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Research on race and ethnicity in leisure will take on greater significance in coming years. The purpose of this study was to systematically examine research related to race and ethnicity within five major leisure journals since their inception to discern quantity of research, thematic patterns in topical areas and to document the research methods used. This assessment identified 150 articles related to race and ethnicity. Nineteen thematic categories were identified. Articles with conceptual discussions, activity and participation studies, and outdoor recreation/forest-based recreation occurred most frequently. Similar to other analyses of the literature, survey research was the most frequently used method of data collection. The discussion focuses on implications for future research on race and ethnicity in leisure studies.
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Introduction

The significant accumulation of social science research on race and ethnicity in leisure make it possible to discern trends in research foci and methodologic approaches. In recent years, several comprehensive literature reviews on race, ethnicity and leisure in book chapters (Gramann & Allison, 1999; Hutchison, 2000; Stodolkas & Yi-Kook, 2005), government publications (Floyd, 1999; Gramann, 1996; Rodriguez & Roberts, 2002), and in peer-reviewed journals (Allison, 1988; Floyd, 1998; Hutchison, 1988) have appeared as well as special issues on race/ethnicity and closely related topics. The increased scholarship devoted to race and ethnicity issues in leisure studies journals also attests to growing and sustained interest in an underdeveloped topical area within the leisure studies literature (Shinew et al., 2004).
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North America has become a more ethnically and racially diverse society. These changes underscore the salience of race and ethnicity within the political and social landscape. In the U.S., census projections indicate that Hispanic Americans, African Americans, and other minority subpopulations will draw equal in number with non-Hispanic White American around 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). In California and Texas, two of the U.S. most populous states, non-Hispanic whites are no longer the majority population. Moreover, several of the nation’s largest cities can be characterized as “minority-majority” cities as racial and ethnic minority populations outnumber non-Hispanic Whites in the population.

Outside the U.S., challenges arise from increasing complexities created by global social change. For example, Pettigrew (1998) noted that two major intergroup trends—massive migration, where a large proportion of the world’s population lives outside its country of origin, and increased group conflict have resulted in more press coverage filling the media across the world. For instance, Stodolska and Walker (in press) note that minority populations in Canada are growing at a significant rate. They report that visible minorities (those not identified as white) increased from 4.7% in 1981 to 13.4% in 2001. Similar to the U.S., larger metropolitan areas show higher concentrations of minority populations.

Outside of North America Western European governments have also engaged in controversial policy debates relating to refugee and deportation policies (Fekete, 2005). The intensity of ethnic tensions and rioting in England has grown to the point where a National Commission on Integration and Cohesion was recently established to find ways to bridge divides between the white and Asian Muslim communities (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006). These situations highlight the importance of research addressing pertinent social issues related to immigrant and ethnic communities. Scholars will continue to be challenged to provide relevant social science research for managing leisure services and environments in an ever increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-racial society.

Scholarship on race/ethnicity in leisure will also be challenged to keep pace with changes in disciplinary approaches to the study of race and ethnicity. As conceptualizations of race and ethnicity have evolved over the course of the 20th century, Hutchison (2000) argued that this evolution is not reflected in leisure research. He highlighted major shifts in sociological paradigms on race and ethnicity including class-based theories, ethnicity, and assimilation theories to more recent articulations of racial formation and identity-based theories.

Being aware of and engaging alternative disciplinary perspectives is important in two respects. First, developments in multiple base disciplines potentially broadens an understanding of leisure and race/ethnicity by offering
general theory and concepts to be applied in leisure settings. Second, as an applied field, leisure research can highlight how aspects of general theories play out within the domain of leisure in every day life. Related to this, the research community remains challenged to translate the body of knowledge for graduate and under-graduate education, i.e., the future front-line providers and managers of leisure services. Given such challenges, systematic examination of the body of knowledge on race and ethnicity in leisure studies is needed.

Thus, the purpose of this article is to examine research about race and ethnicity in five major leisure studies journals since their inception to discern thematic patterns in topical areas and to document research methods used. In short, this article addresses what has been studied, how research has been conducted, and discusses why certain topics are studied and why certain methods are used. Implications are drawn for both research and practice. First, this article measures the extent of research on race and ethnicity in the selected journals. Results are reported by year and by journal. Next, a content analysis was used to identify research themes and methods used in race/ethnicity in leisure literature. Findings are discussed with a view toward making recommendations for future research topics, recommending methodological alternatives, and suggesting possibilities for connecting the subfield to practitioners and broader social policy concerns.

