Journal of Leisure Research
1997, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 145-166

Articles

Native Americans and Leisure: State of the Research and Future Directions

Daniel McDonald
Douglas College, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Leo McAvoy
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Though leisure researchers have in recent years established a growing interest in cross-cultural leisure research, they have paid little attention to Native American communities. This evaluative review of literature examines Native American leisure beliefs and behaviors through related concepts such as play, games and parks. The article is also an examination of Native American value systems in general, with their relationships to leisure beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. Specific recommended guidelines for conducting research in Native American communities are given, as well as a number of recommendations for future research directions.

KEYWORDS: *Native Americans, leisure values, leisure behavior, cultural diversity, first nations*

Introduction

There is a growing need for a fuller understanding of the leisure values and behaviors of distinct cultural groups as society continues to be characterized by increasing levels of cultural diversity (Kraus, 1994). One group that has received little attention in the leisure research literature is Native Americans, the indigenous peoples of North America. There are a number of reasons why this fuller understanding of Native American leisure is important now, beyond the scholarly inquiry reason of satisfying academic curiosity. Many Native American tribal groups are involved in negotiations with federal, state, and provincial recreation resource land managers concerning the recreational use of tribal lands and resources. These land managers often have little understanding of the worldview of Native Americans and how that worldview may influence Native American leisure values and behaviors. This

This article has resulted from research supported by the Pacific Southwest Forest Experiment Station, USDA Forest Service, and the University of Minnesota. Daniel McDonald is currently with the Department of Child, Family and Community Studies, Douglas College, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Leo McAvoy, Division of Recreation, Park and Leisure Studies, 209 Cooke Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, (612) 625-5887. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to [mcavo001@tc.umn.edu]

lack of understanding has led to conflict and other difficulties when trying to work together cooperatively. A number of sovereignty issues concerning hunting, fishing and gathering are active throughout the United States and Canada. Resource management controversies such as access to sacred sites within protected park lands have illustrated the lack of understanding the dominant Euro-American culture often has of the Native American cultural perspective (Rudner, 1994). Some urban and rural recreation agencies are trying to implement recreation program opportunities in Native American communities to address issues such as youth-at-risk, and are finding it difficult to bridge the gap of understanding between the Caucasian and the Native cultures. A fuller understanding of Native American leisure may lead to more cooperation between leisure agencies and Native Americans. And finally, the recent economic impact of Native American gambling facilities on reservations and elsewhere has brought increased tourism and other development (including recreation development) to Native American communities. This development is influenced by, and may influence, Native American leisure values and behaviors.

Our interest in this article has developed from our personal and professional efforts in learning more about various Native American cultures and how leisure fits into those cultures. We are especially interested in how Native Americans view outdoor recreation and the outdoor resources where that recreation may take place. One author is Metis, a recognized Canadian First Nation, and has a background in Native American Studies and leisure behavior. The other author is non-Native American and has a number of years of experience studying outdoor recreation behavior and resources. When we tried to begin a research study on Native American outdoor recreation behaviors and values we found that the leisure literature had very little to offer us on this topic. Since little leisure research has been done regarding Native Americans, a review of the leisure and leisure-related research appears to be warranted, along with a look to the future regarding research directions and methods that will be appropriate.

The purpose of this article is to present an evaluative review of the literature pertaining to leisure and Native American populations. Though leisure researchers have, in recent years, shown a growing interest in cross-cultural leisure research (Allison, 1988; Ewert, Chavez, & Magill, 1993), they have paid little attention to Native American communities. Because of this lack of research in the leisure literature, much of this article will draw from the literature of other disciplines, and will seek to examine Native American leisure-related beliefs and behaviors through related concepts such as play, games and parks, rather than adopting the more conventional conceptualizations of leisure and recreation used in the field. Little empirical research was found even in related literatures, therefore much of the work cited is analysis based on secondary sources, case studies, and anecdotal reports based on the experiences of the writers.

Part of this article will also include an examination of Native American value systems in general, in which leisure beliefs, attitudes and behaviors

would be contained. In part, this will mirror a similar description of Hispanic-American values put forth by Carr and Williams (1991) in their look at outdoor recreation for that population. A difficulty in the examination of cultural values will be that present day tribal groups represent myriad cultures and languages, living in diverse present and historical contexts (Champagne, 1994; Da, 1970).

A final part of this article will be a review of numerous recommendations to conducting research in Native American communities. Some recommendations are based on the extensive experience of other disciplines in conducting such research. Other recommendations reflect the stated desires of Native Americans themselves. And, others are lessons learned by these two researchers over four years of conducting research in Native American communities. A synthesis of these recommendations may prove helpful to leisure researchers as they begin to explore the leisure experience of indigenous peoples, and thus continue to expand the knowledge base beyond that of the dominant Anglo-American experience. The conclusion section contains a number of recommendations for future directions in Native American leisure research.

A large measure of the literature and research reported on Native Americans focuses on or has been conducted in Canada, where the indigenous peoples comprise a larger percentage of the population than in the United States, and are more evenly distributed throughout the country. As a later section describes however, there are some common cultural traits among Native American groups. Many First Nations (a term used in Canada to describe Native American tribal groups) have members on both sides of the Canadian-United States border. Caution must be used throughout not to over-generalize, as political and social conditions and tribal histories can differ markedly between the two countries.

Necessary Caution When Approaching the Literature

The stated purpose of this review and its discussion must be placed within the context of the limitations in the sources, many of which are dated, and in the current academic debate concerning authorship of research and articles on minority populations in Western society.

There are few Native American authors who have written on leisure-recreation-parks related pan-Indian values, or conducted research in Native American communities. Where authors cited in this review can be identified as members of a Native American community, their tribal affiliation will be noted. Otherwise the reader should assume that Native American identity could not be verified or that the author(s) are Euro-American. The dearth of Native American authors increases uncertainty about the authenticity of many of the cultural representations presented in these works, especially as many rely heavily on secondary sources for their data. We advise the reader interested in a specific topic area of leisure to go to the sources we cite and to make your own decision as to the authenticity of the representations pre-

sented there. This paper will not argue that only people within a culture may do valid research on that culture. However, the leisure research topic area could benefit from more partnerships between Native American and non-Native American researchers, as is the case with the authors of this paper. Such partnerships would help alleviate many of the concerns raised in later sections of this paper.

The research methods used in studies cited also needs to be considered. As is explained later in this paper, most Native American cultures rely heavily on the spoken word rather that the written word to communicate values and beliefs. This makes many traditional social science research methods rather inappropriate in Native American communities, and would suggest that qualitative and interpretive methodologies would be more appropriate. But, even the qualitative approach can be problematic when the researcher does not speak the language or is not familiar with the cultural nuances of a particular group. These research realities are often challenges for researchers trying to study minority cultures. These limitations do not render the research invalid, but the reader must be aware of the limitations when considering the results and conclusions.

