Journal of Leisure Research
2009, Vol. 41, No.3, pp. 337–350

Situational Antecedents to Leisure Behavior

by Peter A. Witt and Doyle W. Bishop

Five "need" theories of leisure behavior (surplus energy, relaxation, catharsis, compensation and task generalization) are outlined and their implications for a situation-response model of leisure behavior discussed. A Leisure Behavior Inventory (LBI) is described. It was constructed to ascertain whether the activities a person would like to participate in during one time period are affected by the experiences or situations he encounters in the prior time period. The LBI, consisting of 13 activities and 10 situations characteristic of the five leisure theories, was administered to eight groups of junior college students. Results showed some general confirmation for the concept that leisure behavior differs with the situational antecedents and that several of the theories of leisure are useful in explaining the relationships. The importance of this approach to the understanding of leisure behavior by park and recreation personnel is outlined with special emphasis given to the importance of understanding the causes as well as consequences of leisure behavior choices.

Over the years theorists have proposed a variety of explanations for leisure behavior patterns. Classical theories basically center around five main explanations: catharsis, compensation, surplus energy, relaxation and task generalization. Each of these theories purports to predict or explain motivation for leisure behavior. Until recently these theories have usually formed the basis for a philosophy of leisure and recreation and have been accepted as the mainstays of a "psychology" of leisure behavior. None of the five theories of leisure, however, has received much, if any, empirical study. Indeed, at times these theories have seemed more burdensome than helpful in understanding the consequences of, or motivation for, participating in certain forms of leisure activity.

The five theories imply certain fundamental human needs, some of which have been the object of much recent psychological research, e.g., activity drives, (Lore 1968, pp. 566-574); varied sensory stimulation, (Fiske and Maddi 1961); displacement and compensation, (Lewin 1951 and Sears 1950, pp. 5-6). Each of the theories suggests that people favor different activities after having been in certain (antecedent) situations. The following

✪ Peter A. Witt is research associate in the department of recreation and park administration, Children's Research Center, University of Illinois. Doyle W. Bishop is assistant professor of recreation and psychology and research assistant professor, Children's Research Center, University of Illinois.

This study was partially supported by a grant from the Title II Higher Education Act of 1965—Kentucky Project, Dr. Terry O'Banion, principal investigator and by Grant No. MH-17913 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Dr. Doyle Bishop, principal investigator. Special appreciation is expressed to J. Gulden, doctoral candidate in higher education, University of Illinois, for his diligent effort in the collection of data used for this study.

review of each of the five theories and their implications concerning leisure activities illustrates the above points.

Surplus Energy Theory

Early proponents of this view hypothesized that the seeking of play or leisure results from an organism having more energy or vitality than is needed for biological maintenance. Today we are less likely to talk of stored or surplus energy, but tend to talk in terms of need for activity or stimulation, needs which as yet have no experimental basis (Lore 1968, pp. 566-574; Fiske and Maddi 1961). The main difficulty with modern versions of the surplus energy theory seems to be the inability to identify the conditions under which a need for activity or stimulation would take place. In most recreation texts high energy activities are assumed to result from situations which allow or force the individual to store surplus energy.

Relaxation Theory

The relaxation theory, which is also referred to as both the recreation theory (Sapora and Mitchell 1961), and the restoration theory (Berlyne 1969, pp. 785-852) stands in marked contrast to the surplus energy theory. This theory implies that intensive involvement in or preoccupation with any activity demands a period of respite during which the person relaxes or re-creates himself. Monotonous conditions provide a point of intersection for the surplus energy and relaxation theories. The difference is that for the surplus energy theory, monotony induces boredom; but for the relaxation theory, it can induce fatigue (Patrick 1916).

In addition, the relaxation theory seems to have two distinct aspects: relaxation after one is fatigued (restoration-relaxation), and relaxation after one has been involved in activity that is not necessarily fatiguing but has left little time for escape (diversionary-relaxation).

