Critical Race Theory and Social Justice Perspectives on Whiteness, Difference(s) and (Anti)Racism: A Fourth Wave of Race Research in Leisure Studies

Susan Arai[1]
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

B. Dana Kivel
California State University
Sacramento, California, USA

Abstract

This special issue of the *Journal of Leisure Research* focuses on critical race theory and social justice perspectives on whiteness, difference(s) and (anti)racism in leisure studies. Drawing on Floyd's (2007) previous work articulating waves of race research in leisure studies, we argue this special issue helps to advance a fourth wave. As part of this fourth wave, papers in this issue address the limitations of essentializing race, advance arguments around the social construction and deconstruction of racial categories, re-examine race and racism within broader theoretical frameworks, and connect power, ideology and white hegemony, to illustrate how whiteness is perpetuated and internalized. In this wave, race is also understood as performance. Authors examine the racialization of space and call for a rethinking of justice to address racism and ideologies inherent within policies and practices. This fourth wave also invokes a call for the use of more diverse methodological approaches.

KEYWORDS: *Race, racism, power, whiteness, justice, leisure*

At the close of another decade on race and ethnicity research we are pleased to introduce this special issue on critical race theory and social justice perspectives on whiteness, difference(s) and (anti)racism in leisure studies. When we sent out the call for papers for this special issue of the *Journal of Leisure Research* (*JLR*), it seemed that leisure studies was entering more fully into a fourth wave of race research. At the 2008 George Butler Lecture, Mary McDonald's keynote address critiqued whiteness as it operates in the study and practice of leisure, noting the contribution of this critical perspective for understanding racism in leisure. This critique was subsequently pub-

lished at the start of this year (*JLR* volume 41, issue 1). McDonald (2009) explained that whiteness constitutes "institutional discourses and exclusionary practices seeking social, cultural, economic and psychic advantage for those bodies racially marked as white" (p. 9). Responses to McDonald's lecture were provided by Nina Roberts, Kim Shinew and Corey Johnson. To continue this dialogue we invited manuscripts that would address issues of social justice and antiracism, and shed light on emerging perspectives on whiteness. We invited responses to McDonald's (2009) paper that would raise questions and interrogate the production of identities and interactions within leisure that further ideologies of whiteness and de-center or marginalize people of color. We also sought insights into the use of emerging theoretical frameworks—whiteness, critical race theory—that in combination with shifting research paradigms might better address issues of race and social justice. Our hope was that the papers would take up issues of difference(s) including questions concerning how leisure affords a space for resistance and the mobilization of power in the lives of people of color, and how issues of racism intersect with other markers of identity—sexuality, gender, class and disability—to influence leisure experiences. Working within a social justice framework and with an eye on social change, we also hoped that the papers would also address issues of public policy, and/or managerial policies and practices that shape leisure spaces. We also challenged leisure scholars to consider the implications of race and racism for leisure spaces (i.e., spaces as racialized and/or segregated), leisure service provision and resources (who is privileged, how that influences the distribution of programs and types of services), policies, and research (how it reifies racial essentialism).

In total, we received 11 manuscripts in response to this call for papers. We were buoyed by the wealth of scholarship around race that is being conducted in leisure studies. It also takes a community to see a special issue move into print. We would like to thank everyone who assisted us with the peer review process including: Lisbeth Berbary, Drew Cavin, Fern Delamere, Rudy Dunlap, Beth Erickson, Brett Lashua, Corey Johnson, Steve Lewis, Susan Hutchison, Harvey Lemelin, Heather Mair, Mary McDonald, Rasul Mowatt, Trent Newmeyer, Don Reid, Diane Samdahl, Erin Sharpe, Greg Shaw, Sue Shaw, Susan Tirone, Dawn Trussel, and Felice Yuen. Some of the reviewers are also authors, but we felt it was important to identify a mix of scholars for this special issue. The reviewers all possessed a particular area of expertise in relation to the manuscripts submitted, with some having a longer history in leisure studies and others contributing to the emergence of new voices. We would also like to thank Kim Shinew and the editorial board of *JLR* for their support of this special issue.