This analysis follows several previous periodic empirical assessments of the overall leisure studies literature (e.g., Jackson, 2004; Samdahl & Kelly, 1999; Van Doren, Holland, & Crompton, 1984), methodologic and theory reviews (Henderson, 1994; Henderson, Presley, & Bialeschki, 2004) and analyses of gender in leisure studies (Henderson, 1990; Henderson, Hodges & Kivel, 2002). To date, no systematic assessment of the race/ethnicity and leisure literature has been published. As Jackson (2004) has summarized, systematic reviews of the literature serve to identify trends and assess contributions, synthesize findings, and set directions for future research.

Background to This Study

Research on race and ethnicity in leisure studies attracts frequent criticism. In general, the sub-field has is often described as limited in quantity, lacking in theory, disconnected from parent disciplines, and narrow in its focus on select topics and racial and ethnic groups (Allison, 1988; Floyd, 1998; Hutchison, 2000; Stodolska, 2000). However, these critiques have not been accompanied by a systematic empirical analysis of the literature. By conducting a systematic empirical review, a more objective statement on the state of the literature can be offered on at least three levels. First, an examination of the quantity of articles published can assess the extent leisure scholarship is engaged with social issues involving race and ethnicity. For example, recent ethnic tensions in Britain offer a compelling example: specifically how are racial and ethnic tensions surrounding Asian immigrants (young, male Muslims in particular) manifested in leisure and sport? Re-
search attention to these and other social issues gives a sense of how connected the race/ethnicity subfield is to broader social problems.

Second, an analysis of themes can also expose gaps and omissions in the literature. At the same time, areas of significant accumulation and well-defined subtopical areas can be identified. Obviously, gaps and omissions can suggest directions for future work by facilitating focused strategies for conducting future research. Ultimately, research directions can impact how managers and policy makers frame issues related to race and ethnicity. For example, research on place meanings among Native Americans and First Nation people (Dustin, Schneider, McAvoy, & Frakt, 2002; McDonald & McAvoy, 1997) has provided essential context for managing conflict over contested areas in national parks.

Last, an examination of research methods documents how studies have been conducted and their sources of data. An assessment of methods allows for evaluation of findings and conclusions drawn from the literature. If the majority of studies are based on ethnographic in-depth interviews, for instance, the literature could be described as contextually rich, but lacking in inferential statistical support. Likewise, if the literature is based primarily on large scale survey research, data on local contexts will be lacking. From this analysis of methods a perspective can be offered on how methods have structured the literature and what methodological strategies are needed to advance the literature.

Methods

Selection of Articles

Five major leisure studies journals (Leisure Sciences, Leisure Studies, Journal of Leisure Research, Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, and Loisir et Societe) were canvassed to identify articles presenting research dealing with race and ethnicity. These journals represent the primary outlets for social science research on parks, recreation and leisure studies over the last several decades. An article was included in this review if (a) it focused entirely or primarily on race and/or ethnicity, where race or ethnicity was a central independent variable; (b) the subject of the analysis (conceptual or empirical) focused on specific racial or ethnic groups or racial or ethnic dynamics (e.g., discrimination, acculturation, etc.) or included comparisons by race and/or ethnicity; or (c) keywords lists for the articles contained the terms race and ethnicity. For example, the review includes studies of racial differences in leisure preferences, conceptual discussions of discrimination models, the impact of race in organizational contexts, and literature reviews. Examples of studies and topics that were omitted include investigations of cross-national comparisons or cultural studies without a race or ethnic dimension.

The underlying goal was to identify those articles that revealed how race and ethnicity have been studied in the leisure studies’ journals. It should be stated from the outset that this paper is not designed to provide a commen-
tary of what is an “appropriate” amount of research on this issue as that would be a total misrepresentation of the point of this discussion. A numerical figure of the number of articles cannot adequately assess the relationship between leisure research and the study of race and ethnicity within the field. However, measuring research output as well as examining the focus of the research does provide an indication as to how the field has pursued particular research agendas involving race and ethnicity. It should be noted that while this review focuses on race and ethnicity it did not intend to treat these terms as interchangeable as has been done in past research (Floyd, 1998; Hutchison, 1988). Given the relatively small size of the literature base, all articles with our keywords and criteria were used in the analysis to allow for a more substantive literature analysis. A complete list of articles selected by the authors is available upon request.

