

Attitude Dimensions of Leisure: A Replication Study

by John Neulinger and Miranda Breit

KEYWORDS: LEISURE; LEISURE, ATTITUDE DIMENSIONS; RESEARCH;
RESEARCH, LEISURE

A previous paper reported the construction of an instrument for the measurement of leisure attitudes and the resulting identification of five relatively independent dimensions in the leisure domain (Neulinger and Breit 1969). In line with "an elemental principle of competent research" (Kessen 1960) and the fact that these findings were based on a factor-analytic procedure, an often unstable phenomenon, it was thought that a replication study was in order before any further use of the above instrument was made. The purpose of the present paper is to report the results of this replication study. In addition, since the results showed the dimensions to be extremely stable and thus useful for future research purposes, available covariates of the identified dimensions will be presented.

Method

Subjects

The sample consisted of 335 adults working full-time, 198 males and 137 females, ranging in age from eighteen to sixty-eight, with a mean age of thirty-five. Thirty-six percent of the respondents were Jewish, 26 percent Catholic, 15 percent Protestant. Eighteen percent reported no religious preference. Respondents were predominantly white (90 percent), the majority married, and their educational level quite high (median category "some college"), although all levels were represented. Reported average family income was equally high: in the \$11,000 to \$13,000 bracket. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were born in the United States. The spectrum of occupations was very broad and included the professions, business, industry and the trades.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of eighty attitude items plus questions relating to standard socio-economic variables. Thirty-two of the items were included for the purpose of replication; twenty-seven of these were identical to the highest

John Neulinger is assistant professor in the Department of Psychology, The City College of The City University of New York. Miranda Breit is a graduate student at New York University, Community Psychology Program.

This research was supported in part by Grant RF-292, Russell Sage Foundation, and in part by The City College computer center.

Manuscript received November 18, 1970; revised February 14, 1971.

Attitude Dimensions: Replication

109

loading items in each of the previously identified five leisure dimensions. Five of the items were new and had been written to get at the "essence" of these factors. The balance of the items related to the leisure environment, the conceptualization of leisure and work, and to sexual attitudes.

Procedure

Data were collected in the Spring of 1970, in and around New York City. Respondents were obtained through the cooperation of The City College students. Great emphasis was placed on appealing to the respondents' cooperation and honesty, and they were assured complete anonymity.

Results

A factor analysis of thirty-two items, using a principal components method and Varimax rotation, yielded five factors. The five factor solution was in line with theoretical expectations, and also justified in terms of the criterion that the number of eigenvalues greater than one determines the number of factors (Harman 1960). Five factors accounted for 38 percent of the total variance. An inspection of the results and comparison with the previous analysis reveals an amazing degree of similarity of outcomes (Table 1). The same labels

TABLE 1

LEISURE ATTITUDE FACTORS DERIVED FROM A FACTOR ANALYSIS OF 32 ITEMS,
BASED ON A SAMPLE OF 335 FULL-TIME WORKING ADULTS AND
INCLUDING FACTOR LOADINGS OF ORIGINAL STUDY^a

ITEM	I	II	FACTOR III	IV	V	COMMUNALITY	ORIGINAL LOADING
<i>I: Affinity for leisure</i>							
How long could you stand a life of leisure	.81	—	—	—	—	.72	.84
How much would you like to lead such a life	.75	—	—	—	—	.71	.77
Would you like your children to lead such a life	.68	—	—	—	—	.58	.66
Free time versus work time allocation ^b	.58	—	—	—	-.32	.52	—
Doing nothing, being idle,39	—	—	—	—	.29	
Taking of habit forming drugs	.33	—	—	—	—	.18	
Would you feel guilty about living a life of leisure	-.57	—	—	—	—	.34	-.55
<i>II: Society's role in leisure planning</i>							
Productive efforts, such as certain hobbies	—	.70	—	—	—	.50	.67
Creative and/or artistic efforts, . . .	—	.63	—	—	—	.41	.52
Social affairs, such as volunteer work, . . .	—	.57	—	—	—	.36	.55
Physical exercise, such as sports, . . .	—	.54	—	—	—	.32	.45
Mental endeavors such as studying, . . .	—	.47	—	—	—	.23	.45

TABLE 1 (continued)