Another caveat concerning the literature cited in this paper is that many of these representations of belief and behavior do not deal well with the diversity present within Native America, both at the macro and micro levels. Champagne (1994) identifies some 57 different language families within Native North America, with Native Americans in California showing more language diversity than all of Europe. Large variations exist among tribal communities based, in part, on language, the environment, experiences connected to European colonization and trade, and the respective policies of the Canadian and United States governments in dealings with their ancestors. Variation also exists within tribes based on such things as generational experiences with residential schools, the economic basis for the community, the degree of remoteness of the reservations, and the percentage of members who have moved to urban environments.

Any discussion of Native American values and behaviors must be placed within the context of life in modern society. There is a tendency to view Native Americans only in a traditional context, and any deviation from those traditional patterns is seen as being a sign of assimilation (Hollinshead, 1992). Native cultures are as contemporary as any other. Euro-American culture is not held up to a 16th century, static ideal, and neither should Native Americans be regarded in like manner. Native Americans live out their values in a modern context (Ross, 1992), which often includes a move to an urban environment, the requirement to compartmentalize one's life, economic survival in a capitalistic structure, and other accommodations most people in North America make, regardless of culture. Such accommodation forces each individual to negotiate with a set of traditional cultural values, and to work out how these values will be expressed in one's life. Euro-Americans, Native Americans, and others in society do so with varied degrees of success.

A final note concerning the sources used in this review is where we obtained them. Most of the literature cited here was gleaned from a thor-

ough search of the social science literature, and those sources referenced within. Additional information undoubtedly lies within government reports, especially those focusing on resource management issues. We did not include those reports in our look at the literature.

Seeing with a Native Eye: Native American Cultural Values

Though Native America is still, in essence, a collection of diverse cultures, some attempts have been made to describe common elements and beliefs. A parallel exercise might be a discussion of similar pan-European cultural characteristics, recognizing that each culture contained within would have differences in language, values and other variables. In a collection of essays titled *Seeing With A Native Eye,* a clear warning is given by Toelken (1976) concerning attempts to generalize about Native Americans:

> One of the most important [things] is that there is almost nothing that can be said about 'the Indians' as a whole. Every tribe is different from every other in some respects, and similar in other respects, so that nearly everything one says normally has to be qualified by footnotes. (p. 9)

In spite of his own warning, Toelken puts forth a number of generalizations that can be made about Native American cultures. He does so because he believes that it is a start in bridging the large conceptual gulf between Native and Euro-Americans. Perhaps he defers to the judgment of an even more eminent scholar of Native Americans, Joseph Epes Brown (1976), who also contributes to the volume:

> In spite of the vast differences between native cultures of North America with respective sacred traditions, it is nevertheless deemed possible for the purpose of this statement to identify certain core or root themes which seem to under gird the traditions of all these groups even though they are expressed through a rich diversity of means. (p. 28)

In the following discussion of shared characteristics, we rely on scholars who are conservative in their listings and identify few shared values (Beck, Walters, & Francisco, 1992; Brown, 1976; Jostad, McAvoy, & McDonald, 1996; Malloy, Nilson, & Yoshioka, 1993; Ross, 1992; Toelken, 1976). This conservative stance is in keeping with earlier statements stressing diversity among Native Americans, a point often emphasized by Native American writers. There are others who are more bold and offer lengthier lists, but they will only be cited where they support items suggested by others (Hollinshead, 1992; Locust, 1988).

One of the traditional values most frequently associated with Native Americans is the pervasive belief in the sacredness of life, where religious experience is constant and surrounds the individual at all times (Jostad et al., 1996; Toelken, 1976). Brown (1976) talks of experiences being infused with a mythic nature, both those of an individual and those of the community. For many Native Americans, the spirit portion of both themselves and nature is the paramount one. Actions are more often motivated by other than worldly concerns, and decisions based on an ethic derived from sacred

traditions (Beck et al., 1992). For other Native Americans this focus on the sacred has been eroded by a loss of traditional knowledge in how to see the spiritual in the realities of modern survival (Beck et al., 1992).

Closely associated with the above characteristic is a sense that there is a clear, reciprocal and interdependent relationship with all of creation (Beck et al., 1992; Brown, 1976; Jostad et al., 1996; Toelken, 1976) and that humans are inseparable from nature (Hollinshead, 1992). Since all is sacred, and infused with spirit, there is a much more egalitarian view of human relationship with nature, compared to the dominant or stewardship view taken by most Euro-Americans. The Inuit of northern Canada speak of this egalitarian relationship as based upon the recognition that animals and humans are equal members of a shared environment (Stairs & Wenzel, 1992). Elders in native communities are often uncomfortable with the concept of resource management because it implies a sense of superiority over nature and separateness from it (Notzke, 1994). Simcox (1993) refers to this worldview as harmonic. Even though the literature indicates this interdependent relationship with the land is a widely shared concept in Native America, there are differences of opinion on how this should be translated into resource management. Many struggles on reservations in the United States over resource development are between Native Americans as well as between Native Americans and non-Native Americans.

Part of the goal of Native American human action, both spiritual and otherwise, then becomes the maintenance of this specific relationship or bond with others and with the land. An important focus of life is the creation of harmony or balance in relationships, both with other humans and with nature (Beck et al., 1992; Jostad et al., 1996; Locust, 1988; Malloy et al., 1993). Often, because of the underlying respect for others inherent in this worldview, Native Americans adhere to an ethic of non-interference in their relationships with people and with the natural world (Locust, 1988; Ross, 1992). Any interfering behavior, from gentle well intentioned manipulation to outright meddling, is considered to be outside the area of proper action (Wax & Thomas, 1961).

In general, Native American cultures place such importance on the relationship with the land that they often have a heightened sense of place or connection to a particular environment (Brown, 1976; Grinde & Johansen, 1995; Hollinshead, 1992). Matthew Coon-Come, Grand Chief of the Crees of Northern Quebec, states

> My people live in and use every inch of the land. We have lived here for so long that everything has a name: every stream, every hill, almost every rock. The Cree people have an intimate relationship with the land. (Cited in Grinde & Johansen, 1995, p. 229)

Dasmann (1976, 1982) refers to such cultures as "ecosystem people," traditionally living in and depending on a single ecosystem or a few adjacent ones, as opposed to "biosphere people" who draw on the resources of the entire biosphere for support. This heightened relationship to the land can

involve the ritual fixing of a center as the place of their peoples' origin, or the stressing of a sacred connection to particular geographical land forms. These places may not coincide with the present place of tribal residence, but may be located in lands inhabited prior to migration to their present locale or removal to a reservation.