Analysis

The analysis of trends in research on race and ethnicity involved three steps. First, the extent race and ethnicity have been studied was examined by providing a numerical count of the total number of articles published in each journal. A count of articles relative to the total number of articles published in each journal was also provided (see Table 1). Second, a content analysis of the selected articles was conducted to identify research themes. This was a multi-step procedure following classical content analysis protocols (Ryan & Bernard, 2000) in that the two authors reviewed all the articles separately and identified a list of themes. As Ryan and Bernard (2000) pointed out, coding of texts using a content analysis procedure is assigned to more than one individual to see whether constructs are shared and whether different raters can apply the same codes. Subsequently, the results from this independent analysis were checked for agreement. Thus, the authors came to an agreement relating to a final list of relevant themes. With

| Journal of Leisure Research | 57 | 1005 | 5.7% |
| Leisure Studies             | 25 | 517  | 4.8% |
| Leisure Sciences            | 40 | 578  | 6.9% |
| Loisir et Societe           | 12 | 688  | 1.7% |
| Journal of Park and Recreation Administration | 16 | 581  | 2.8% |
| Total                      | 150 | 3369 | 4.5% |

**TABLE 1**

*Comparison of the Number of Articles on Race and Ethnicity as a Percentage of the Total Number of Articles Published Per Journal*
this final list each author conducted another independent content analysis for theme identification and article placement and surveyed articles were placed in non-exclusive thematic categories. Therefore many articles were placed in more than one thematic category in order to maintain the integrity of the article’s focus. After the list of articles was thematically coded by the two authors, their list was checked by a third reviewer. The agreement ranged from a low of 77% (Leisure Studies) to a high of 100% (Journal of Park and Recreation Administration). The list of themes from each journal are shown in Table 2. The final procedure involved a content analysis of research methods (e.g., method of data collection, type of design and analysis) used in the studies (see Table 3).

Results

Number of Articles

Of 3,369 articles published in the journals from their inception through 2005, 150 or 4.5% have race or ethnicity as a major focus of the research (Table 1). Leisure Sciences and the Journal of Leisure Research have published a greater percentage of articles focused in this area than the other three. Within the Journal of Leisure Research, about 6% (5.7) of the total number of published article deal specifically with race or ethnicity and 7% of articles published in Leisure Sciences focus on race and ethnicity. This reflects the relative longevity of these journals. The Journal of Leisure Research commenced in 1969 and Leisure Sciences in 1978. Both journals have devoted special issues related to the topic (the Journal of Leisure Research in 1993 and 1998; Leisure Sciences in 2002 and 2005). Leisure Studies, a British based journal, had 25 articles that focused on race/ethnicity. This journal also devoted a special issue in 1997 entitled “a Black Perspective” which examined prominent issues facing the black population within the sport and leisure field. Both Loisir et Societe and the Journal of Park and Recreation Administration had fewer articles that concentrated on this issue. Neither of these journals had a special issue focusing on race and ethnicity. Of the total number of articles on race/ethnicity, articles in the Journal of Leisure Research account for over a third (38%) of articles published.

Research Themes

Nineteen thematic categories resulted from the content analysis (Table 2). Readers should keep in mind that the thematic categories are unique to this study and that the categories are not mutually exclusive. A brief description of each category is provided below:

- Neighborhood/community-based leisure: Studies with a focus on issues related to leisure opportunities within local communities and neighborhoods that directly affect minorities. Examples include access to urban parks or factors that affect minorities’ participation in recreation within their community (e.g., Ho et al., 2005; Outley & Floyd, 2002).
### TABLE 2
Articles on Race and Ethnicity Categorized by Predominant Themes from Five Major Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood/community based leisure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation &amp; forest recreation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial interaction/race relations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic identity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentaries/theoretical discussions of race/ethnicity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity participation &amp; preferences and leisure behavior</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; race issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, youth &amp; race</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived benefits, motivations &amp; leisure meanings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; program delivery/managerial issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; social justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport sociology &amp; race/ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity and travel/ tourism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity, health and wellness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults and race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity and social class</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey (telephone &amp; mail)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site survey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review/</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/content analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding errors.
Outdoor/Park & Forest-based Recreation: Research on racial and ethnic variation in outdoor recreation participation, use of natural parks, and forest settings is included in this category (e.g., Johnson & Bowker, 1999; Thapa, Graefe, & Absher, 2002).