Catharsis Theory

The catharsis theory refers to the purging of emotion, especially emotional tension and anxiety, by participation in leisure activity (Carr 1902; Groos 1922). Psychoanalytic theorists have used the catharsis concept in explaining some features of play, such as coping with an emotional experience (Axline 1947; Escalona 1943, pp. 336-378). According to the catharsis theory, the individual exposed to a tension or anxiety producing situation seeks emotional release through participation in either high-energy-consuming or relaxing activities, depending on his favorite means of unwinding. The stereotyped response is usually thought of as the pursuit of an activity which allows for the acting out of ones feelings.

Compensation Theory

Mitchell and Mason (1934) have suggested that leisure activities are compensatory mechanisms for goals whose direct achievement is blocked. The concept of substitute satisfaction for blocked motives, however, has been a frequent concern of more general psychological theories. Freudian theory

with its concept of displacement and the works of Lewin and his colleagues with their concepts of substitute valence and substitute value are two examples of this basic concern (Escalona 1943, pp. 336-378; Lewin 1951; Sears 1950, pp. 5-6).

The concepts of catharsis and compensation are sometimes used interchangeably. They differ, however, in the generality or specificity of the conditions that arouse the need and the subsequent responses; compensation refers to overcoming, by a specific displacement activity, a frustration induced by blockage of a specific goal. According to the compensation theory, the individual would seek leisure activities that compensate for blocked goals in other spheres of endeavor.

Task Generalization

The concept of task generalization has only recently been applied to the investigation of leisure behavior (Hagedorn and Labovitz 1968, pp. 272-283). The idea behind task generalization is essentially the same as the older psychological concept of response generalization—the tendency for a stimulus, to which a particular response has been learned, to evoke similar responses (Munn 1956, pp. 611-612; and Murphy 1954, p. 105).

The concept of task generalization has been applied primarily in the comparison of work and leisure to account for some people's tendency to choose leisure activities that are the same as, or similar to, the activities in their work. An example would be a college professor who uses his "leisure" time to read professional magazines or to attend special lectures. Presumably, such similarity in behavior is based on certain reinforcing events, but no attempt has been made to identify what they are (except to assume that somehow one's work is intrinsically motivating and rewarding). The task generalization concept is still somewhat vague, but might be useful for describing certain situation-leisure response sequences in which the leisure responses are similar to the responses observed in an antecedent situation.

These five theories of leisure suggest that the type of leisure activity sought after specific experiences (the antecedent situation) differ according to the effect of the situation on the individual. This is not to imply that leisure activity is the only form of behavior that could follow these experiences. Rather, if the person chooses what can be referred to as a leisure activity, it tends to differ according to the antecedent situation.

Purpose of Study

To study empirically some of the above generalizations, we developed a Leisure Behavior Inventory (LBI) to measure the relationship between the situations that a person might experience and the activities in which he might subsequently choose to participate. Using this inventory, we wished to ascertain whether the activities a person expressed a desire to participate in after being in certain situations were predictable, and if they could be accounted for by the "need" theories of leisure. If a relationship between antecedent events and subsequent activity choices was found but the leisure theories were not adequate or useful in explaining the results, we hoped to suggest additional theoretical constructs with which leisure behavior could be explained.

TABLE I

SITUATIONS AND CORRESPONDING THEORIES USED IN THE LEISURE BEHAVIOR INVENTORY[a]