A fourth commonly identified characteristic of Native Americans is a belief in the cyclical pattern of life (Brown, 1976; Malloy et al., 1993; Simcox, 1993). Toelken (1976) speaks of a tendency for Native Americans to recreate this cyclical or circular image at every level of their cultures. Examples can be found in architecture, dance, music, religion, sports, art, and other activities. In part, this imagery fused with a clear recognition of relationship with others, can account for the collectivist view of many Native American cultures. Many Native American cultures downplay individual ownership or action, especially concerning material goods, though individuals may have exclusive rights to other items such as dances, spiritual practices, and other non-material things (Hollinshead, 1992).

A final common Native American value is the importance of the spoken word (Beck et al., 1992; Brown, 1976; Ross, 1992). Thought is expected before verbal commitments are made. This thoughtful pause has often been interpreted by Euro-Americans as withdrawal. It has also led to a stereotypical portrayal of Native Americans as a stoic and silent people. Sacred knowledge is often passed down in oral forms, in contrast to Christian religions' emphasis on the written word. Elders, repositories of this oral knowledge, often gain increased status in the Native American social system (Brown, 1976).This reliance on the spoken word has implications for those attempting to conduct research in Native communities.

Is There a Common Native American View of Leisure?

Little research has been conducted on the meaning of leisure for Native Americans, although numerous authors suggest that any distinction from work or other activities would be meaningless in aboriginal traditions (Mrozek, 1983; Notzke, 1994; Simcox, 1993). In the Euro-American world there is a tendency to fragment human experience into specific types, and to institutionalize this separation with labels like work and leisure. Native American cultures, in contrast, tend to see leisure as inseparable from a host of other concerns and interests. In one study, Malloy et al. (1993) suggest that the marginal economic levels characteristic of many Native American communities would give little meaning to the categorization of recreation as a self-expressive motivated type of free-time. However, the results of the Malloy et al. study need to be regarded with caution because their small sample of 5 interviews is not sufficient to support generalization of this position.

One notable examination of meaning suggests an indigenous view of leisure that may be of importance for leisure providers and researchers in particular (Picken, 1992). Elements of this definition also hint at a formulation of leisure quite similar to the dominant Euro-American view, perhaps

in response to the increasing compartmentalization of life in modern society. Based on 34 interviews conducted during a six week winter period, Picken found her Cree respondents using five common ideas in reference to leisure. Pursuit of freedom and extrinsic motivation were found to be in common with models based on Euro-American respondents. The other three ideas all gave this conceptualization of leisure a particular Cree twist. They described it as a sense of being close to nature and a response to an inner drive to be outdoors. Pueblo writer Da (1970) also refers to this same drive and the desire of being alone in nature. Picken's Cree respondents also saw it as being inherently relational, based on interactions with either human or other-than-human beings (i.e. nature). Caution is necessary with this study's results, given Picken's stated limitations concerning her ability to interpret accurately the language and cultural differences of community members.

Reid (1993), as part of a study of recreation development in Ontario First Nation communities, looked at the meaning and function of recreation to native peoples. His qualitative data produced themes that were similar to what Picken found with the Cree. The importance of recreation for Reid's Ontario respondents included: "the joy of pure participation; relaxation, stress reduction and improved health; relief from boredom; a tool for individual rehabilitation and social development; and, cultural expression" (p. 92). The latter two benefits differ from much of the current benefits literature, and reflect strongly two pressing ongoing issues in many Native American communities: the need for cultural preservation and the high incidence of substance abuse.

Observed Differences in Leisure Behavior and Motivations

More studies have attempted to describe Native American recreation behavior or motivations than the limited number focused on meaning, but recreation behavior still has not been an area of much research. Most of these studies have not been published, but remain in dissertation or report form. A very early study, concerning the James Bay Cree of Canada (Flannery, 1937), describes (even at that time) a mix of traditional Eastern Cree recreative forms and general Canadian recreative culture. There was little evidence of organized sport activity, but rather a blend of Euro-American and native games of skill. These games included tag, hide and seek, races of all sorts, high jumping, and snowsnake (sliding a log in the snow for distance). Both children and adults played such games, often past midnight during summer months. Imitative play was also encouraged for children with many receiving small canoe paddles and hunting bows by their third birthday. Flannery noted the non-competitive nature of participation, with little drive to triumph over other contestants. The focus was on the ability to perform a skill rather than on whether one could beat an opponent.

The mixture of cultures, or acculturation, identified by Flannery has accelerated according to Cole, a Mohawk working on the Stoney Reservation in Alberta (1993). He claims that, "the majority of leisure activities presently

engaged in by Aboriginal peoples have been adopted or adapted from colonialistic lifestyles" (p. 105), and that Euro-Canadian recreative forms dominate in the Stoney and Mohawk communities he studied. Flannery's study was conducted in 1937, and conditions have changed with many tribal groups regarding sports competition. But even now an observer can often see subtle differences between how a group of Native American youth play a basketball game and how Euro-American youth play the game. Native Americans often seem to concentrate more on playing the game well rather than putting down an opponent. They also often make subtle adjustments in the rules to accommodate their definition and style of competition.

In another recent study conducted in northern Canada, Coldevin and Wilson (1985) looked at the effects of a decade of satellite television on adolescent leisure patterns in the Arctic. For Inuit youth, they found that television watching had become the most cited leisure activity, but also that there had been a corresponding resurgence in traditional pursuits during the same 1974-83 period. These included hunting, fishing and sewing. They also reported a lower internal locus of control for Inuit who are heavy television users, in comparison to Euro-Canadian frequent watchers.

Another recent study, comparing eighth graders from five American ethnic groupings, found significant differences in their rate of participation in selected out-of-school activities (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1990). Looking at only the figures comparing Native American/Alaskan Native participation with that of the dominant Euro-American culture, in general a higher percentage of Native American youth participated in activities sponsored by agencies with a social service focus, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, the Y's, Neighborhood Clubs, and Scouting. Their rate of participation was only eclipsed by African-American youth. In contrast, Anglo children had significantly higher rates of participation in church sponsored activities and non-school team sports. In a further comparison of homework versus non-academic home based activities for all five groups, Native Americans did the least amount of homework and watched the greatest amount of television per week, while Anglo-Americans did the most homework and watched the least television. These findings perhaps reflect more the social context (poverty) that many Native American children find themselves in rather than any inherent cultural differences in values.