ITEM	I	II	FACTOR III	IV	V	COMMUNALITY	ORIGINAL LOADING
<i>III: Self-definition through leisure or work</i>							
Leisure activities express talents better than does my job	.—	.—	.69	.—	.—	.50	.73
Leisure activities are more satisfying than work	.—	.—	.67	.—	.—	.50	.66
Self-description through free time or work activities ^b	.—	.—	.66	.—	.—	.44	—
More important to be good at free time activities than work activities	.—	.—	.50	.—	.—	.29	.51
Prefer fame for job rather than free time activity	.—	.—	-.40	.—	.—	.20	-.52
Ambitions more realized on job than free time	.—	.—	-.64	.—	.—	.45	-.55
<i>IV: Amount of perceived leisure</i>							
I have enough leisure	.—	.—	.—	.61	.—	.46	.60
Leisure time felt to be boring ^b	.—	.—	.—	.41	.—	.19	—
How much of free time as "killing time"	.—	.—	.—	.40	.—	.20	.50
Little of my free time is actually leisure	.—	.—	.—	-.41	.—	.21	-.48
Like more free time than I have now	.—	.—	.—	-.55	.—	.46	-.50
Always more things to do than time for	.—	.—	.—	-.61	.—	.38	-.62
<i>V: Amount of work or vacation desired</i>							
How many weeks of vacation would you like to have	.—	.—	.—	.—	-.78	.67	-.63
Given the most ideal conditions, how many weeks of vacation should a person have	.—	.—	.—	.—	-.73	.57	-.62
Given the present state of our society, how many days per week should be spent working	.—	.—	.—	.—	.46	.31	.66
Days per week you want to work for a living	-.30	.—	.—	.—	.67	.60	.72
Sum of squared factor loadings	3.25	1.98	2.82	1.75	2.38	12.18	
Percent of total variance	10	6	9	5	8	38	

^a Three items were excluded as factor definers because they had highest loadings of less than .30 and one item because it was tied on two factors by a difference of less than .10. For the sake of clarity factor loadings of less than .30 have been omitted from this table.

^b These were the new items written to get at the essence of the factor.

Attitude Dimensions: Replication

111

have been used to identify the dimensions: (1) *affinity for leisure*, (2) *society's role in leisure planning*, (3) *self-definition through leisure or work*, (4) *amount of perceived leisure*, and (5) *amount of work or vacation desired*. As before, only those items were used to define factors that had loadings of at least .30, and .10 larger on the respective factor than on any other factor. Of the five new items, two loaded on the factors they had been written for, namely Factors III and IV. The item written for Factor V turned up on Factor I, loading to a lesser degree on Factor V. The item written for Factor I tied on Factor V and was thus excluded. The item written for Factor II did not relate to any of the factors.

Only two of the previous twenty-seven items load now on a different factor than before. They are the two lowest loading items, now in Factor I (Doing nothing, being idle, . . . ; taking of habit forming drugs), previously in Factor II. Overall, then, it is quite apparent that the dimensions identified are stable across different samples.¹

Standardized factor scores were obtained for all subjects on each of the five factors. Intercorrelations of these factor scores resulted in correlation coefficients which were all less than .07, indicating near independence of factors.

Factor scores were then related to respondents' socio-economic characteristics, using correlational procedures for age, educational level and family income (Table 2), and analyses of variance for sex, religious preference, marital status and occupation (Table 3). Admittedly, the correlation coefficients in Table 2 are not very high, but they do show some significant trends. Note that the younger respondent tends to show a higher affinity for leisure than the older one, that he identifies himself more with leisure than work, and that he perceives himself as having more leisure. He is also more desiring of vacation than is his older counterpart. The more highly educated respondent shows greater affinity for leisure than does the one with less education and is in favor

TABLE 2
LEISURE ATTITUDES AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES:
AGE, EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, INCOME
(CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS)

	LEISURE DIMENSIONS				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Age of respondent	— .18 ^b	— .04	— .12 ^a	— .13 ^a	.12 ^a
Educational level ^c	.20 ^b	— .02	— .19 ^b	— .01	— .23 ^b
Family income ^c	.01	— .07	— .15 ^b	.06	.05

^a $p < .05$

^b $p < .01$

^c For purposes of correlations the respondents' code values were used.

1. To check further on the stability of the obtained factor structure a factor analysis of seventy-three items of the questionnaire, including the thirty-two present items, was carried out and rather arbitrarily rotated to ten factors. With the exception of the two lowest loading items, the factor structure of the thirty-two items remained the same.