Interracial interaction/race relations: This category captures those studies examining racism and discrimination. Also, included were articles on interracial interaction during leisure or implications of interracial interaction on leisure experiences (e.g., Floyd & Shinew, 1999; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; Philipp, 1999; West, 1989).

Racial/ethnic identity: Studies involving the concepts of assimilation and acculturation and their influence on leisure choices were included in this category. This category also encompasses studies of how leisure relates to ethnic and racial identity (e.g., Stodolska, 1998; Walker, Deng & Dieser, 2001).

Immigration: Included under this theme are studies of leisure experiences of single immigrant groups. This theme also includes comparisons of post-immigration leisure experiences across different immigrant groups (e.g., Stodolska & Yi, 2003; Taylor, 2001).

Commentaries/theoretical discussions: This category included articles containing theoretical discussions, model development, literature reviews, invited essays, and commentaries. Articles in this category did not contain empirical analyses (e.g., Gomez, 2002; Hutchison, 1988; King, 2004).

Activity participation/leisure preferences & behavior: Articles in this category focused primarily on describing differences in activities and preferences. This theme also included demand or projection models where race/ethnicity was a central focus of the research (e.g., Murdock, Backman, & Hoque, 1991; Stamps & Stamps, 1985).

Gender and race: This category focused on articles relating to the interaction of race and gender, or articles that focused on the leisure of women belonging to a particular racial or ethnic minority group (e.g., Arnold & Shinew, 1998; Shinew, Floyd, McGuire, & Noe, 1995).

Children/youth and leisure: This category included articles whose primary focus or study population consisted of children, youth or adolescents who belonged to a particular racial or ethnic population (e.g., Busser, Hyams, & Carruthers, 1996; Philipp, 1999).

Perceived benefits, motivation and leisure meanings: Research in this group of articles investigated questions related to perceived social-psychological benefits, motivations, or meanings associated with leisure experiences. Articles where perceived benefits were treated as dependent variables were also placed in this category (e.g., Ho et al., 2005; Shaull & Gramann, 1998).

Constraints: This theme included articles on the constraints of racial or ethnic minority populations, or comparisons between racial/ethnic groups. Articles were limited to studies of constraints as conceptualized in the current paradigm of constraints research (e.g., Shinew, Floyd, & Parry, 2004; Stodolska, 1998).
• **Services and program delivery/managerial issues:** Included under this theme are articles which focused primarily on management issues, professional development, education, and program delivery. In general, these articles did not employ a theory or conceptual framework (e.g., Johnson & Bowker, 1999; McKinney & Collins, 1991).

• **Environmental/Social Justice:** This category captured articles with an explicit focus on environmental justice or social justice as they relate to outdoor recreation management and leisure services delivery (e.g., Allison, 2000; Floyd & Johnson, 2002; Tarrant & Cordell, 1999).

• **Leisure, sport, and race:** This group of studies examined how the issue of race and ethnicity affects issues within amateur and professional sport around the world (e.g., Hylton, 2005; Stodolska & Alexandris, 2004).

• **Race/ethnicity, travel and tourism:** Articles focused on ethnic/racial variation in travel patterns or involvement racial/ethnic minorities in travel and tourism services or development (e.g., Hollinshead, 1998; Phillip, 1993).

• **Physical activity, health, and wellness:** This theme included studies on physical activity and the unique issues facing minority populations and their health (e.g., Henderson & Ainsworth, 2001).

• **Aging/Older adults and race:** Articles in this category focused on issues relating to older adults who are also minorities (e.g., Allison & Geiger, 1993; Riddick & Stewart, 1994).

• **Research methods:** This thematic category included methodological based articles involving minorities. This could include scale development, or articles that discussed unique issues relating to research with minority populations (e.g., Barnett, 2005; Wicks & Norman, 1996).

• **Race/ethnicity and social class:** Articles in this category focused on interactions of race/ethnicity and social class. Studies that emphasized class in addition to race and ethnicity were also included in this category (e.g., Floyd et al., 1994; Shinew et al., 1996).

Across journals a clear pattern of themes emerged. Articles categorized as commentaries and theoretical discussions (39, or 12.5%) and studies on activity participation and preferences (37, 11.8%) were the most frequently studied themes. A second tier of studies consists of investigations of race/ethnic issues in outdoor recreation (29, 9.3%), interracial interaction and race relations (25, 8.0%), identity (20, 6.4%), constraints (23, 7.3%), and gender and race/ethnicity (20, 6.4%). A third tier of articles consists of studies involving neighborhood and community-based leisure (17, 5.4%), leisure meanings and benefits (15, 4.8%), children and youth development (14, 4.5%), sport (13, 4.2%), immigration (12, 3.8%), services and program delivery/managerial issues (12, 3.8%) and race and social class (11, 3.5%). These patterns reflect the evolution of the sub-field.