It is interesting to compare the findings of these studies to those found by McDonough and Pancner (1982) in their look at Native American recreation patterns in the Chicago metropolitan area. They found a great similarity in leisure pursuits with those of the Anglo majority, with the exception of a few areas. Though urban Native Americans participated in picnicking, driving for pleasure, swimming and walking, these activities were ranked much lower than the top five ranking given them by the American public as a whole. The researchers found in the Native American youth a greater emphasis on team sport participation, especially basketball and baseball, and over 40% of their sample reported taking part in pow-wows, tribal dancing and other traditional pursuits in the past year. They concluded that urban

Native Americans continue to pursue traditional activities, and that they incorporate new ones that are consistent with traditional values, like group involvement. This group focus is consistent with the comments of Harold Cardinal, noted Cree intellectual and writer in his discussions of competitive activities in aboriginal communities (Malloy, 1991).

A few older dissertations have focused on the leisure patterns of Native Americans. The earlier caution about how circumstances have changed in some Native American communities over the past 20-30 years is relevant when considering these studies. McAllister (1968) studied the Lakota Sioux, and found a focus on activities based on physical skill and endurance and on games of chance. In direct contrast to Flannery's findings with the Cree, McAllister found participants to be fiercely competitive, even at an early age. This finding supports, in part, other descriptions of Plains Indian cultures (Fowler, 1987) in contrast to Woodland cultures like the Cree.

Other studies with specific Native American cultures include McCarty's (1971) on the Taos Pueblo, Pittman's (1972) on the San Carlos Apache, and Barta's (1976) look at Tewa high school students. McCarty, using the Witty Interest Finder and a more open ended questionnaire with 50 girls and boys, found a strong nature orientation to the boys' interests and a home orientation to the girls interests. Both sexes also spent significant amounts of time chopping wood, hauling water, and carrying refuse, all reflective of the reservation conditions. Of particular note was an emphasis by all children on the family as the focus of leisure activity. Pittman, while interviewing 43 San Carlos teenagers, focused more on the motivation for engaging in particular activities. Most frequently cited reasons centered on opportunities to gain social status, social obligations to family and friends, and social interaction. Also important was the maintenance of a distinct Apache identity through activity selection. Barta's Tewa high school students also identified the latter motivation, but indicated through questionnaire responses, a declining participation in tribal activities and greater interest in dominant culture (Euro-American) choices.

Farris (1975) and Dewall (1984) conducted more comparative studies. Farris contrasted Anglo-American leisure with Navajo children. Dewall contrasted Anglo-American, Hispanic and urban Native American students. Farris, through observation of play behavior, concluded that Anglo children were more active and played in more elaborate and rule-driven ways than did Native American children. Farris found that Navajo children were more patterned and less innovative than Anglo children. Dewall focused more on leisure satisfaction differences, surveying 320 students with the short form Leisure Satisfaction Scale developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980). There were significant differences between the subscale scores of all three groups (Anglo, Hispanic, Native American) but all had similarly ranked subscales. The greatest differences were in demographics between Native American and Anglo-American youth. Another significant difference was in order of importance, with Anglo and Hispanic students placing the relaxational subscale as most important, while the Native American youth rated social needs as more important.

A final study in this category is worth noting, as it used recreation participation as an independent variable to assess its effect on Cree and Saulteaux academic performance (Van der Wal, 1989). Two separate studies were conducted, one using an on-reserve sample and the other an urban sample. No overall differences were found in either academic performance or grade lag, between students who were active in school activities and those who were not. This was the only study encountered in this review that tried to determine the effect of recreation on Native American subjects, as opposed to describing the nature of Native American recreation.

The Anthropological Focus on Play

Though Native Americans have been one of the most studied groups in cultural research, particularly by anthropologists, recreation and leisure have not received much attention (Chick, 1995). Little has changed since Woodward and Woodward (1970) made a similar observation introducing their work on the leisure time use of the Plains Cree. Rather, the focus has been on play and specific forms of play like sport and games. Anthropologists focus on description of what is termed expressive culture, and then seek to make connections between these and larger generalizations about the culture under study (Norbeck, 1977). Often this analysis seeks to identify the function of play in each society.

For example, in a recent look at the play of the Mescalero Apache, Farrer (1990) sought to categorize play as forms of communication. She suggested there were four types of play: parent-child, between lovers, as a prank, or functionless free play. Perhaps of greater interest to cross-cultural leisure research were some of the behavioral patterns she identified as she moved toward her conclusions. She saw that, in general, winning and losing were largely irrelevant, verbal interaction was minimal, no advice or correction was called out, and that playmates were more often than not kin. These observed behaviors echo, in part, some of the earlier values discussion of this paper.

Ager (1977) sought to find reflections of cultural values in the games of Eskimo [Inuit] children. She found valued traits of self-reliance and independence tempered with a strong group solidarity. The competition in games was characterized by everyone trying to do their best, but not at others' expense. At their summer games everyone who played an activity received a prize. There was almost no aggression, even in games that were based on causing extreme discomfort to one's opponent, such as mouth pulling.

Another study of Inuit youth, albeit not focused directly on leisure or play, concluded that sports have become an integral part of adolescent life (Condon, 1988). There was an increased emphasis on competition in teenage sports throughout the Arctic, especially among boys who spent a great deal of their time engaged in team sports. The researcher attributed the competitive increase to exposure to United States and southern Canada produced television shows. Girls' play, though increased in amount, did not

display the same competitiveness. They played in a smaller group, and in a more spontaneous, less highly organized way.

Further study of the numerous anthropological collections on play (Lancy & Tindall, 1977; Norbeck & Farrer, 1979; Schwartzman, 1978) may be fruitful for leisure researchers, especially regarding attitudes that may be generalized to outdoor forms of recreation. However, two limitations are present. First, anthropologists rarely include much of what is considered outdoor recreation in form in their definitions of play. Where hunting and fishing, for example, are clearly seen as outdoor recreation by leisure researchers, they are viewed as primarily economic activities by anthropologists. Given that indigenous cultures did not categorize activity in that way, the identification of these as economic or play in form may be arbitrary. Anthropological literature on these activities, while extensive, may bear little that can be useful in furthering our understanding of recreation in Native American cultures. The second limitation is one of currency. Anthropology, like any discipline, goes through cycles in its interests. The study of play by anthropologists has, in fact, been in steady decline over the past years (Chick, 1995). The most recent flurry of anthropology-based play literature was in the late 1970s, prior to some extensive changes in Native America and in anthropological thought concerning research. Changes in Native America include the influx of gambling revenues, continued religious and language renewal, increased self-government and tribal controlled education. Anthropological interest in leisure may be on the rise again, with the recent establishment of the journal *Play and Culture.*

Parks, Protected Areas and Native Peoples

Parks and wilderness areas are recognized in Western societies as having purpose in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities. Native American attitudes toward and uses of these areas may provide some insight about their outdoor recreation beliefs and behaviors, given the lack of direct sources. One of the central features of wilderness and park areas in Western societies is an emphasis on environmental control, to produce "recreation opportunities" or maintain the purity of "wilderness." Although Native Americans have long had an impact on natural resources (White, 1992), the modern concept of management of nature, with its emphasis on control, runs counter to the traditional Native American ethics of harmony and inter relatedness (Grinde & Johansen, 1995; Jostad et al., 1996; Morrison, 1995). The idea of wilderness, in the establishment of sanctuaries, has considerable evidence in Native American history. Sanctuaries were often created for sacred ritualistic reasons, not for the Western ideals of preservation and recreation often attached to wilderness designation (Bierhorst, 1994).