(1) **Compensation.** You have just gotten results from the biggest exam of the year and you have either failed or not done as well as you expected to do.
(2) **Compensation.** After months of trying to be appointed as a member of an important student committee, you find that you have been turned down. You get this information via a letter which is waiting for you when you return from your classes.
(3) **Catharsis.** You get back from the library where you have had a great deal of trouble studying due to the incessant noise.
(4) **Catharsis.** You have just lost all of your class notes for your hardest class. You return from searching for them feeling frustrated and under extreme tension.
(5) **Relaxation (Restoration).** You have just finished a strenuous day of runing from class to class, doing a great number of errands and in general being under extreme tension and pressure. It is now midafternoon and your last errand has been taken care of.
(6) **Relaxation (Diversionary).** It is Friday afternoon and although not under any pressure or duress, the events of the past week have kept you extremely busy without much chance for recreation.
(7) **Surplus Energy.** It is Saturday morning. Just yesterday you caught up on your school work. You have had a good night's sleep and awake fully refreshed and full of energy.
(8) **Surplus Energy.** Today you got up full of energy and never really wanted to go to class. As a result, the long hours of sitting in lectures has made you very restless. It is now afternoon and you have finished your last class.
(9) **Task Generalization.** You have just completed an afternoon's work in the library. Although you've spent a lot of time, the work was worth it because you found many materials that gave shape to your ideas for an important term paper.
(10) **General Positive.** You have had an average day of classes. It is midafternoon and a representative of an important student group, which you have wanted very much to join, calls you and asks you to meet him next day about joining the group.

[a] The situations were presented to the students in the order 9, 1, 7, 2, 5, 8, 3, 6, 4, 10. The order is changed in Table I and the text for ease of understanding.

Description of the LBI

The LBI was specifically constructed for use in an academic setting. Ten situations typical of college experiences were described (See Table I). Two each were designed to correspond to experiences which elicited needs typical of the compensation, catharsis, relaxation and surplus energy theories, while one situation was constructed to fit the task generalization theory. A tenth situation was constructed to approximate a generally positive experience with no specific relationship to any of the above theories.

Individuals were asked to check on a scale of 1 to 5 ("Almost certainly I *would not* feel like" to "Almost certainly I *would* feel like") how much they would feel like doing each of 13 activities after having been in each situation (See Table II). The inventory consisted of ten pages with one situation and the activities on each page.

To assess the reliability of the LBI, an identical form to the one used in this study was administered on two occasions to 35 undergraduate recreation majors at the University of Illinois. Each person's responses were correlated for each situation over the two administrations. After a Fisher Z transformation the coefficients were averaged over the 35 subjects for each of the ten situations. The resulting coefficients ranged from .60 for Situation 3 to .83 for Situation 8. Nine of the ten situations had test-retest reliability coefficients above .69. The coefficients obtained were thought to be of sufficient magnitude to consider the questionnaire reliable.

Data Collection

The LBI was administered as part of a larger study to a total of 754 male and female students attending eight junior colleges in Kentucky. After exclusion of questionnaires with incomplete items (three or more blanks) or improperly filled out items (two or more cases of two checks for a single item), questionnaires for 572 out of the original 754 students were retained for analysis. The authors considered that the number of properly filled out questionnaires was quite high (67.9%), considering the number of items to

TABLE II

ACTIVITIES USED IN THE LEISURE BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

(1) Watching television
(2) Spending time on my favorite hobby such as playing a musical instrument, painting or drawing, or working on some form of arts and crafts
(3) Taking a nap
(4) Going to where my friends gather to talk or socialize
(5) Visiting a friend
(6) Playing in a competitive game such as tennis, handball, squash, or badminton with another person
(7) Spending time in the out-of-doors walking or hiking
(8) Going partying
(9) Spending time catching up on odd tasks such as letters or errands
(10) Finding a quiet place to sit and relax by myself
(11) Spending time on academically related activities such as studying, or working on a specific assignment or reading for a course
(12) Playing in a contact game such as football, soccer, or basketball
(13) Going shopping for clothes

be filled out and the number of other instruments the subjects were asked to complete as part of the larger study.[1]

Comparability of Data Among the Eight Samples

Several analyses were performed to assess the similarity in response patterns among the eight samples. The rank order of the 10 situation means (averaged over responses and persons) for each of the eight samples was compared in a 10 × 8 (situations × samples) matrix. Kendall's coefficient of concordance W was calculated for this matrix to ascertain if the situation means were similarly rank ordered in the eight samples. W is an indicator of the degree of association or similarity among several sets of rankings. In the current case W will express the average agreement in the rank ordering of situation means by the eight samples. W can vary from .00, perfect disagreement, to 1.00, perfect agreement. An obtained W can be tested for significance by a chi square test. If W is found to be significant, this implies that the agreement in rankings among the samples is higher than it would be by chance. W can also be converted to an average rank order correlation coefficient (Rho_{ave}). Rho_{ave} can vary from −1.0 (perfect inverse relationship) to .00 (no relationship) to +1.0 (perfect direct relationship).[2]