**Research Trends**

In early studies of race/ethnicity, activity participation was the primary dependent variable of interest. Concerns about racial inequality in the 1970s
translated into research on identifying disparities in activity participation and access to parks and other leisure opportunities between Whites and Black Americans. While empirical studies of earlier periods lacked strong conceptual foundations, Washburne’s (1978) seminal article on the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses provided a reference point for subsequent empirical studies and commentaries and critiques. Thus, there was substantial amount of work on differences in activity participation and preferences, testing the marginality/ethnicity framework, or reacting to the lack of theory or the marginality/ethnicity framework (Allison, 1988; Hutchison, 1988).

The second group reflects a shift in interest toward more diverse population groups, additional dependent variables, and innovation in theoretical frames and methodologic approaches. For example, the increasing presence of Hispanic Americans in parks and forests (e.g., Carr & Williams, 1993; Floyd & Gramann, 1993) created a need among recreation resource managers for research to understand more diverse outdoor recreation preferences. Studies employing alternative theoretical frameworks such as assimilation/acculturation (e.g., Carr & Williams, 1993; Floyd & Gramann, 1993), critical race theory (e.g., Hylton, 2005), perceived benefits, constraints, and social groups (e.g., Allison & Geiger, 1993; Arnold & Shinew, 1998) is evidence of interest in alternative theoretical approaches and a movement toward dependent variables beyond participation. Within the last group, the focus on immigration is a recent emerging theme (e.g., Stodolska & Alexandris, 2004; Stodolska & Yi, 2003).

Describing where articles on particular topics or themes are published also help characterize the state of the race/ethnicity literature. Even though the *Journal of Leisure Research* and *Leisure Sciences* have similar editorial policies, articles related to racial/ethnicity identity, immigration, children and youth, and environmental and social justice appeared less frequently in *Leisure Sciences*. Articles on outdoor and forest/park-based recreation and activity participation are concentrated in the *Journal of Leisure Research* and *Leisure Sciences*. *Leisure Studies* was dominated by commentaries and theoretical discussions and articles on sport related topics. For example, sixty percent of articles on race/ethnicity in *Leisure Studies* were commentaries or theoretical discussions or sport related. Furthermore, across the five journals sport topics are concentrated in *Leisure Studies*. Table 2 shows that *Loisir et Societe* published no articles on neighborhood/community-based leisure, outdoor and forest-based recreation, interracial interaction/race relations, commentaries/theoretical discussions, services & program delivery/managerial issues, sport, travel, research methods, and physical activity and health and race, ethnicity and social class. Even though tourism journals have proliferated in recent years, giving tourism scholars many more publication options, the low frequency of tourism related topics is noteworthy in view of the keen interest in cultural studies related to ethnic tourism (Hollinshead, 1998; Hutchison, 2000).
Methods Used in Race and Ethnicity Studies

This section provides a description of the methodological foundations of the literature on race and ethnicity (see Table 3). Similar to the field as a whole (Henderson, Presley, & Bialeschki, 2004), survey research was the dominant method of data collection. Thirty-five percent of all articles used either mail or telephone surveys. Literature reviews, including theoretical discussions and commentaries, were also a primary method of research (29%). The use of literature reviews generally might be explained by the need to offer directions for an under-developed sub-field (e.g., Allison, 1988; Floyd, 1998; Hutchison, 1988) rather than to integrate or synthesize existing research. More recent reviews involve theoretical discussions and model development involving more integration and synthesis (Gomez, 2002; Stodolska, 2005).

We observed no experimental designs being used and only 4% of studies used secondary data sets. Although qualitative interviews were used in 13% of studies only 2% of the studies were ethnographies where the researcher(s) spent extended period of time within the research setting. As McDonald and McAvoy (1997) pointed out, within certain ethnic groups, a highly participatory role is necessary to build up trust to be allowed access into that community.