In an early essay, Meeker, Woods and Lucas (1973) wrote that Native Americans show little enthusiasm for the national parks in the United States. Based on a review of Native American authors, they suggest this is due to Native Americans' original inclusion as potential exhibits in these parks,

along with the other elements of the wild. Native Americans often feel that "parks are places of humiliation" where they are "displayed and exploited" (p. 5). This belief is supported by Hodgins and Benidickson (1989) when they observe that "the familiar presence of the Temagami Indians became an essential part of the popular vision of Temagami [Ontario Wilderness Park] as a wilderness area of adventure and escape" (p. 220). Meeker et al. also postulate that, because of differing values concerning nature, many Native Americans do not need parks to satisfy the same set of cultural needs as those of European ancestry. These European cultural needs include a reaffirmation of human worth and purity and a sense that nature needs protecting.

Dasmann (1976), using his earlier discussed differentiation of peoples, says that biosphere people create parks while ecosystem people traditionally lived in the equivalent of a park. The American parks resulted from a biosphere people coveting an ecosystem people's area, and then removing and marginalizing the residents (Clay, 1985; Greenberg, 1985). In another article (1982) Dasmann recognizes that,

> Most of the land Western societies designate as formal wilderness or set aside in national parks is passed on to us by people who considered it to be, in part at least, their homeland. . . . We consider it to be of national park quality because they did not treat it the way we have treated land. (p. 668)

This homeland idea is found as one of the central differences in Sanders' (1990) comparative study of tribal managed parks and federally managed parks on Native American lands in the Southwest.

Reflection on the two previous paragraphs may suggest reasons why Dragon and Ham (1986) report such low national park visitation by Native Americans in their comparative study of Nez Perces tribal members and Anglo-American residents of Idaho. This also indicates why their data more strongly support the ethnicity hypothesis over the marginality hypothesis in explaining attendance differences. These hypotheses, first suggested by Washburne (1978), have since been used extensively by leisure researchers looking at cross-cultural issues to explain why minority behaviors may differ from the majority. Ethnicity would attribute differences to distinctive cultural beliefs, while marginality would contribute the same differences to economic and political disadvantage.

A look at Hultkrantz (1954), noted for his anthropological work on Native American belief systems, could suggest a further reason for Dragon and Ham's findings. Regarding Yellowstone National Park and Native American reluctance to visit or talk about the park, both at the time of its creation and afterward, Hultkrantz suggests religious reasons. His review of evidence concerning the "Summit of the World" (p. 41), as it is referred to by the Shoshone, concludes that visitation to the site by non-medicine people and discussion of the site with outsiders were both taboo. Designation of the mountainous park as sacred is consistent with White's observations concerning sacred site location (1992). Rudner (1994) gives a detailed discussion of

the present day issue of Native American sacred sites on federal and state park lands in the United States.

In his look at park and wilderness area creation in northern Canada, Sadler (1989) states that the traditional Native American response to establishment of these areas was negative. The setting of park boundaries was viewed as alienation from, rather than protection of the land. This idea of "taking something away" is supported by Clad (1984, p. 68) in his review of indigenous peoples' reactions to the establishment of a number of protected areas, and in Zivot's (1979) look at management issues pertaining to the creation of North Yukon Park Reserve. Though wilderness preservation can be seen as a central goal in both Native American land claims and the national parks movements, Sadler (1989) stresses they are based on different premises.

> One is based on an exclusive view of man's role in national parks—as a visitor who does not remain. The world view of indigenous peoples, by contrast, is based on a perception of themselves and their activities as part of rather than separate from the natural environment. (p. 193)

Another illustrative case of these differences can be seen in Lawson (1985), and his review of the impact of Auyuittuq National Park on Baffin Island. Lawson found that the local Inuit referred to the park as "the place where whiteman comes to play" (p. 54), while the Inuit spoke of having a significant personal and communal connection to the same land.

Another area of differences between Native Americans and the dominant Euro-American culture concerns the Native American desire to use national park and wilderness lands for traditional worship and hunting activities. Wilkinson (1993), documents the festering resentment some tribes in the lower forty-eight United States carry about insensitive treatment at the hands of federal land managers. Most tribes desire at least co-management of federally managed traditional lands. Many tribal societies from reservations near national parks have continued to use traditional spiritual sites, harvest native plants, and hunt within parks. Response by the National Park Service has been to initiate steps toward limited co-management, but the tribes involved want more, including allowed use of park resources. The different political contexts of the country of location is important when considering resource management issues. The differences between Canada and the United States in political systems, legal structures and treaty negotiations have a great deal to do with what can and cannot be done in resource management in each respective country.

More Native Americans have recently become involved in both park creation and management, especially in Canada and Alaska. Dearden and Rollins (1993) even suggest that Native Americans have supplanted environmentalists and entrepreneurs as the external group now exerting the strongest influence on park and wilderness area policy in Canada. Many new parks involve some negotiated continuance of Native American hunting and fishing rights (Griffth, 1987), even though such activities are often forbidden to

other visitors. Other recently designated Canadian national parks, such as South Moresby/Gwaii Hanaas and North Yukon would not have been created were it not for Native Americans exerting their influence through the use of the land claims process.

Conducting Research in Native American Communities

Given the general lack of leisure research presented in this review, it may be reasonable to expect some future research activity in Native American communities by leisure researchers. The experiences of other fields and warnings from Native Americans themselves should then be noted. In a special issue of *American Indian Quarterly*, Wax (1991) reports the results of a survey of both researchers and Native American communities involved in over 20 years of research. He focuses on the ethic of non-interference valued in many Native American cultures, and stresses the importance of confidentiality, the difficulties in gaining informed consent, and the paramount consideration of community well-being. Wax also stresses how important it is for the researcher to become involved in the community and to insure that local and immediate benefits accrue from his/her presence on the reservation. This benefit must not be simply utilitarian, as it is with most research subjects, but must be based on the establishment of a relationship and subsequent exchange of promises. Finally, he repeatedly recommends the ideal situation of joint-planning and reporting of the research, especially given that researchers need the validation of cultural experts and the communities require the outside research skills of the researcher.