A high level of agreement was found between the rank orderings of situation means among the eight samples ($W = .94$, $\chi^2 = 82.8$, df = 9, $p < .01$). The obtained value of W was equal to a .93 average rank order correlation among all possible pairs of samples.

A similar comparison was made for the rank orderings of the 13 activity means (averaged over situations and persons) among the eight samples. As with the situations means, a high level of similarity was found in the rank ordering of response means among the 8 samples ($W = .92$, $\chi^2 = 108.0$, df = 12, $p < .01$). This value of W was equal to a .91 average rank order correlation among all possible pairs of samples. The above results indicated good comparability of the data among the eight samples.[3]

Given the high level of agreement in data among the eight samples, the data was summed and averaged to form a composite Situation × Activity matrix (See Table III). Each entry in Table III is the average over all persons in all samples for a particular situation-activity combination.

1. Although we were willing to accept both the percentage of questionnaires returned and the obtained reliability coefficients as sufficient for making further inferences from the obtained data, we recognize that there exist a variety of standards by which to judge the magnitude of these indices. While certain readers might not interpret the above indices as acceptable, we feel that they were sufficient for the purposes of the present research.

2. For further details concerning W and Rho_{ave}, see S. Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956).

3. To further support this conclusion, a comparison of the rank ordering of the 130 activity-situation means (10 situations × 13 activities per situation) was made among the 8 samples. In other words, a comparison was made among the rankings of the 130 separate activity-situation means between the samples to determine if there was any consistency among the samples in the rank orderings of each separate questionnaire item. The resulting W indicated that there was a high level of agreement in the rank orders ($W = .93$, $\chi^2 = 15.356$, df = 129, $p < .01$). The average rank order correlation among all possible pairs of samples was .92.

TABLE III

ACTIVITY MEANS FOR EACH SITUATION AVERAGED OVER ALL SAMPLES

	SITUATION[a]										
ACTIVITY	Co 1	Co 2	CA 3	CA 4	RR 5	DR 6	SE 7	SE 8	TG 9	GEN 10	GRAND MEAN RESPONSES
T.V.	2.0	2.2	2.4	1.7	3.2	2.7	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.3	2.37
Hobby	2.1	2.4	2.5	1.8	2.7	3.1	3.2	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.58
Nap	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.3	3.9	2.4	1.3	2.2	3.1	2.1	2.53
Socialize	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.4	3.2	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.32
Visit	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.6	3.1	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.0	3.8	3.28
Comp. game	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.2	3.6	3.9	3.6	2.9	3.0	2.88
Walk or hike	3.4	3.6	3.0	2.8	2.7	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.33
Partying	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.0	2.4	3.9	3.7	3.6	2.9	3.3	2.89
Odd tasks	2.1	2.3	2.6	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.9	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.37
Quiet place	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.9	2.8	2.1	2.5	3.4	2.8	3.17
Academic	2.3	2.3	3.1	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.28
Cont. game	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.3	3.4	3.7	3.4	2.8	2.8	2.80
Shop	2.2	2.4	2.3	1.9	2.3	3.0	3.7	3.1	2.6	2.9	2.63
Grand Mean Situations	2.55	2.68	2.73	2.26	2.78	3.13	3.13	2.96	2.92	2.90	
Situation Ranks	9	8	7	10	6	1 tie	1 tie	3	4	5	

[a] TG = Task Generalization, Co = Compensation, SE = Surplus Energy, GEN = General Positive, RR = Restoration Relaxation, DR = Diversionary Relaxation

Comparison of the Rank Ordering of Activities Among Situations

Several different analyses were performed to assess (1) if situations constructed to represent the same theories had the same rank ordering of activity means, and (2) if there were any similarities in the rank ordering of activity means between situations which were supposed to represent different theories. The first analysis was performed to estimate the similarity of response patterns between situations constructed to represent the same theory. The second analysis was performed to ascertain if there were dimensions or groupings of theories which might provide better explanations for the link between situations and activities than single theories taken by themselves.