An examination of methods in the different journals reveals some distinct patterns. Both the Journal of Leisure Research and Leisure Sciences were dominated by survey research and literature reviews (in that order). The top two methods used in the Journal of Park and Recreation Administration were surveys and qualitative methods. These differences likely reflect the types of audiences served or the editorial policies of these journals. The Journal of Leisure Research and Leisure Sciences, for example, regularly published conceptual discussions. On the other hand, the Journal of Park and Recreation Administration attempts to publish empirical studies with an emphasis on managerial or program implications. Loisir et Societe was more similar to the Journal of Leisure Research and Leisure Sciences, with surveys and qualitative methods the most frequently employed methods. Leisure Studies was dominated by literature reviews and conceptual discussions; 80% of all articles fell in this category. The high frequency of literature reviews in Leisure Studies probably reflects the North American bias toward empirical studies and the demands from research sponsors in North America. For example, university research funding within the United Kingdom is dependent on the perception as to whether it will make a contribution to the economy. Furthermore the structure of university research is set up differently often under conditions of strict financial stringency (Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt, & Terra, 2000).

Discussion and Conclusions

Summary of Results

We sought to provide an empirical assessment of the research on race and ethnicity by examining the quantity of articles and describing the themes
and methods represented in five major leisure studies journals. While the number of articles related to race and ethnicity show interest in the topic, less than five percent of articles in the journals combined have race or ethnicity as a primary focus of the research. Looking at the distribution of articles across the different journals reveals an uneven pattern. The *Journal of Leisure Research* accounted for 38% of articles published while the *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* accounted for only 11% and *Loisiret Socie\'\'t* had 8%.

This study also shows that research on race and ethnicity encompasses a rich set of topics. A content analysis identified 19 thematic categories. The greatest concentration of themes centered on theoretical discussions, activity participation and preferences, outdoor recreation/parks and forest recreation, interracial interaction and race relations, and leisure constraints. An analysis of methods used in race and ethnicity studies found that over one-third of all studies used either mail or telephone surveys for data collection; 29% used literature reviews; and 13% employed qualitative methods.

In the concluding sections of this article we comment on the state of the literature and outline some directions for research on race and ethnicity in leisure studies. We also make recommendations related to methodological challenges.

*State of the Literature*

The count of articles shows a substantial increase over time. Relative to the entire literature, however, race and ethnicity research remains a small sub-topical area. If this is indicative of the importance of race and ethnicity to the field, it would suggest that the race and ethnicity sub-field exists on the periphery of the literature and still exists outside the mainstream of leisure research. This imposes limitations on an understanding of leisure and has implications for practice. For example, only a few studies offer a perspective on how race and/or ethnicity shape both perceptions of and motivations for leisure. Thus, there is limited understanding of basic constructs from different racial and ethnic group perspectives. In their work Walker, Deng, and Dieser (2001, 2005) demonstrated that processes underlying motivations for leisure may vary between participants of European American and Chinese ethnicity. They also describe management implications of the interrelationships of ethnicity, self-construal, and intrinsic motivation. Their analysis suggests that groups may experience differential outcomes associated with established management approaches such as the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum and benefits-based management. Similarly, research on women’s leisure has shed light on how gender roles impact perceptions and meanings of leisure (Henderson, 1990). As Stodolska (2000) writes, “studying these groups not only enables us to investigate the validity of mainstream theories, but also provides the opportunity to detect relationships that could otherwise escape our attention” (p. 158).
Themes

This analysis of themes indicates that literature reviews, participation studies, outdoor recreation/forest-based recreation, and interracial interaction studies were the most frequently occurring themes across the five journals. The number of literature reviews and commentaries would suggest that key issues, limitations, and challenges have been addressed. The identification of 19 themes also suggests the increasing diversity of topics and that race and ethnicity is being studied in relation to other leisure constructs such as constraints and motivations or perceived benefits. Overall, however, the literature has not gone far beyond examining differences and variation in leisure participation, park use, and visitation (Walker et al., 2001). This would suggest that significant progress in explaining processes giving rise to racial/ethnic variation has not been made (Hutchison, 2000).