In the same issue, noted Lakota scholar Vine Deloria (1991) lists four general recommendations: First, the researcher must establish a precise identity in the community. Second, the project must come from expressed community need, and not be simply for replication purposes. Third, the most important task is to establish relationships, even if scientific objectivity seems compromised. Finally, researchers must remember that the community members, not the researchers, are the authorities on their own culture. To indicate otherwise is a sign of disrespect.

Echoing many of these earlier recommendations, Mihesuah (1993) gives ten suggested guidelines for scholars conducting research on Native Americans. The following guidelines would apply to leisure researchers who hope to avoid the animosity generated by earlier researchers from other disciplines:

1. Only the tribe's elected political and religious leadership should review and approve research.
2. Researchers must remain sensitive to economic, social, physical, psychological, religious and general welfare of individuals and the culture. Often the tribe's view of these may not coincide with the prevailing view of the academic community.
3. Lengthen preparation time to months and years to allow for the slower decision making mechanisms of some tribal traditions.

4. Use extreme caution with cameras and tape recorders.
5. Ensure that informants receive fair and appropriate return, as determined jointly by tribal members and the researcher.
6. Communicate the anticipated consequences of the research to all affected.
7. Make every attempt possible to cooperate with the host society.
8. Have the tribe's elected representatives and religious leaders review the results.
9. Ideally, Native Americans should be the ones contracted to conduct research in their own communities.
10. Follow these guidelines for each new research project in a community.

Lessons have been learned from the leisure research that has been conducted in Native American communities, though most of these lessons are centered on political and cultural awareness rather than method, per se. Sanders (1990) emphasizes the need for cultural sensitivity, especially with regard to the diversity that may be present within tribal communities. He also stresses the knowledge of history of the people, especially concerning past dealings with governments, and political climate. Lastly, he cautions that tribal members must be fully informed of and be given time to consider any research being conducted in their community. Berg (1990) also stresses these same recommendations, but emphasizes the reciprocal nature of his research in the *Nuu-chah-nulth* community. He used "respondent consultation" as an additional data source, incorporating comments by community members into the data and subsequent analysis.

Some guidance concerning methods can be derived from the few outdoor recreation studies conducted in Native America. Those studies with considerable success in response all used personal, semi-structured interviews (Berg, 1990; Jostad et al., 1996; McDonough & Pancner, 1982; Sanders, 1990). This contrasts sharply with the zero percent response rate encountered by Zivot (1979), from his mail survey to northern Native communities in Canada. He was then forced to rely on secondary anthropological data to contrast with the responses from his survey of white recreationists who visited the parks in question. Jostad et al. (1996) found that a pre-set, formal list of interview questions for her qualitative study was inappropriate, as it assumed too much knowledge of Native American worldview on the part of the researchers. They used the initial protocols only as an outline or guide and relied heavily on the respondent to guide how the research questions would be approached.

In a portion of their conclusion, Grinde and Johansen (1995), (the former author a Yamasee Indian), discuss at length why qualitative methodologies may have greater acceptance in Native American communities. They state, "Essentially in the Native American world, finding out what is going on is more important than 'explaining' what happened" (p. 274). Native communities often prefer methods that are tentative and process oriented,

because that is closer to how Native Americans believe the world operates. Traditional learning in these communities values observation of natural phenomena and careful listening to those with direct experience.

Two theoretical pieces in the *Annual Review of Sociology* give further direction to researchers who are contemplating conducting research with Native Americans. Snipp (1992), commenting on social research on Native Americans, stresses two theoretical issues. First, the boundaries of Native American cultures and communities are fluid, with high degrees of intermarriage but not necessarily corresponding assimilation. This results in extreme internal diversity within community populations. Secondly, he suggests that an internal colonialism model may be more appropriate when studying reservation communities rather than an acculturation model. Porter and Washington (1993) echo this internal colonialism notion, but also suggest other theoretical revisions. They argue that assimilation should be viewed not as a single continuum, but rather as pluralistic in nature, with the possibility that individuals can simultaneously carry two or more cultural identities. The situation often dictates which is stronger at any one time. They also suggest testing of other probable theories such as ethnic negotiation and competition, relative deprivation, and alienation, all the while stressing the important difference of race and ethnicity when constructing theory. These comments are similar to those made in the recreation literature by Allison (1988) and Hutchison (1988).

A final recommendation, again more theoretical than methodological, comes from Stanfield and Dennis (1993). They warn against two fallacies. The first is that cultural communities are homogeneous and possess an internal sameness. The second is that they are monolithic, and that each individual has only one identity.

Conclusion

This literature review suggests a number of implications for leisure research. Eight will be discussed here.

First, the theoretical polarity of ethnicity or marginality, as causal explanations for leisure behavior, seem premature. There needs to be more descriptive data upon which to base tentative theories. Efforts should be made to discuss causal factors for leisure behaviors with Native American respondents themselves, in exploratory qualitative research, to identify more culturally sensitive or emic theories.

Second, there should be further exploration of the literature on pan-Indian traits and values, to see which may be reflected in behavioral and attitudinal differences in leisure. Such pervasive worldview elements including the sacredness of all things, the inseparableness from nature, the strong sense of place, the cyclical nature of existence, and the importance of the spoken word, may well be found in leisure as well.

Third, these same worldview elements will influence not only the data collected concerning leisure, but also the success of varying methods used

to collect it. Given preference for the spoken word, the spiritual nature of interaction with people and the land, the sense of interrelationships, and the meaning given to sense of place, it appears that qualitative methods will be more successful at answering the questions discussed here. Careful accommodation of the desires of Native American communities, ensuring they see purpose and benefits in each study, will also increase chances for research success.

Fourth, based on recent recommendations by Chick (1995), some effort should be made to utilize anthropological study of both play and outdoor activities, in such a way as to make them meaningful within leisure studies constructs. The focus on form, while contrary to the psycho-social conceptualization of leisure dominant in the recreation literature, is rich in detail on myriad Native American cultures. Models should be developed to allow such data to shed light on problems of leisure researchers. The attention to function in the examination of culturally based activity also warrants exploration. Researchers may find that many activities that have primarily recreative functions in Euro-American cultures, do not in Native American cultures. The possibility of multiple functions for activities must also be considered, in light of the pervasive inter-connectedness and non-compartmentalization of Native American worldview.

Fifth, leisure researchers should consider the implications of Gallagher's (1993) assertion that Native Americans have a special bond to the land; that they are "hooked on the deep, subtle satisfactions this environmental relationship provides" (p. 206). Many leisure researchers tend to think of the leisure experience as being a product of activity and setting, but without the consideration that setting may override activity, in effect, due to the person's relationship with the setting. Human-human relationships are complex; can human-land ones be any less so? Perhaps the examination of sense of place by the leisure research field, spawned in part by the work of humanistic geographers, should focus on indigenous peoples with their lengthier cultural relationships with specific pieces of North American lands.