In order to assess if there were similarities in the response patterns among situations constructed to represent the same theory, several different comparisons of the rank ordering of activity means in Table III were made. As an initial step the rank ordering of activity means were compared for all ten situations. Using Kendall's coefficient of concordance a W of .68 was obtained ($Rho_{ave} = .64$). This indicated a fairly high agreement in the rank ordering of activity means among the ten situations and provided a baseline by which to judge the degree of agreement among situations constructed to approximate the same theory.

Greater homogeneity (and thus higher W's than the baseline previously mentioned) was obtained by comparing the rank ordering of activity means for situations constructed to represent the same theories. W for the two surplus energy situations was .94; while for catharsis and compensation theories the W's were .90 and .98 respectively. Rho_{ave} for these three comparisons were .88, .85 and .94.[4] Thus, although each activity had the same general rank over the 10 situations, the pairs of situations constructed to represent each of the above three theories respectively showed substantially greater agreement among themselves on the rank ordering of activities than did the entire list of ten situations taken as a whole.[5]

In contrast to the above, comparison of the rank ordering of activity means between the two situations constructed to represent the relaxation theory yielded a W of only .58 ($Rho_{ave} = .17$). This would indicate that there is little relationship between the activity patterns for these two situations. This is not surprising, however, since two distinct dimensions (restoration and diversion) were originally postulated for the more general relaxation theory, and one situation was constructed to represent each dimension.

The data in Table III was again used to ascertain if there were some general similarities because situations constructed to represent different theories and thus if the theories themselves might be grouped into dimensions. If dimensions encompassing more than a single theory existed, it would

4. When only two situations are compared $Rho_{ave} = Rho$.

5. It is not possible to note the degree of difference between any two W or Rho_{ave} values, since no formulas exist for such a comparison. All differences or increases must be considered on a face value, numerical basis. Because of the exploratory nature of the research, however, the differences between a Rho_{ave} of .64 and .85, .88 or .94 were considered meaningful.

add further insight into the relationship between situational antecedents and subsequent activity choices.

Initially, a comparison was made between the overall level of response for each of the ten situations. The overall level of response for a given situation was calculated by averaging the thirteen activity means for that situation. The ten overall situation means and their relative rank order (high to low) are given in the last two rows of Table III. Analysis of these means indicated that the situations could be divided roughly into two groups. The five situations representing compensation, catharsis and restoration relaxation had overall means between 2.26 and 2.78, while those representing the general positive tone, task generalization, diversionary relaxation and surplus energy had overall means between 2.90 and 3.13. On the original questionnaire all activity choices were coded from 1 ("Almost certainly I *would not* feel like") to 5 ("Almost certainly I *would* feel like") with 3 indicating a fifty-fifty chance of participation. On this basis respondents expressed less likelihood of participating in activities under the first group of situations than under the second group. Since respondents expressed less overall interest in participating in the listed activities for the first group of situations and since the first five situations had a basic underlying theme of emotional tension, the first group of situations was labelled the tension-plus-low-energy dimension. In an opposite manner the second group of situations was labelled the non-tension-plus-high-energy dimension.

A further comparison was made of the rank order of activities among the situations comprising each of the above two dimensions. This was done to see if the situations within each dimension were similar not only in overall level of response but also in activity preference patterns. W for the five situations comprising each of the two dimensions were .62 and .92 (Rho_{ave} = .53 and .90 respectively), indicating less relationship among the rank ordering of activities for the situations comprising the tension-plus-low-energy dimension than the situations making up the non-tension-plus-high-energy dimension.