TABLE 3
LEISURE DIMENSIONS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES:
SEX, RELIGION, MARITAL STATUS, OCCUPATION
(MEAN FACTOR SCORES)

	N	LEISURE DIMENSIONS				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Sex:						
male	198	.07	.02	-.05	.20	.07
female	137	-.10	-.03	.07	-.29	-.10
F		2.59	.22	1.55	28.48 ^b	3.04
Religion:						
Protestant	49	.08	-.08	.04	-.13	.35
Catholic	89	-.30	-.07	-.16	-.05	.24
Jewish	121	.06	.13	-.03	.03	.02
Other	14	.53	-.12	-.25	-.06	-.58
None	60	.14	-.06	.36	.17	-.57
F		4.32 ^b	1.07	3.68 ^b	.97	12.90 ^b
Marital Status:						
single	111	.08	-.02	.20	.19	-.21
married	197	-.04	.03	-.12	-.06	.19
separated, divorced	19	.07	-.03	.08	-.30	-.84
widowed	7	-.47	-.38	-.15	-.76	.29
F		1.04	.55	3.18 ^a	5.03 ^b	12.07 ^b
Occupation:						
professional	87	.27	-.12	-.25	-.12	-.31
business-sales	53	-.07	-.06	-.34	.35	.19
business-service	18	.03	.16	.22	-.19	.18
public service	23	.10	.46	.20	.22	.24
clerical	77	-.19	.08	.32	-.09	.20
tradesman	33	-.32	-.06	.30	.02	.18
F		3.20 ^b	1.92	7.11 ^b	2.82 ^a	5.91 ^b

^a $p < .05$

^b $p < .01$

of longer vacations and shorter work periods; however, he is more likely to identify himself with work than leisure. Also note that the higher the respondent's income, the more likely is he to identify himself with work rather than leisure. These findings may be confounded, however, as the three variables are themselves significantly correlated (age and educational level, $r = -.26$; age and family income, $r = .22$; educational level and family income, $r = .18$).

Table 3 indicates that only Factor IV—*amount of perceived leisure*—is significantly related to sex. Males seem to be more satisfied with the amount of leisure they have than are females. For religion the most significant differences are on Factor V—*amount of work or vacation desired*. Protestants are most in favor of work, and those reporting *other* or no religious preference

are least so. Even the difference between Protestants and Catholics is significant (Duncan test, $p < .05$). The *other* and no religious preference groups also show the highest affinity for leisure; however, it is the Catholics who score lowest on Factor I. Those who report no religious preference also tend to identify themselves more closely with leisure than work; the *other* group here is similar to the Catholics and Jews who are more likely to identify themselves with work rather than leisure.

For marital status the largest differences are again found on Factor V. The married tend to be more work oriented than the single, and the separated or divorced are least so. The single also tend to identify themselves more with leisure than the married (Factor III). Somewhat surprisingly, the widowed and, to a lesser degree, the separated and divorced perceive themselves as having less leisure than the singles (Factor IV).

A word is in order about the classification of occupations. A rather broad method of grouping occupations was adopted, realizing the difficulties of a totally satisfactory system. The main interest was in the occupation's potential for self-definition, and in that respect the grouping seems to have been somewhat successful. Both professionals and people in business-sales identify themselves more with work than leisure when compared to people in clerical jobs, tradesmen, and to a lesser degree, people in business-service and public service. There is also a sharp distinction between professionals and all others in terms of the *amount of work or vacation desired*, with professionals being clearly more vacation oriented. Professionals also show the highest affinity for leisure, compared to tradesmen and people in clerical jobs. Note that people in business-sales are the ones who seem to perceive themselves as having enough leisure, and that professionals are among those groups who would prefer to have more leisure.

Discussion

The most striking result of this study is the surprising similarity of factors in this and the previous study. There remains little doubt that the factors identified represent some very real dimensions in the leisure domain. Equally important is the fact that these dimensions are relatively independent of each other; as such they hold great promise as predictors of work and leisure behavior.

The meaning of the five leisure dimensions has been described in the previous paper; at this point each factor will merely be highlighted, and an attempt will be made to add meaning through a consideration of its covariates.

Affinity for Leisure

This factor addresses itself to the person's liking of leisure as well as his perceived capacity for it. It also involves the person's guilt feelings about leisure. Note that the two items that switched to this factor—"taking of habit forming drugs" and "doing nothing, being idle, . . ."—had the lowest loadings of any of the acceptable items and that therefore a liking of leisure should not be equated with an attitude of encouragement for the taking of habit forming drugs. The common variance may stem from an openness of mind toward new experiences associated with leisure and the taking of drugs.