Sixth, there is a need for more research of Native American leisure. This is particularly true regarding outdoor recreation. Little resolution of the dearth of outdoor recreation research identified by Scholer (1986) as part of *The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors,* seems to have occurred. At present there is little descriptive research to support assumptions of differences between Native and non-Native Americans in outdoor recreation activity participation patterns and leisure styles. A broad range of indigenous cultures should be studied to determine what recreation patterns emerge that can be claimed to represent Native Americans as a whole, and what others differ from culture to culture. At the very least, demographic data based on self-identification of Native American identity should be included on all surveys of park and wilderness area usage. Ideally, such identification should allow the respondent to clarify further what specific Native American culture they represent, like what is presently being attempted with Hispanic Americans (Ewert et al., 1993).

Seventh, all efforts to pursue research in Native American communities must take into account the historical relationships between aboriginal peoples and both government and the research community. It would be naive to expect that the way federal, state and provincial lands were obtained for park and wilderness area creation would not affect how Native people feel toward and interact with these lands, and feel toward and interact with government employees and researchers. Some have claimed that past research in Native American communities was motivated by the political intentions of the sponsoring governmental agencies as well as scientific inquiry (Deloria, 1991). This historical context for research continues with the present political and legal struggles over access to sacred sites and reservation land recovery still influencing Native American beliefs and behaviors.

Finally, as the leisure research field increasingly studies the leisure values and behaviors of Native Americans, it should heed both the warnings from and lessons learned by other disciplines, and its own pioneering researchers. It is a worthy pursuit of a perspective increasingly seen as valuable, but it must be done well, and in ways that honor and respect Native American values.

References

Ager, L. (1977). The reflection of cultural values in Eskimo children's games. In D. Lancy & B. Tindall (Eds.), *The Study of play: Problems and prospects.* West Point, NY: Leisure Press. 92-97.

Allison, M. (1988). Breaking boundaries and barriers: Future directions in cross-cultural research. *Leisure Sciences, 10,* 247-259.

Barta, A. (1976). Selected recreational activity preferences of selected Native American high school students. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Utah. *Psychological research on American Indian and Alaskan native youth: An indexed guide to recent dissertations.* 1984. (Ed.) S. Manson et al. Connecticut: Greenwood. 17.

Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research, 12*(1), 20-33.

Beck, P., Walters, A., & Francisco, N. (1992). *The sacred: Ways of knowledge, sources of life.* Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.

Berg, L. (1990). *Aboriginal people, aboriginal rights and protected areas: An investigation of the relationship between Nuu-chah-nulth people and Pacific Rim National Park Reserve.* Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

Bierhorst, J. (1994). *The way of the earth: Native America and the environment.* New York: William Morrow & Co.

Brown, J. E. (1976). The roots of renewal. In W. Capps (Ed), *Seeing with a Native Eye* (pp. 25-34). Salt Lake City, UT: University Press.

Carr, D., & Williams, D. (1991). *Outdoor Recreation and Ethnic Group Membership: A Literature Review.* Unpublished report. U.S.D.A. Forest Service and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. PSW-90-0030CA.

Champagne, D. (Ed). (1994). *Native America: Portrait of the peoples.* Detroit, MI: Visible Ink Press.

Chick, G. (1995). The anthropology of leisure: Past, present and future research. In L. Barnett (Ed.), *Research About leisure: Past, present and future* (pp. 45-65). Champaigne, IL: Sagamore.

Clad, J. (1984). Conservation and indigenous peoples: A study of convergent interests. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 8*(4), 68-73.

Clay, J. (1985). Parks and people. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 9*(1), 2-5.

Coldevin, G. & Wilson, T. (1985). Effects of a decade of satellite television in the Canadian arctic: Euro-Canadian and Inuit adolescents compared. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 16*(3), 329-354.

Cole, D. (1993). Recreation practices of the Stoney of Alberta and Mohawk of the Six Nation Confederacy. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 18*(2), 103-114.

Condon, R.G. (1988). *Inuit youth: Growth and change in the Canadian arctic.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Da, P. (1970). Indian values. *The Living Wilderness, 34*(109), 25-26.

Dasmann, R. (1982). The relationship between protected areas and indigenous peoples. In J. McNeely & K. Miller (Eds.), *National parks, conservation and development: The role of protected areas in sustaining society* (pp. 667-671). Proceedings of the 1982 World Congress on National Parks. Washington, DC: Smithsonian.

Dasmann, R. (1976). National parks, nature conservation and future primitive. *The Ecologist, 6*(5), 164-172.

Dearden, P. & Rollins, R. (Ed). (1993). *Parks and protected areas in Canada: Planning and management.* Don Mills, ONT: Oxford University Press.

Deloria, V. (1991). Commentary: Research, Redskins and reality. *American Indian Quarterly, 15,* 457-468.

Dewall, B. (1984). Leisure satisfaction profiles of selected American Indians, Anglo Americans and Hispanic Americans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of New Mexico. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45*(2), 639A.

Dragon, C. & Ham, S. (1986). Native American under representation in national parks: Tests of the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses. In USDI National Park Service (Ed). *Program Abstracts of the 1st National Symposium on Social Science in Resource Management.* Corvallis, OR: National Park Service & Oregon St. University.

Ewert, A., Chavez, D., & Magill, W. (Ed). (1993). *Culture, conflict and communication in the wildland-urban interface.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Farrer, C. (1990). *Play and inter-ethnic communication: A practical Ethnography of the Mescalero Apache.* New York: Garland.

Farris, F. (1975). Sex and cultural effects on the individual play behavior of young children. In S. Manson (Ed.). *Psychological research on American Indian and Alaskan Native youth: An indexed guide to recent dissertations.* Connecticut: Greenwood. 20.

Flannery, R. (1937). Some aspects of James Bay recreative culture. *Primitive Man, 9,* 49-56.

Fowler, L. (1987). *Shared symbols, contested meanings: Gros Ventre culture and history 1778-1984.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell.

Gallagher, W. (1993). *The Power of place: How our surroundings shape our thoughts, emotions and actions.* New York: Poseidon.

Greenberg, A. (1985). Game conservation and Native Peoples in Northern Ontario. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 9*(1), 26-30.

Griffith, R. (1987). Northern park development: The case of Snowdrift. *Alternatives, 14*(1), 26-30.

Grinde, D. & Johansen, B. (1995). *Ecocide of Native America: Environmental destruction of Indian lands and peoples.* Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.

Hodgins, B. & Benidickson, J. (1989). *The Temagami experience: Recreation, resources and aboriginal rights in the northern Ontario wilderness.* Toronto, ONT: University of Toronto.