As we began to review previous research, we looked to Floyd (2007), who had reviewed the history of race in leisure studies and identified three distinct waves of research emerging in the 1970s, 1980s and late 1990s respectively. Floyd argued that we are anticipating a "fourth wave" of scholarship on race. In this special issue we contend that we are moving more fully into this fourth wave of race research in leisure studies. Reflecting this fourth wave, the contents of this special issue challenge some of the ways race has been conceptualized in leisure studies and brings issues previously held implicit or invisible into the light for additional conversation. Drawing on the work of Kesler (2000) on healthy communities, we posit that if philosophy and practices within leisure studies are to fully reflect the diversity of our community then it is imperative that we work through our discomfort, and perhaps even encounter conflict as we ap-

proach our own learning edges. As Kesler cautioned, if we dialogue only on topics for which we have consensus, we "may leave a lot of unhealthy kindling in a community still ready to ignite and explode" (p. 275). Democracy, Kesler argues, occurs where we are able to dialogue through conflict. This special issue may trigger discomfort, challenge belief systems and/or spark disagreement as one reads through our colleagues' analyses of race and racism; this, we believe, contributes to healthy conversations and the opportunity for difference to be explicit within leisure studies.

Three Waves on Race in Leisure Studies, Looking Back on 40 Years. . .

According to Floyd (2007), the first wave of race research in leisure studies occurred during the 1970s and focused on concerns about racial inequality and policy issues connected to the civil rights movement in the United States. The 1980s and 1990s were identified as the second wave – this era included studies with greater "theoretical and methodological innovation" (Floyd, p. 247) and focused on a greater variety of populations including Latina/o and Asian. While these studies described similarities and differences between groups; this research, did not, however, offer theoretically satisfying explanations of why these differences exist. Further, Floyd argued that "research failed to capture specific aspects of race of ethnicity associated with racial/ethnic differences. . . previous approaches (e.g., marginality-ethnicity) were not able to deal with emerging issues related to race and ethnicity" (p. 247). The third wave, emerging by the late 1990s, continued to be "diverse in origins and theoretic and methodological approaches" and included a more direct focus on multiethnic comparisons and these "studies included a greater number of diverse groups, including white ethnic groups" (Floyd, p. 247). A noted marker of this third wave was the examination of the intersection of race or ethnicity with other markers such as gender and sexuality (cf. Allison, 2000; Kivel, 2000). A summary of the special issues and articles on race and ethnicity in the third wave reveals that while research projects on this topic increased in number and scope, there were common foci among these projects.

In a 1998 special issue of *JLR* on race and ethnicity, Stodolska and Jackson examined discrimination in leisure and work experienced by a "white" ethnic minority group; Shaull and Gramann looked at issues of cultural assimilation and family and nature-related recreation among Hispanic Americans using whiteness as the "norm"; and Bowker and Leeworthy examined trip demand using the travel cost method across white and Hispanic user groups. Bialeschki and Walbert provided an historical analysis of the intersection of race, gender, class and leisure among white and African American women textile and tobacco workers in the south; Johnson, Bowker, English and Worthen examined marginality and ethnicity theories as they related to wildland recreation in the rural south; Hollinshead provided a critical analysis of tourism studies and the ways in which researchers essentialize "people, places and pasts through tourism" (p. 121); and Henderson focused on making researchers more sensitive, bringing awareness to the positionality of the researcher; using various research methods and strategies; and " researching [how] diverse groups might change the researcher" (p. 157).

A 2000 special issue of *JLR* focused on the "future of leisure," and researchers Allison, Kivel, Philipp, and Stodolska addressed issues of leisure, race, ethnicity, diversity and social justice. Allison wrote that a social justice paradigm would allow scholars to

"integrate and expand the parameters of scholarly efforts surrounding people of difference" (p. 5). She also argued this paradigm provides an opportunity for scholars to explore the "ideological suppositions that underlie our own scholarly efforts" (p. 5). Philipp argued that "race" continues to be a divisive issue in the United States and that "most leisure researchers and professionals in the field, want to believe that leisure is always beneficial; they really do not want to think that leisure spaces might contribute to, or actually be, a large part of the problem" (p. 123). In this same issue, Stodolska suggested that potential theoretical contributions have yet to be realized by studying the leisure behavior of ethnic and racial minorities. Furthermore, Kivel raised questions about the ironies of our research with people of color. "To what extent does our research with typically marginalized populations ironically and paradoxically reinforce and perpetuate hegemonies of difference" (p. 80).

