006; Barnett & Klitzing, 2006). Because a wealth of previous research revealed minimal differences attributable to race in the personality facets, the inference that the variation observed in the study can be attributed to desired free time outcomes is reasonable. These findings strongly caution researchers that as they undertake additional research they synchronously investigate the roles of both race and gender as they prevail in suggesting qualitative differences between males and females (see also Gramann & Allison, 1999; Rehman, 2002), at least for members of this population.

### **Caveats**

Strategies and techniques for measuring leisure and recreation vary widely, and it is important a priori to determine which aspects the authors want to capture and at what level of detail. Leisure has been regarded as a motivational force (Driver, Tinsley, & Manfredi, 1991; Tinsley & Kass, 1978), a behavioral choice (McKechnie, 1975; Szalai, 1972), an enduring preference (Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Stebbins, 1992), a predisposition to approach any given environment (Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990; Weissinger & Bandalos, 1995), a state of being of only momentary and fluctuating duration (Bishop, Jeanrenaud, & Lawson, 1975; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), among others. In the present study, interest in desired outcomes from free time was the focus, following from earlier research that culminated in the Recreation Experience Preference (REP) scales (Driver, 1977, 1983). Designed to measure "the types of psychological goal states desired by recreationists" (Manfredi et al., 1996, p. 204), particularly those anticipating an outdoor recreational experience, studies using this instrument (see Manfredi et al., 1996, for a comprehensive review and meta-analysis) detected 19 domains underlying the 108 items. In an effort to update the instrument (initially developed using data 30 to 40 years ago), customize it to the young adult college population, and shorten its length without losing its intent or psychometric properties, we used an alternate measure of desired leisure outcomes in this study (Your Free Time) that had previously been developed with these criteria in mind. This more recently developed instrument focuses on the contemporary leisure interests of the young adult (college-aged) group and presents initial demonstration of being reliable and valid. Although each of the 27 resulting items that make up the Your Free Time instrument corresponded to items within the 108-item REP scales, focus group members found a number of REP items and domains were not relevant to this age group's recreational preferences (e.g., items that make up the REP domains of Social Recognition, Telling Others, Control-Power, Equipment, Being With Similar Others, Observing Other People, Studying Geography, Learning More About Nature, Enjoying Nature, Introspection, Nostalgia, Social Security, Teaching Others, and Risk Reduction). Statistical procedures detected six factors underlying the items in the



present study based on “importance” ratings (as was one of the criterion measures used in the REP studies), and although different monikers were assigned to factors, several factors captured intent similar to that found with the REP scales. Initial analyses on the Your Free Time instrument have been promising (Barnett, 2011); however, additional empirical work is needed before this questionnaire can be recommended for widespread use for those of a similar age group not attending college or for older adults.

In addition, the findings should be subjected to scrutiny concerning their generalizability to individuals of different ages, income levels, and life situations (marital/partnership status, family constellation, employment, educational level). The extent to which personality might play a role in determining the experiences that people seek in their free time should not be presumed to play a consistent role across the life span and as life events and circumstances change. In addition, how personality interacts with environmentally based gender roles and opportunities and projects men and women along different trajectories in how they regard and experience their free time is an important area for further study. Finally, an important limitation of the study is the inability to explicate similarities and differences as a function of the race/ethnicity of participants, as the low cell sizes forced coding into contrasts between Caucasian and minority. This grouping of minority participants is highly undesirable, and the implication that they can be homogeneously combined is not intended to carry meaning beyond the requirement for the purpose of statistical analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Free time*, *leisure*, and *leisure time* have been used interchangeably in the present investigation, as supported by previous research that showed minimal distinctions between the terms by members of the university student population.

## References

- Ackerman, P. L., & Heggstad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological Bulletin*, *121*, 219–245.
- Aickin, M. (1999). Other methods of adjustment of multiple testing exists. *British Medical Journal*, *318*, 127–128.
- Allen, L. R. (1982). The relationship between Murray's personality needs and leisure interests. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *14*, 63–76.
- Arai, S., & Kivel, B. D. (2009). Critical race theory and social justice perspectives on whiteness, difference(s) and (anti)racism: A fourth wave of race research in leisure studies. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *41*(4), 459–470.
- Argyle, M., & Lu, L. (1990a). The happiness of extraverts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *11*, 1011–1017.
- Argyle, M., & Lu, L. (1990b). Happiness and social skills. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *11*, 1255–1261.
- Ashton, M. C., Jackson, D. N., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Rothstein, M. G. (1995). The criterion validity of broad factor scales versus specific trait scales. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *29*, 432–442.

- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Paunonen, S. V. (2002). What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 245–252.
- Avni, A., Kipper, D., & Fox, S. (1987). Personality and leisure activities: An illustration with chess players. *Personality and Individual Differences, 8*, 715–719.
- Azibo, D. A. (1991). An empirical test of the fundamental postulates of an African personality metatheory. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 15*, 183–195.
- Barnett, L. A. (2006). Accounting for leisure preferences from within: The relative contributions of gender, race or ethnicity, personality, affective style, and motivational orientation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 38*(4), 445–474.
- Barnett, L. A. (2011). How do playful people play? Gendered and racial leisure perspectives, motives, and preferences of college students. *Leisure Sciences, 33*(5), 382–401.
- Barnett, L. A., & Klitzing, S. W. (2006). Boredom in free time: Relationships with personality, affect, and motivation for different gender, racial and ethnic student groups. *Leisure Sciences, 28*(3), 223–244.
- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 15*, 219–228.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 238–246.
- Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS: Structural equations program model*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- Bishop, D. W., Jeanrenaud, C., & Lawson, K. (1975). Comparison of a time diary and recall questionnaire for surveying leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 7*, 73–80.
- Bogg, T., & Roberts, B. W. (2004). Conscientiousness and health behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(6), 887–919.
- Brandstatter, H. (1994). Pleasure of leisure – Pleasure of work: Personality makes the difference. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*(6), 931–946.
- Carmine, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 453–484.
- Caughlin, J. P., Huston, T. L., & Houts, R. M. (2000). How does personality matter in marriage? An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 326–336.
- Chan, D. (1997). Racial subgroup differences in predictive validity perceptions on personality and cognitive ability tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 311–320.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1988). Mood and the mundane: Relations between daily life events and self-reported mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 296–308.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Collins, J. M., & Greaves, D. H. (1998). Race, job applicants, and the Five-Factor Model of personality: Implications for black psychology, industrial/organizational psychology, and the five-factor theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(4), 531–544.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 853–863.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 65*, 21–50.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., & Dye, D. A. (1991). Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 887–898.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 322–331.
- Courneya, K. S., & Hellsten, L. (1998). Personality correlates of exercise behavior, motive, barriers, and preferences: An application of the Five-Factor Model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 625–633.
- Cramer, D. (1993). Personality and marital dissolution. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14*, 605–607.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Day, D. V., & Bedeian, A. G. (1995). Personality similarity and work-related outcomes among African-American nursing personnel: A test of the supplementary model of person environment congruence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46*, 55–70.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 38. Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237–288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 197–229.
- Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., & Emmons, R. A. (1984). Person by situation interactions: Choice of situations and congruence response models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 580–592.
- Diener, E., Sandvik, E., Pavot, W., & Fujita, F. (1992). Extraversion and subjective well-being in a U.S. national probability sample. *Journal of Research in Personality, 26*, 205–215.

- Donnellan, M. B., Conger, R. D., & Bryant, C. M. (2004). The Big Five and enduring marriages. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 481–504.
- Driver, B. L. (1977). *Item pool for scales designed to quantify the psychological outcomes desired and expected from recreation participation*. Fort Collins, CO: Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Driver, B. L. (1983). *Master list of items for Recreation Experience Preference scales and domains*. Fort Collins, CO: Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Driver, B. L., & Knopf, R. C. (1977). Personality, outdoor recreation, and expected consequences. *Environment and Behavior, 9*, 169–193.
- Driver, B. L., Tinsley, H. E. A., & Manfredi, M. J. (1991). The Paragraphs About Leisure and Recreation Experience Preference scales: Results from two inventories designed to assess the breadth of the perceived psychological benefits of leisure. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Benefits of leisure* (pp. 263–286). State College, PA: Venture.
- Droomers, M., Schrijvers, C. T. M., van de Mheen, H., & Mackenbach, J. P. (1998). Educational differences in leisure-time physical inactivity: A descriptive and explanatory study. *Social Sciences and Medicine, 47*(11), 1665–1676.
- Dunn, J., Causgrove Dunn, J., & Asyrotuik, D. (2002). Relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and goal orientations in sport. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 24*, 376–395.
- Emmons, R. A., Diener, E., & Larsen, R. J. (1986). Choice and avoidance of everyday situations and affect congruence: Two models of reciprocal interactionism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 815–826.
- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(3), 429–456.
- Fleeson, W., Malanos, A. B., & Achille, N. M. (2002). An intraindividual process approach to the relationship between extraversion and positive affect: Is acting extraverted as “good” as being extraverted? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1409–1422.
- Floyd, M. F. (2007). Research on race and ethnicity in leisure: Anticipating the fourth wave. *Leisure/Loisir, 31*(1), 245–254.
- Furnham, A. (1981). Personality and activity preference. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 57–68.
- Gaines, S. O. (1995). Relationships between members of cultural minorities. In J. T. Wood & S. Duck (Eds.), *Understudied relationships: Off the beaten track* (pp. 51–88). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gibson, H., & Chang, S. (2012). Cycling in mid and later life: Involvement and benefits sought from a bicycle tour. *Journal of Leisure Research, 44*(1), 23–51.
- Graef, R., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Gianinno, S. M. (1983). Measuring intrinsic motivation in everyday life. *Leisure Studies, 2*, 155–168.
- Graham, S. (1994). Motivation in African Americans. *Review of Educational Research, 64*(1), 55–117.
- Gramann, J. H., & Allison, M. T. (1999). Ethnicity, race, and leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 283–297). State College, PA: Venture.

- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795–824). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Gurtman, M. B. (1995). Personality structure and interpersonal problems: A theoretically-guided item analysis of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. *Assessment, 2*, 343–361.
- Hansen, J. C. (1998). *Leisure Interest Questionnaire*. St. Paul, MN: JCH Consulting.
- Hansen, J. C., & Scullard, M. G. (2002). Psychometric evidence for the leisure interest questionnaire and analyses of the structure of leisure interests. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 331–341.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Prototypes and dimensions of masculinity and femininity. *Sex Roles, 31*, 653–682.
- Henderson, K. A. (1991). The contribution of feminism to an understanding of leisure constraints. *Journal of Leisure Research, 23*, 363–377.
- Henderson, K. A. (1996). One size doesn't fit all: The meanings of women's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 28*, 139–154.
- Henderson, K. A. (2009). Just research and physical activity: Diversity is more than an independent variable. *Leisure Sciences, 31*(1), 100–105.
- Henderson, K. A., Bialeschki, M. D., Shaw, S. M., & Freysinger, V. J. (1996). *Both gains and gaps: Feminist perspectives on women's leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Henderson, K. A., & Hickerson, B. (2007). Women and leisure: Premises and performances uncovered in an integrative review. *Journal of Leisure Research, 39*(4), 591–610.
- Henderson, K. A., Hodges, S., & Kivel, B. D. (2002). Context and dialogue in research on women and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 34*(3), 253–271.
- Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (1998). Positive moods derived from leisure and their relationship to happiness and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 523–535.
- Hou, J.-J., Tu, H. H.-J., & Yang, M.-F. (2007). Agreeableness and leisure satisfaction in the context of online games. *Social Behavior and Personality, 35*(10), 1379–1384.
- Houston, L. N. (1990). *Psychological principles and the Black experience*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 35–51). State College, PA: Venture.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Weissinger, E. (1990). Perceptions of boredom in leisure: Conceptualization, reliability and validity of the Leisure Boredom Scale. *Journal of Leisure Research, 22*, 1–17.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Kirkcaldy, B. D. (1989). Gender and personality determinants of recreational interests. *Studia Psychologica, 30*, 115–127.