Hollinshead, K. (1992). 'White' gaze, 'red' people-shadow visions: The disidentification of 'Indians' in cultural tourism. *Leisure Studies, 11,* 43-64.

Hultkrantz, A. (1954). The Indians and the wonders of Yellowstone: A study of the interrelations of religion, nature and culture. *Ethnos, 19*(1), 34-68.

Hutchison, R. (1988). A critique of race, ethnicity and social class in recent leisure-recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 20*(1), 10-30.

Jostad, P., McAvoy, L., & McDonald, D. (1996). Native American land ethics: Implications for natural resource management. *Society of Natural Resources,* 9, 565-581.

Kraus, R. (1994). *Leisure in a changing America: Multicultural perspectives.* New York: McMillan.

Lancy, D. & Tindall, B.A. (Ed). (1977). *The study of play: Problems and prospects.* West Point, NY: Leisure Press.

Lawson, N. (1985). Where whitemen come to play. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 9*(1), 54-56.

Locust, C. (1988). Wounding the spirit: Discrimination & traditional American Indian belief systems. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3), 315-329.

Malloy, D. (1991). Cross-cultural awareness in administration: An interview with Harold Cardinal. *Recreation Canada.* July. 40-44.

Malloy, D., Nilson, R., & Yoshioka, C. (1993). The Impact of culture upon the administrative process in sport and recreation: A Canadian Indian perspective. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 18*(2), 115-130.

McAllister, F. (1968). The Lakota Sioux: Their ceremonies and recreations. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. *Dissertation Abstracts, 29,* 1183A.

McCarty, J. (1971). A study of leisure activities of Taos Pueblo Indian children. Ph.D. dissertation. North Texas State University. In S. Manson (Ed.) *Psychological Research on American Indian and Alaskan Native Youth: An Indexed Guide to Recent Dissertations.* 1984. Connecticut: Greenwood.27.

McDonough, M. & Pancner, C. (1982). Use of urban recreation resources by Native Americans. *Abstracts from the 1982 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 104). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.

Meeker, J., Woods, W., & Lucas, W. (1973). Red, white and black in the national parks. *The North American Review.* Fall:3-7.

Mihesuah, D. (1993). Suggested guidelines for institutions with scholars who conduct research on American Indians. *American Indian Culture & Research Journal, 17*(3), 131-139.

Morrison, J. (1995). Aboriginal interests. In M. Rummel (Ed.). *Protecting Canada's endangered spaces: An owners manual* (pp. 18-26). Toronto, ONT: Keyporter.

Mrozek, D. (1983). Thoughts on indigenous western sport: Moving beyond the model of modernity. *Journal of the West. 22*(1), 3-9.

Norbeck, E. (1977). The Study of play-Johan Huizinga and Modern Anthropology. In D. Lancy & B. Tindall (Eds.). *The Study of Play: Problems and Prospects* (pp. 13-22). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.

Norbeck, E. & Farrer, C. (Ed). (1979). *Forms of play of Native North Americans.* St. Paul, MN: West.

Notzke, C. (1994). *Aboriginal peoples and natural resources in Canada.* North York, ONT: Captus.

Picken, K. (1992). *The meaning of leisure to Native Manitobans: A case study of South Indian Lake.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

Pittman, A. (1972). Recreational activities instrumental to expressed life goals of San Carlos teenage Apaches. In S. Manson, (Ed.) *Psychological Research on American Indian and Alaskan Native Youth: An Indexed Guide to Recent Dissertations,* (p. 31). 1984. Connecticut: Greenwood.

Porter, J. & Washington, R. (1993). Minority identity and self-esteem. *Annual Review of Sociology, 19,* 139-161.

Reid, D. (1993). Recreation and social development in Ontario First Nation communities. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 18*(2), 87-102.

Ross, R. (1992). *Dancing with a ghost: Exploring Indian reality.* Markham, ONT: Octopus.

Rudner, R. (1994). Sacred geographies. *Wilderness, 58*(206), 10-28.

Sadler, B. (1989). National parks, wilderness preservation and Native Peoples in Northern Canada. *Natural Resources Journal, 29*(1), 185-204.

Sanders, J. (1990). *Tribal and national parks on American Indian lands.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arizona, Tucson.

Scholer, E.A. (1986). Native Americans. In, U. S. Dept of Interior, (1986), *A literature review: The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors,* (pp. 99-101). Washington, DC: U.S. Dept of Interior.

Schwartzman, H. (Ed). (1978). *Play and Culture.* West Point, NY: Leisure Press.

Simcox, D. (1993). Cultural foundations for leisure preference, behavior and environmental orientation. In A. Ewert, D. Chavez, & A. Magill (Eds.). *Culture, Conflict and Communication in the Wildland-Urban Interface,* (pp. 267-280). San Francisco, CA: Westview.

Snipp, M. (1992). Sociological perspectives on American Indians. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18,* 351-371.

Stairs, A., & Wenzel, G. (1992). "I am I and the environment": Inuit hunting, community and identity. *Journal of Indigenous Studies, 3*(1), 1-12.

Stanfield, J., & Dennis, R. (Ed.) (1993). *Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Toelken, B. (1976). Seeing with a native eye: How many sheep will it hold? In W. Capps (Ed.), *Seeing with a Native Eye* (pp. 9-24). Salt Lake City, UT: University Press.

U.S. Department of Education (1990). Percentage of eighth graders participating this year in outside-school activities. In (authors) *A Profile of the American Eighth Grader* (p. 55). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Van der Wal, H. (1989). Recreation and education achievement: A case study among Cree and Saulteaux Indians in Saskatchewan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Colorado State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International.* 49/10A.

Washburne, R. (1978). Black under-participation in wildland recreation: Alternative explanations. *Leisure Sciences, 1*(2), 175-189.

Wax, M. (1991). The ethics of research in American Indian communities. *American Indian Quarterly, 15,* 431-456.

Wax, R., & Thomas, R. (1961). American Indians and White people. *Phylon, 22*(4), 305-316.

White, R. (1992). Indian land use and the National Forests. In H. Steen (Ed.), *The Origins of the National Forests* (pp. 173-179). Durham, NC: Forest History Society.

Wilkinson, T. (1993). Ancestral lands: Native Americans seek to restore treaty rights to worship and hunt in many national parks. *National Parks, 67*(7-8), 31-35.

Woodward, J., & Woodward, V. (1970). A leisure time activity of the Plains Cree. *Anthropological Journal of Canada, 8*(4), 29-31.

Zivot, L. (1979). *Management issues pertaining to the use of northern national parks: A case study of the North Yukon.* Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, Edmunton, Alberta, Canada.