In 2002, Sasidharan and Kerstetter edited a special issue of *Leisure Sciences* that examined recreation and the environment within the context of culture. Most of the articles in this special issue focused on "differences" among and across diverse populations vis-à-vis issues such as recreation behaviors, environmental attitudes, styles of recreation, preferences, park usage, and benefits (Cordell, Betz & Green; Gobster; Outley & Floyd; Payne, Mowen & Orsega-Smith; Thapa, Graefe & Absher; Tinsley, Tinsley & Croskeys). Other researchers examined broader issues related to culture. For example, Rehman examined the influence of ideologies and values on leisure experience; and the influence of researchers' cultural biases and assumptions on the interpretation of data. Floyd & Johnson focused on defining environmental justice and developing guidelines for future research on environmental justice and outdoor recreation. Dustin, Schneider, McAvoy & Frakt explored conflict among rock climbers and Native Americans, with an emphasis on finding a balance between use and non-use of natural sites among groups with divergent histories and ideologies about engaging with the natural environment. And, Gomez proposed a model of ethnicity and public recreation participation (EPRP) to explain the connection between recreation participation and one's ethnic or racial identity.

Then, in *Leisure Sciences* in 2005 Garry Chick edited a special issue on "Explorations of Discrimination and Leisure Settings," in which Monika Stodolska introduced the idea of a "conditioned attitude model of individual discriminatory behavior." Five authors (Chick, 2005; Henderson, 2005; Hutchison, 2005; Kivel, 2005; Shaw, 2005) provided responses and Stodolksa (2005) offered a rejoinder. Stodolska's model was intended to predict the extent to which people might hold prejudicial attitudes that manifest in discriminatory practices. In response to Stodolska's model, Kivel (2005) and Shaw (2005) emphasized the importance of contextualizing any such model within broader discussions of social and structural inequalities such as racism, power, ideology and white hegemony. Similarly, in 2006 Shinew et al. wrote about the limitations of "single variable" analyses, and examined the limitations of constraints literature and the need to integrate intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural factors when examining constraints. They also wrote about the role of leisure in terms of helping to build community across diverse constituencies. Ultimately, they argued that we need to better understand the complexities of factors and forces that influence people and their leisure behaviors; and they called for leisure studies to engage in the process of understanding these complexities.

In 2007, Stodolska & Walker edited a special issue on "Ethnicity and Leisure: Historical Development, Current Status, and Future Directions" for the Canadian journal *Leisure/Loisir*. Their lead article for this special issue provided a detailed historical analysis of the literature on ethnicity and leisure, providing information about population growth, immigration patterns and detailed demographic profiles of Canada and the United States. As Stodolska and Walker wrote, most early "race"-based research focused on African Americans, but over the years the "field expanded to include groups such as American Indians. . . Koreans. . . Chinese. . . South Asians. . . and Poles" (pp. 7-8). Research on Latino Americans, they suggested, has focused on participation in "wildland settings, and in the National Forests in particular" (p. 8). They argued that not only have the populations studied been broadened to include a range of individuals based on markers of ethnicity and race, but also the range of topics studied with these different populations has increased. These thoughts were echoed by Floyd (2007) who suggested that leisure studies has broadened the examination of racial/ethnic populations and developed more sophisticated methods for analyzing these groups. While Floyd argued that this has advanced leisure studies beyond the marginality-ethnicity hypothesis, we contend that this hypothesis continues to be the dominant theoretical framework for examining "differences" in race and ethnicity. Similarly, Floyd, Boccarro & Thompson (2008) noted that the majority of research since the late 1990s focused on race-based patterns of recreation participation, barriers preventing full participation and the uniqueness of culturally distinct recreation-based activities. During the third wave, researchers in leisure studies articulated differences among and between different groups of people, and have done this work with increasingly sophisticated theoretical frameworks and methodological strategies. At the heart of this third wave research is the construction of race and ethnicity as research variables used to identify and categorize different groups of people and to examine how and why such differences exist. The challenge here was that these explanations were grounded in reproducing categorical research and in reproducing differences. In doing so, research in this wave held fast to a focus on individuals and their experience even though marked by prejudice, discrimination and institutionalized oppression. Yet, a few of the articles in this last decade offered a view beyond categorical research (cf. Allison, 2000; Floyd, 2007; Floyd & Johnson, 2002; Hollinshead, 1998; Rehman, 2002) and others such as Kivel (2005), Shaw (2005) and Shinew et al. (2006) provided critiques that marked the beginning of a shift to a fourth wave of race research in leisure studies.