- Kirkcaldy, B. D., & Furnham, A. (1991). Extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and recreational choices. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 737–745.
- Kleiber, D. A., Larson, R., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1986). The experience of leisure in adolescence. *Journal of Leisure Research, 18*, 169–176.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Knopf, R. C. (1983). Recreational needs and behavior in natural settings. In I. Altman & J. F. Wohlwill (Eds.), *Behavior and the natural environment* (pp. 205–240). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Krcmar, M., & Greene, K. (1999). Predicting exposure to and uses of television violence. *Journal of Communication, 49*, 24–45.
- Krcmar, M., & Keyan, L. G. (2005). Uses and gratifications of media violence: Personality correlates of viewing and liking violent genres. *Media Psychology, 7*, 399–420.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 395–412.
- Larson, R., Mannell, R., & Zuzanek, J. (1986). Daily well-being of older adults with friends and family. *Journal of Psychology and Aging, 1*, 117–126.
- Lewinsohn, P. M., & Graf, M. (1973). Pleasant activities and depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41*, 261–268.
- Lodi-Smith, J. L., & Roberts, B. W. (2007). Social investment and personality: A meta-analysis of the relationship of personality traits to investment in work, family, religion, and volunteerism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 68–86.
- Lucas, R. E., & Diener, E. (2001). Understanding extraverts' enjoyment of social situations: The importance of pleasantness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(2), 343–356.
- Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., Grob, A., Suh, E. M., & Shao, L. (2000). Cross-cultural evidence for the fundamental features of extraversion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 452–468.
- Lucas, R. E., & Fujita, F. (2000). Factors influencing the relation between Extraversion and pleasant affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(6), 1039–1056.
- Magnus, K., Diener, E., Fujita, F., & Pavot, W. (1993). Extraversion and Neuroticism as predictors of objective life events: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1046–1053.
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L., & Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the Recreation Experience Preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research, 28*, 188–213.
- Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indexes in confirmatory factor analyses: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 391–410.
- McCrae, R. R. (1996). Social consequences of experiential openness. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*(3), 323–337.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 81–90.

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1991). Adding *Liebe und Arbeit*: The full Five-Factor Model and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 227–232.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the Five-Factor Model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51–87). New York, NY: Guilford.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 139–153). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., del Pilar, G. H., Rolland, J. P., & Parker, W. D. (1998). Cross-cultural assessment of the Five-Factor Model: The revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *29*, 171–188.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., Pedrosa de Lima, M., Simoes, A., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., . . . Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Age differences in personality across the adult life span: Parallels in five cultures. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*(2), 466–477.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, *60*, 175–215.
- McCullough, M. E., Hoyt, W. T., Larson, D. B., Koenig, H. G., & Thoresen, C. E. (2000). Religious involvement and mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Health Psychology*, *19*, 211–222.
- McDonald, M. G. (2009). Dialogues on Whiteness, leisure, and (anti)racism. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *41*(1), 5–21.
- McKechnie, G. E. (1975). *Manual for the Leisure Activities Blank*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.
- Melamed, S., Meir, E. I., & Samson, A. (1995). The benefits of personality–leisure congruence: Evidence and implications. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *27*, 25–40.
- Miller, M. J. (1991). Accuracy of the leisure activities finder: Expanding Holland's typology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *39*, 362–368.
- Mitchelson, J. K., Wicher, E. W., LeBreton, J. M., & Craig, S. B. (2009). Gender and ethnicity differences on the abridged Big Five circumplex of personality traits. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *69*(4), 613–635.
- Mosby, D. P. (1972). Toward a theory of the unique personality of Blacks – A psychological assessment. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology* (pp. 124–125). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations and personality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Neulinger, J. (1981). *The psychology of leisure* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Noftle, E. E., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big Five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(1), 116–130.
- Paunonen, S. V. (2003). Big Five factors of personality and replicated predictions of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(2), 411–424.

- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big Five factors and facets and the prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 524–539.
- Paunonen, S. V., Haddock, G., Fosterling, F., & Keinonen, M. (2003). Broad versus narrow personality measures and the prediction of behavior across cultures. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 413–433.
- Pavot, W., Diener, E., & Fujita, F. (1990). Extraversion and happiness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 11*, 1299–1306.
- Perneger, T. V. (1998). What's wrong with the Bonferroni adjustments. *British Medical Journal, 361*, 1236–1238.
- Plomin, R. (2004). Genetics and developmental psychology. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 50*, 341–352.
- Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., & Fulker, D. W. (2007). *Nature and nurture during infancy and early childhood*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rehman, L. A. (2002). Recognizing the significance of culture on ethnicity: Exploring hidden assumptions of homogeneity. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(1), 43–58.
- Reid, D. G., & Mannell, R. C. (1993). Future possibilities: The changing patterns of work and leisure. In A. J. Veal, P. Jonson, & G. Cushman (Eds.), *Leisure and tourism: Social and environmental change* (pp. 373–378). Sydney, Australia: University of Technology Sydney Press.
- Reis, M., & Gold, D. P. (1993). Retirement, personality, and life satisfaction: A review of two models. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 12*, 261–282.
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Bogg, T. (2005). Conscientiousness and health across the life course. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 156–168.
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*, 1–25.
- Rogge, R. D., Bradbury, T. N., Hahlweg, K., Engl, J., & Thurmaier, F. (2006). Predicting marital distress and dissolution: Refining the two-factor hypothesis. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 156–159.
- Ross, S. R., Rausch, M. K., & Canada, K. E. (2003). Competition and cooperation in the Five-Factor Model: Individual differences in achievement orientation. *The Journal of Psychology, 137*, 323–337.
- Russell, R. V. (2009). *Pastimes: The context of contemporary leisure* (4th ed.). Champaign, IL: Sagamore.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 54–67.
- Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in Big Five personality traits across 55 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(1), 168–182.
- Schrader, M. P., & Wann, D. L. (1999). High risk recreation: The relationship between participant characteristics and the degree of involvement. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*, 426–441.
- Shaw, S. M. (1985). The meaning of leisure in everyday life. *Leisure Sciences, 7*, 1–24.
- Shaw, S. M. (1994). Gender, leisure and constraint: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 26*, 8–22.