The analysis of themes also reveals several under-developed areas of research, especially areas that address salient societal issues and present opportunities for transdisciplinary work. Research on immigration, children and youth, environmental justice, and physical activity are examples of where such opportunities exist. While leisure researchers have begun to examine leisure in the context of immigration (e.g., Stodolska & Alexandris, 2004), demographic trends suggest the need to understand relationships involving leisure and immigration will continue. Though low in number, studies have been conducted on the impact of immigration on leisure experiences (e.g., Stodolska, 1998; Stodolska & Yi, 2003; Yu & Berryman, 1996). More than 60% of the net increase in minority population growth was due to immigration, with over 75% of U.S. immigration originating from Asia and Latin America (Murdock, White, Hoque, & Pecotte, 2003). Documenting the effect of immigration on leisure experiences, understanding the role of leisure in adjustment to American society and expression of ethnic identity will continue to be important areas of inquiry. In particular there is a need to know how leisure contributes to sense of place and community where communities are forming and restructuring due to immigration. Ethnic tensions and conflict occurring in the U.S., Europe and other parts of the world show there are opportunities for race and ethnicity research to explore how leisure contributes to social conflict and community cohesion.

It is somewhat surprising that more articles on social and environmental justice were not observed. Just eight studies were categorized under this theme, and only one empirical study (Tarrant & Cordell, 1999) and one discussion article (Floyd & Johnson, 2002) dealt with environmental justice. In the 1990’s there was a proliferation of studies on environmental justice in sociology, planning, transportation, and geography. It is also surprising because public health research has begun to focus on the association between parks and recreation areas and racial disparities in leisure-time physical activity (LTPA). While 40% of U.S. adults report engaging in no LTPA, 52% of African-Americans and 54% of Latinos report engaging in no LTPA (Healthy People 2010, 2004). LTPA is a critical protective factor against obe-
sity, cardiovascular diseases and other health risks. Public health studies have found that communities with high concentrations of African Americans or Latinos tend to have fewer public resources than white communities for leisure time physical activity such as parks, sport facilities, and walking/biking trails and commercial recreation opportunities (Gordon-Larsen et al., 2006; Powell, Slater, Chaloupka, & Harper, 2006). Geographers have also examined environmental justice issues related to parks and recreation. For example Wolch, Wilson, and Fehrenbach’s (2005) study of Los Angeles found that African Americans and Latinos have less access to park lands than white non Hispanic residents, and benefit less from park funding initiatives. It will become increasingly important for leisure studies researchers to address these kinds of concerns in order to help reduce racial and ethnic disparities in access to parks and physical activity opportunities.

Finally, this review also noted that only 14 articles focused on race/ethnicity and child, youth and adolescent issues. These facts are troubling given the fact that two recent reports (Frey, 2006; Presidents Council for Physical Fitness and Sport, 2005) highlight important social and political issues that directly impact minority youth resulting in questions that leisure scholars should be in a position to answer. First, the Presidents Council for Physical Fitness and Sport (2005) concluded that physical inactivity and obesity issues among black non Hispanic and Mexican American children are higher than other groups of children. The authors of the report warn that these issues should not be ignored, concluding that future research should focus on environmental barriers that prevent minority children from exercising in their community as well as understanding issues relating to social marketing and answering questions relating to access to affordable fitness facilities.

Second, Frey’s (2006) report on behalf of the Brookings Institute noted that a large number of areas in the U.S. have developed “majority-minority” populations among children and this trend will continue. This increased child diversity compared to the adult population is compounded by the fact that the white adult population is often older than minority adults with school aged children (Frey, 2006). Thus relationships within communities may become strained as interests between the two groups conflict particularly in respect to competition for local government resources such as expenditures on schools and public park and recreation facilities.

The absence or low involvement of leisure researchers in these topics is symptomatic of the “irrelevance” of our research outside of the field. Attention to such issues discussed above would go far in addressing Shaw’s (2000) concern. She stated,

Attention to leisure first and other issues second, may be limiting our vision and the potential application, breadth and social relevance of our research. It may be that if our starting point for research were to shift from leisure and leisure participation to particular pressing needs, the list of issues that we might address would be different, more extensive, and I would suggest, more relevant (p. 149).
Approaching topics in this fashion would also facilitate more opportunities for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research.

Methodological Issues

While the increased number of articles and themes evidence some maturation, imbalance in methods suggest otherwise. Although a wide array of methods were used, survey research (and quantitative approaches) dominated. Qualitative methods were used in 13% of all studies. Thus, it appears that researchers have neglected suggestions and recommendations expressed by scholars such as Lee, Brock, Dattilo, and Kleiber (1993) that utilizing qualitative methods will yield benefits such as enhancement of theory, delivery of new concepts and developing knowledge about leisure behavior from an “insiders” perspective, all aspects that Floyd (1998) points out are lacking in the work on minorities.