Emergence of a Fourth Wave Examining Race in Leisure Studies

According to Floyd (2007), "what is not well understood is how leisure practices create, reinforce, and perpetuate racist practices in contemporary society. And, can understandings of race and leisure contribute to formation of social policies designed to foster constructive engagement and goodwill among different racial and ethnic communities?" (pp. 249-250). Floyd's comment and question provide the catalyst for moving into the fourth wave of research, and this special issue of *JLR* takes us further into the wave. We believe that this special issue will be a bridge to a different way of examining how we think about and construct meaning around "race" because, as Floyd noted, "race does matter." Yet, what matters more is how researchers contextualize race and the ideological underpinnings that give meaning to this construct. We have been

so focused on verifying that racial identity matters and makes a difference in leisure that we have not fully stepped back to answer Kivel's question (2000), "what difference does difference make?"

The fourth wave of race research may be framed as including an analysis of the social construction and deconstruction of racial categories. The fourth wave places emphasis on re-examining race and racism, rather than just ethnicity and cultural differences. This wave contextualizes discussions of race and racism within theoretical frameworks which enable broader discussion of social and structural inequalities, power, ideology and white hegemony. These shifts also raise the call for the use of more diverse methodologies for examining race and racism in leisure studies.

In arguing for the deconstructing of racial categories, there is a need to explore how race is socially constructed and reified in social systems and institutions, including within the context of research. Invoking Jackson (1992), Sasidharan (2002) argued that race and ethnic classifications are often a product of racism rather than biology. Racism (including racial and ethnic categorizations), "may be understood as a consciously or unconsciously held notion that people can be categorized into a distinct number of discrete races and ethnic groups based on physical and biological criteria" (Sasidharan, p. 2). Shinew et al. (2006) asserted that few articles in leisure studies respond to the complexities of race, and Sasdiharan posed that few examine issues of power and inequality. Consequently there is a need to contextualize discussions of race and racism within theoretical frameworks that examine social and structural inequalities such as racism, power, ideology and white hegemony. Floyd (1998) argued that in the absence of theoretical frameworks to study race and ethnicity, much of our research, "developed around marginality and ethnicity hypotheses" (p. 5). Floyd provided an extremely detailed analysis of the limitations of this framework and argued that while both hypotheses are influenced by ideological underpinnings we should focus on more of the root causes that lead to the creation of these differences and disparities. Finally, he argued for research that endeavors to elaborate on "the types and range of discrimination and how they impact leisure choices and constraints" (Floyd, p. 7).

Floyd (1998) provided a doorway into studying whiteness when he wrote about institutional discrimination and how focusing on the majority might be beneficial to understanding the inequities of minority groups. At the time at which he was writing, the language and literature on whiteness was slowly being constructed in other fields. Floyd also wrote about race as a social construct; although not a new idea in other disciplines, it was new to the leisure research literature. In this special issue, authors move the discussion about the social construction of race beyond a focus on the individual to emphasize broader social and structural contexts.

In the fourth wave of race research, investigating leisure experiences and constraints experienced by white ethnic groups is not the same as interrogating whiteness. Few references in our literature examine how white privilege and whiteness operate in and through leisure spaces and impact leisure experiences of people of color. Willis (1997) argued that given the dominance of whiteness as a racial identity in the United States, white people do not cognitively comprehend their whiteness whereas racism makes it impossible for people of color to not be aware of their racial identity. Mc-Donald (2008) noted that whiteness operates in the study and practice of leisure, and invoking Frankenberg, stated that whiteness focuses attention on the "production and

reproduction of dominance rather than subordination, normativity rather than marginality and privilege rather than disadvantage" (p. 236). McDonald focused on how whiteness influences leisure experiences of people of color and the contribution that this critical perspective makes to understanding racism in leisure. Few researchers in our field use critical race theory to "trouble" the category of "race" or to critically examine ideologies that reinforce race and racism to create artificial differences between people. Absent is a discussion bringing together empirical knowledge about race-based participation in leisure and/or leisure experience and race, with critical and theoretical analyses of power and the politics of race and difference drawn from disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, and law.

In fourth wave research, expanded theoretical and methodological approaches to studying race and leisure are also needed. As Floyd predicted in 1998, there has been, according to Sasidharan (2002), a "surge in the number of outdoor recreation studies incorporating race and ethnicity as the primary cultural variable" (p. 1). Yet, he argues that "while race and ethnicity do represent important components of cultural change, the interplay of race and ethnicity, gender, age, and social structural variables (e.g., social roles, group relations, inequality), that could influence the outdoor recreation milieu remains largely unexplored" (Floyd, p. 1). The purpose of the special issue that Sasidharan and Kerstetter edited was to, "extend discussion of the relationship between recreation and key cultural components such as race and ethnicity; and elevate our wisdom regarding multicultural issues in outdoor recreation" (Sasidharan, p. 1). While in this particular issue, Floyd and Johnson (2002) define and discuss environmental justice and environmental justice in outdoor recreation, they argued that, "efforts to bring about environmental justice should focus on reducing income and class distinctions rather than attempting to eliminate racism" (p. 63). However we, like Stewart, Glover and Parry (2008), question the separation of ideology and policy issues. Where previous research approaches tended to separate ideology from policy, in the fourth wave, ideology, policy and research are not mutually exclusive.