In addition, the W of .62 for the tension-plus-low-energy dimension was less than the W's obtained when comparing only the two compensation ($W = .98$), two catharsis ($W = .90$) or all ten situations ($W = .64$). It may be more useful, therefore, to continue to make a distinction between the compensation and catharsis theories rather than subsuming the two concepts under a non-tension-plus-low-energy category.

On the non-tension-plus-energy side a comparison of the diversionary relaxation, task generalization and general positive situations yielded a W of .78, indicating that the association of activity ranks for the overall non-tension group ($W = .92$) was highly influenced by the high relatedness ($W = .94$) of the two surplus-energy situations.

Summarizing, the above analysis indicated:

(1) A high overall relationship among the rank ordering of activity means for all ten situations but even higher relatedness for the situation pairs constructed to approximate the surplus energy, catharsis and compensation theories,

(2) evidence supporting a differentiation between the diversionary and restoration dimensions of the relaxation theory, and
(3) some indication of relationship in both level of response and rank order of activity means among situations constructed to represent the theories of surplus energy, diversionary relaxation, task generalization and general positive tone. This dimension was tentatively labelled non-tension-plus-energy.

Activities Associated or Not Associated with Situations

The previous section described the general similarity in the rank ordering of activity means for situations constructed to represent the same theory. It was possible, however, that even though the situations which were constructed to fit a given theory showed similarity in activity patterns, the activity patterns might not be related to those predicted by the theories themselves. The preferred and non-preferred activity choices for each situation were noted, therefore, and compared to the patterns predicted by the theories.

The activity means in Table III were classified as being either high, medium or low according to two different criteria. Using an "absolute" criterion, a particular activity for a given situation was categorized as high if its mean exceeded 3.5 on the original scale of 5. A mean greater than 3.5 indicated that on the average people would generally feel like doing that specific activity after being in the given situation.

An activity for a given situation was categorized as low if its mean was less than 2.5 which was equivalent to a person not feeling like doing that specific activity after being in the given situation.

Activity means were also classified as high or low on a "relative" criterion. Using this criterion, approximately the upper third of the activity means were placed in the high category and the bottom third in the low category. Activity means above 3.0 were classified as high and those below 2.4 as low on the relative criterion.

In Table IV are listed the activities categorized as high and low according to both the absolute and relative criteria. Underlined activities are those ranked as high using the relative criteria but not the absolute criteria, and starred (*) activities are those ranked as low on the absolute criteria but not on the relative criteria. All other entries were ranked by both criteria.

The number of activity means classified as low by the two methods was almost identical (absolute = 45, relative = 43), but there were 14 more activity means classified as high by the relative criterion than by the absolute criterion (absolute = 29, relative = 43). There was a difference in the number of activities categorized as high by the two methods because the relative criteria classified activity means above 3.0 as high. The absolute criteria, however, required a mean of 3.5 for an activity to be placed in the high category. It may, therefore, be a better indicator of which activities were actually preferred for the given situations. On the low side there is no major difference in the categorization of activity means by the two methods (2.5 versus 2.4).

Analysis of activities categorized as high and low for each situation and between situations was undertaken to yield further insight into the relationship of actual responses to those predicted by the various theories.

TABLE IV

ACTIVITIES RANKING HIGH AND LOW FOR EACH SITUATION BASED ON THE RELATIVE OR ABSOLUTE CRITERIA[a]