It comes as little surprise that the younger generation feels a greater affinity for leisure than does the older. One might interpret the finding that the more educated respondent has a greater affinity for leisure as a sign of his greater capacity for leisure. In line with this interpretation is the fact that the professional person also shows a greater affinity for leisure than does, for example, the clerical person or the tradesman. The fact that Catholics showed the least affinity for leisure came as somewhat of a surprise, since this factor had been expected to relate to the so-called Protestant Ethic. No speculations will be attempted about this finding until it can be replicated in further studies.

Society's Role in Leisure Planning

This factor seems to measure a person's attitude toward society's control, regulation, support of, or interference with, men's free time. It is characterized by the absence of any clear-cut relationship with socio-economic background variables. The only trend which appeared was that people in public service were more in favor of society having a role in leisure planning than were professionals, people in business-sales and tradesmen (Duncan test, $p < .05$, with overall non-significant F). Perhaps being in public service makes one more prone to be conscious of society's obligations.

Self-definition Through Leisure or Work

This factor relates to the relative importance of work and leisure in a person's life, and more particularly, the degree to which he defines himself either through his work or his leisure. It is the factor of greatest theoretical interest since it may help to measure the degree to which the modern job has lost its potential as a foundation for self-definition. Not too surprisingly, it is again the younger generation which tends to identify itself with leisure rather than work. The fact that higher educational level and higher income relate to self-definition through work rather than leisure, as does being a professional or person in business-sales, confirms the very thing just alluded to. For some people, namely professionals or people in prestigious managerial or top sales positions, jobs still offer the basis for relatively meaningful or at least ego-consuming activities. For the lesser educated person in the lesser occupations, such a chance is rapidly vanishing; thus, he seeks to find meaning for his life and himself in his non-work—leisure—activities. Again, there is no ready explanation for the religious differences related to this factor. That the single identify themselves more with leisure than the married may relate to their being younger and the fact that for the married, the obligations of a job loom larger.

Amount of Leisure Perceived

This factor not only indicates the amount of a person's perceived leisure, but also his satisfaction with the amount he has or his need for more. It is the only factor with a significant sex difference: the female more than the male respondent feels the lack of leisure, a fact which may have something to do with all females in this sample being full-time working females. A sub-analysis, carried out separately for males and females, indicated that it is the females who account for the relationship of age to this factor ($r = -.35$), and that the male relationship is non-significant ($r = -.07$). Thus, it is particularly the

younger female rather than the older one who sees herself as harassed. Because of the significant sex differences, the analyses of variance reported in Table 3 were carried out separately for males and females for this factor. There were still no significant religious differences, nor were there any occupational differences. Only the males showed a significant difference on marital status: the single males perceived themselves as having more leisure than the married males.

Amount of work or vacation desired

This factor reflects a person's belief as to how much of his life should be spent at work as opposed to vacation; it deals with a person's work ethics. The fact that the younger as well as the more educated respondent shows less desire for work may reflect value changes taking place in our society. The high score of Protestants on this factor suggests that this may well be a measure of The Protestant Ethic. The lesser work orientation of the singles compared to the marrieds might be accounted for by the same reasons offered for differences in Factor III: singles are younger, and work is not as compelling to them as it is for the married. One might think of the low score of the separated and divorced as a kind of regression to their bachelor life! An interesting distinction appears in terms of occupations. Professionals and business-sales people both identified themselves more closely with work than leisure. Now, however, there is a break between these two groups. The business-sales person is relatively work-oriented while the professional prefers his vacation.

In conclusion, it seems evident that relatively stable and independent attitude dimensions in the leisure domain have been identified. These dimensions do not exist in a vacuum, but rather inside very real people with different backgrounds and experiences. This study is a first step in the analysis of these relationships. Future studies will investigate how these attitudes develop, how they are distributed in the population at large, and mainly, how they relate to work and leisure behavior.

References

- Harman, H. H. 1960. *Modern factor analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kessen, W. 1960. Research design in the study of developmental problems. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Child Development*, P. H. Mussen, ed. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Neulinger, J. and Breit, M. 1969. Attitude dimensions of leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 1 (Summer 1969): 255-261.