- Shaw, S. M. (1997). Controversies and contradictions in family leisure: An analysis of conflicting paradigms. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29*, 98–12.
- Shaw, S. M. (1999). Gender and leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 271–281). State College, PA: Venture.
- Shores, K., & Scott, D. (2007). The relationship of individual time perspective and recreation experience preferences. *Journal of Leisure Research, 39*(1), 28–59.
- Sidanius, J. (1985). Cognitive functioning and sociopolitical ideology revisited. *Political Psychology, 6*, 637–661.
- Soto, C. J., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2010). Age differences in personality traits from 10 to 65: Big Five domains and facets in a large cross-sectional sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(2), 330–348.
- Stebbins, R. A. (1992). *Amateurs, professionals, and serious leisure*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination. *Psychological Bulletin, 133*(1), 65–94.
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(1), 138–161.
- Steiger, J. H., & Lind, J. C. (1980). *Statistically based tests for the number of common factors*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Psychonomic Society, Iowa City, IA.
- Szalai, A. (1972). *The use of time*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.
- Tellegen, A., Lykken, D. T., Bourchard, T. J., Jr., Wilcox, K. J., Segal, N. L., & Rich, S. (1988). Personality similarity in twins reared apart and together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1031–1039.
- Tetlock, P. E. (1983). Cognitive style and political ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 118–126.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., & Eldridge, B. D. (1995). Psychological benefits of leisure participation: A taxonomy of leisure activities based on their need-gratifying properties. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 123–132.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., Hinson, J. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Holt, M. S. (1993). Attributes of leisure and work experiences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 447–455.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., & Johnson, T. L. (1984). A preliminary taxonomy of leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 16*, 234–244.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., & Kass, R. A. (1978). Leisure activities and need satisfaction: A replication and extension. *Journal of Leisure Research, 11*, 278–291.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., & Tinsley, D. J. (1986). A theory of the attributes, benefits, and causes of leisure experience. *Leisure Sciences, 8*, 1–45.
- Tucker, J. S., Friedman, H. S., Wingard, D. L., & Schwartz, J. E. (1996). Marital history at midlife as a predictor of longevity: Alternative explanations to the protective effect of marriage. *Health Psychology, 15*, 94–101.
- Tucker, J. S., Kressin, N. R., Spiro, A., & Ruscio, J. (1998). Intrapersonal characteristics and the timing of divorce: A prospective investigation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 211–225.
- Unger, L. S. (1984). The effect of situational variables on the subjective leisure experience. *Leisure Sciences, 6*, 291–312.

- Versplanken, B., & Herabadi, A. (2001). Individual differences in impulse buying tendency: Feeling and no thinking. *European Journal of Personality, 15*, 71–83.
- von Collani, G., & Grumm, M. (2009). On the dimensional structure of personality, ideological beliefs, social attitudes, and personal values. *Journal of Individual Differences, 30*(2), 107–119.
- Walton, K. E., & Roberts, B. W. (2004). On the relationship between substance use and personality traits: Abstainers are not maladjusted. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 515–535.
- Watkins, M., & Bond, C. (2007). Ways of experiencing leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 29*, 287–307.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 767–793). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., McIntyre, C. W., & Hamaker, S. (1992). Affect, personality, and social activity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(6), 1011–1025.
- Weissinger, E., & Bandalos, D. L. (1995). Development, reliability and validity of a scale to measure intrinsic motivation in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*, 379–400.
- Wilkinson, T. J., & Hansen, J. C. (2006). The relationship among leisure interests, personality traits, affect, and mood. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 39*, 31–41.
- Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(6), 806–838.