	SITUATIONS									
	Compensation		Catharsis		Relaxation Restoration Diversion		Surplus Energy		Task Generalization	General
	Co 1	Co 2	CA 3	CA 4	RR 5	DR 6	SE 7	SE 8	TG 9	GEN 10
Category	Quiet	Quiet	Quiet	Quiet	Nap	Socialize	Outdoors	Socialize	Socialize	Socialize
	Outdoors	Outdoors	Acad.		Quiet	Party	Visit	Outdoors	Quiet	Visit
		Visit	Outdoors		Socialize	Visit	Comp. Game	Visit	Outdoors	Party
High					T.V.	Outdoors	Socialize	Comp. Game	Nap	Outdoors
					Visit	Comp. Game	Party	Party	Visit	
						Cont. Game	Shop	Cont. Game		
							Cont. Game	Shop		
	T.V.	T.V.	Shop	T.V.	Acad.	Nap	Nap	Acad.	Odd Tasks*	Nap
	Odd Tasks	Acad.	Party	Hobby	Odd Tasks	Odd Tasks	Quiet	T.V.		T.V.
	Hobby	Odd Tasks	Comp. Game	Odd Tasks	Comp. Game		Acad.	Nap		Acad.
	Shop	Party	Cont. Game*	Shop	Shop		T.V.	Odd Tasks		
	Acad.	Shop		Party	Cont. Game					
Low	Party	Hobby		Comp. Game	Party					
				Cont. Game						
				Nap						
				Socialize						

[a]Underlined activities are those included by the relative criteria but not by the absolute criteria. Activities with a * are included by the absolute but not by the relative criteria. Those with no underlining or * are included by both criteria.

Compensation

Both compensation situations presented in the LBI implied a direct sense of failure on the part of the responders. For both, high responses were "finding a quiet place to sit and relax by myself" and "spending time in the out-of-doors walking or hiking," plus "visiting a friend" for Situation 2. Low responses for both situations included activities which implied a work orientation (odd tasks, hobby, shop, academic) plus T.V. and "going partying." This set of responses indicates that an individual after having been subjected to failure experiences seeks a place and an opportunity to think out the experience, get away from people in general or seek out the company of a chosen friend. The dominant element of making up for one's failures through alternative activity is not, therefore, necessarily present in these results. It is possible that the chosen compensation situations are of such a drastic nature that drawing into oneself is the desired response in order to choose *future* compensating activities.

Catharsis

The situations constructed to fit the catharsis theory, like those relating to the compensation theory, may also have been too drastic in nature. Situation 3 produced a marked response of seeking further academic activity. This response is understandable, since the original situation implied that one had gone to the library to study and was prevented from doing so. "Seeking a quiet place" and "hiking or walking" were also prominent responses to Situation 3. Situation 3 had low response levels for all high energy activities. This pattern is quite similar to the high and low activity patterns for the compensation situations.

Situation 4 showed only a high level of response for "seeking a quiet place." Apparently, the situation of losing one's notes is quite a depressing experience! This can best be seen from the long list of low responses for Situation 4.

Surplus Energy

The non-tension, high-energy-level nature of Situations 7 and 8 are reflected in both the number of high responses and the inclusion of "napping," "quiet place" and "academic" in the low category. It would seem that the suggestion of available energy and the lack of tension led to both a wide range of high responses and to the desire for active endeavors.

Relaxation

As noted in previous sections, the relaxation theory seems to have two distinct dimensions. High and low activities for these two dimensions further illustrated this distinction. High activities for Situation 5 (restoration-relaxation) and Situation 6 (diversionary-relaxation) showed basically opposite tendencies. Restoration-relaxation had high responses for low energy activities such as "napping" and "seeking a quiet place." Diversionary-relaxation had high means for all of the social activities as well as the more active activities such as participating in contact or competitive games. Low activities

were also directionally opposite for the two situations. For restoration—relaxation the active responses, as well as "odd tasks" and "shopping," had low means while for diversionary-relaxation only "academic," "napping" and "odd tasks" showed low responses. In terms of high and low responses restoration-relaxation was similar to the patterns for compensation and catharsis, while diversionary-relaxation showed similarities to surplus energy.

Task Generalization

The high responses for Situation 9 had the underlying theme of taking it easy and relaxing after mental energy expenditure. There was no evidence that the individual wished to participate in further academic endeavors or work related activity. The situational concept of task generalization will have to be refined further in order to approximate more fully the task generalization model described previously.

General Positive

Situation 10 was constructed to be of a generally positive nature. Indeed, responses to this situation indicated possible elation over the experience and the desire to share the news and be around friends. High activities are similar to those for the other non-tension, high-energy situations, such as those characteristic of surplus energy.