The final point of the “insiders” perspective seems particularly relevant given the debate over whether quantitative research gives minorities and others not “in power” a voice. Delpitt (1993) argues that ethnographic analysis is crucial in identifying and giving voice to alternate world views. She concludes by pointing out that people are experts on their own lives and research must be careful not to dismiss or deny their interpretations or accuse them of “false consciousness.”

Nineteen years ago Allison (1988) suggested that some major changes need to be made in methodological approaches if we are to gain some insights into the nature of ethnic/racial similarities and differences within the leisure and recreation field. She suggested using more “interpretive frameworks” which utilized more qualitative research techniques or some array of qualitatively grounded techniques that result in quantifiable data. However, few studies have heeded her advice. The methodological strategies that Allison (1988) suggests are often time-consuming and difficult but can be one of the few ways to gain meaningful insights into group dynamics.

Researchers such as Delpitt (1993) believe that many quantitative approaches have sought to reinforce existing power structures and have further silenced and alienated oppressed groups. Often the voices of the powerless are not incorporated into the mode of traditional qualitative inquiry (Figueira-McDonough, 1998) despite the fact that qualitative strategies have been advocated as a means of reducing the power gap as well as allowing participants’ viewpoints to be heard on their own terms (Patton, 2003). Indeed, within certain ethnic groups a highly participatory researcher role is necessary to build up the necessary trust to be allowed access into that community (McAvoy, Winter, Outley, McDonald, & Chavez, 2000; McDonald & McAvoy, 1997; Stanfield & Dennis, 1993). Nevertheless, quantitative data does allow for wider generalization and standardization of methods and measures.

Across all journals, no study used experimental design and only six articles (4%) used secondary data sets. Manning and Vaske (2006) noted that using secondary data sets allows researchers to “identify causal factors that
typically cannot be manipulated in a single study” (p. 409). Although there are limitations to using these data sets (e.g., a lack of control as to how race/ethnicity have been measured), they give researchers the opportunity to conduct longitudinal studies. Numerous data sets that may be used for such analyses include the General Social Survey, the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Surveys on Hunting, Fishing, and Wildlife-associated Recreation, and the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.

Experimental designs are appropriate where concepts and propositions are clearly defined and are particularly suited to explain rather than describe phenomena (Babbie, 1998). While experiments have not been used within our field in relation to race/ethnicity, the psychology and social psychology disciplines routinely use experimental studies to understand prejudice and discrimination. For example, Goar and Sell (2005), using expectation states theory, tested whether task complexity would modify the effects of racial inequality within small task oriented groups. By manipulating certain environmental conditions they were able to show how task conditions may be adapted to reduce the effects of racism in small groups. Although experimental research has its own limitations, it does offer leisure researchers the opportunity to explain rather than describe phenomena related to race and ethnicity within our field.

Limitations

This analysis of five major journals provided new insight into the structure of the race and ethnicity literature. To date, no systematic assessment of this literature has been attempted. Despite the potential contributions of our analysis, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, labels used to describe thematic categories were developed by the authors and have no previously accepted standards. While agreement was established between the co-authors, there is no reason to believe that a different team of researchers would arrive at the same categories. Second, articles on race and ethnicity in leisure do appear in other journals within the field (e.g., Loisir and World Leisure), and outside the field (e.g., Environmental Management, Rural Sociology). This study’s choice of journals obviously excluded these. Literature such as published conferences and symposium proceedings and influential publications outside of peer-reviewed journals (e.g., Lee, 1972; Washburne & Wall, 1980) were also excluded. These may have increased the quantity of studies for review. However, this analysis focused on peer-reviewed articles to give insight into major topics and methods used by researchers publishing in primary leisure studies journals.

Future Directions

Future research should emphasize under-developed themes and emerging issues such as children and youth, immigration, environmental justice, and physical activity. We would also encourage other researchers to provide
systematic assessments of the literature similar to reviews by Henderson (1990, 1994) on gender and leisure. Subsequent work might emphasize integrative research reviews and analysis of theories, populations and findings. As Henderson et al. (2004) have shown studies can be categorized as four types: theory or model testing, theoretical or conceptual framework application, descriptive or evaluative studies, and theory or model development.

The research on race and ethnicity within the leisure field will take on added importance as ethnic change and related dynamics are felt worldwide. In their commentary, Shinew et al. (2006, p. 407) noted that significant research progress on race and ethnicity has been made. Despite this progress, they also noted that “we have far to go.” It is our assertion that this review and subsequent integrative reviews will help set a course and provide directions for future research on race and ethnicity in leisure studies.
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