Summary and Conclusions

A Leisure Behavior Inventory (LBI) was constructed to ascertain the relationship between the experiences or situations one might encounter in one time period and the activities one would choose to participate in during the next time period. Five common theories of leisure behavior were utilized in an attempt to explain the relationship.

Results of the data analysis indicated that the surplus energy, catharsis and compensation theories were useful in explaining the relationship between activities and antecedent situations. In addition, the data suggested that a distinction between the diversionary and restoration aspects of the relaxation theory would be useful in future studies. Finally, there was some indication that several of the theories might successfully be grouped together to form composite or more general explanations of activity choices.

The fact that a relationship can be shown between past events and subsequent behavior has important implications for those involved in the provision of leisure services. The situational context of behavior, though often noted, is rarely recognized in the actual planning and development of recreation programs by public and private agencies and is rarely dealt with in recreation curricula designed to train leaders and administrators. Understanding the basis of leisure behavior, its "causes" as well as consequences, is mandatory for those concerned with public and private recreation services. Participants may approach the same activity on different occasions in a variety of moods, seeking to fulfill a variety of "needs." Similarly, an individual may seek to participate over time in a variety of activities to fit his changing needs. The recreation professional should be aware of these needs and the concomitant responses and of how his leadership may help participants to select the correct activity or to get the most out of an existing experience.

Situational Antecedents 77

Finally, any theoretical investigation suffers from abstractness and possible removal of the studied variables from their natural loci of occurrence. An effort should be made to study real responses to real situations, thus removing the described technique from one of abstractness to one more closely approximating reality. The collection of activity data using a diary record might enable one to discern the relationship between activity choices and antecedent situations, since the data would be the result of experience rather than hypothetical responses to hypothetical situations. Such a study has been proposed and is presently being designed (Bishop 1969). If a questionnaire technique similar to the LBI was used again, the change to an open-ended format for activity choices would enable the respondent to designate his responses to past experience more freely. Other techniques that could be employed might include creating experimental situations and then studying subsequent behavior or interviewing people while they are actually engaging in certain activities to determine the antecedent situations in which they had been previously engaged.

References

Axline, V. M. 1947. *Play therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Berlyne, D. E. 1969. Laughter, humor and play. In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, eds., 2nd ed., vol. III, pp. 785-852. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Bishop, D. W. 1969. *Psychological adjustment and leisure time activities*. Research grant no. MH-17913-01. Bethesda: National Institute of Mental Health.

Carr, H. H. 1962. *The survival value of play*. Denver: University of Colorado.

Erickson, E. H. 1950. *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Escalona, S. 1943. Play and substitute satisfaction. In *Child Behavior and Development*. R. G. Barker et al., eds., pp. 336-378. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, D. W. and Maddi, S. R., eds. 1961. *Functions of varied experience*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Groos, K. 1922. *Das spiel. Zivei vortage von Karl Groos. part II:Das spiel als Katharsis*. Jena: G. Fischer.

Hagedorn, R. and Labovitz, S. 1968. Participation in community associations by occupations: a test of three theories. *American Sociological Review*. 33 (April 1968): 272-283.

Lewin, K. 1951. *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lore, R. K. 1968. Activity-drive hypothesis: effects of activity restriction. *Psychological Bulletin*. 70 (December 1968): 566-574.

Mitchell, E. D. and Mason, B. S. 1934. *The theory of play*. New York: Barnes.

Munn, Norman. 1956. *Psychology: the fundamentals of human adjustment*. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Murphy, G. 1954. Social motivation. In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, eds., 2nd ed., vol. II, pp. 601-633. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Patrick, G. T. W. 1916. *The psychology of relaxation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sapora, A. V. and Mitchell, E. D. 1961. *The theory of play and recreation*. New York: Ronald Press.

Sears, R. R. 1950. Relation of fantasy aggression to interpersonal aggression. *Child Development*. 21 (March 1950): 5-6.