Advancing the Fourth Wave: An Introduction to Papers in this Special Issue

Writing from a range of social, historical and political contexts, the six articles in this special issue advance the fourth wave of race research. The first two papers expand our conceptual and theoretical understanding of race and whiteness. In "(Re)Theorizing Leisure Experience and Race" Dana Kivel, Corey Johnson and Sheila Scraton (2009) examine the ways that we have historically conceptualized both leisure and race as "experience" and explore ways to (re)theorize race as socially constructed and racialized identities as fluid. In "Crossing the Color Line With a Different Perspective on Whiteness and (Anti)Racism: A Response to Mary McDonald," Nina Roberts (2009) focuses on power, privilege and the continued existence of oppression and discrimination. She draws on park use and exploring the outdoors during our leisure time as a context for understanding racism. The two papers that follow provide historical insight into how whiteness shaped leisure and leisure studies. In "Notes from A Leisure Son: Expanding an Understanding of Whiteness in Leisure," Rasul Mowatt (2009) examines whiteness underlying the development of recreation and parks in the U.S. amidst the racial politics of the 1960s. Then, in "Rocky Mountain National Park: History and Culture as Factors in African-American Park Visitation" Beth Erickson, Corey

Johnson and Dana Kivel (2009) shed light on historical and cultural factors of racism that have influenced experiences of African-Americans in a National Park. The final two papers in this special issue provide us with insight into how racial politics shape experiences of incarceration. Felice Yuen and Alison Pedlar (2009), in "Leisure as a Context for Justice: Experiences of Ceremony for Aboriginal Women in Prison," write about Aboriginal women's experiences of colonization, and ceremony as a context for liberation in a federal prison in Canada. In contrast, Laurel Richmond and Corey Johnson (2009) write about the reification of racial categories in the experiences of men in prison in "'It's a Race War': Race and Leisure Experiences in California State Prison."

To challenge definitions of race rooted in essentialized and natural categories of identity, articles in this special issue argue for the further examination of the social construction of race. Kivel, Johnson, and Scraton (2009) argue that, leisure studies has often adopted an essentialized approach which assumes that, "if we ask the right questions and if we dig deeply enough, we will uncover the illusive 'essence' of individuals and their leisure experiences" (p. 482). However, they argue that "a shift in focus is needed to strategize new ways to conceptualize and analyze 'race' and other identity politics" (p. 482). With this they challenge the emphasis in leisure studies on the examination of individual experience through a social-psychological lens. This lens, they argue, coupled with the lens of positivist methodology and the challenges of measurement led to a focus on mainstream populations and excluded marginalized individuals, or associated leisure experience with participation rates, markers of identity and leisure behaviors. As they suggest, these approaches tended to locate the individual's interpretation of leisure experiences at the center of discussions about leisure which carries with it an implicit assumption that identities emerge apart from social, political, economic and ideological discourses that shape experience. Drawing on Frankenberg, Kivel, Johnson and Scraton argue race is a social construct, and that the meaning of race changes over time in relation to power and processes of struggle in society. The authors weave together a complex set of lenses for shifting our analyses, suggesting we critically examine experience in relation to "identities and the ideologies that construct identity; with identity being thought of as "fluid and contextual" and accounting for "the intersection of experience with 'race,' 'gender' and 'sexuality' " (p. 480).

In this shift away from essentialized categories of race, articles in this special issue also focus on race (and racism) in relation to power, ideologies, and specifically white hegemony. Drawing on Gunter, Kivel, Johnson and Scraton (2009) argue that individual experiences need to be contextualized and understood within these broader ideological and discursive structures of whiteness and the production of the "other." Similarly, Roberts (2009) views race, in this case whiteness, in relation to power and privilege. Roberts calls on Feagin's work to address issues of racism and whiteness, arguing that "at its very base in both discourse and written scholarship, whiteness is known as a function of power and privilege" (p. 497). Taking up McDonald's themes or tactics that conceptualize whiteness (color and power evasiveness, normalization, intersectionality), Roberts elaborates on how invisibility and normalizing entrench whiteness, citing examples of color evasiveness and "racial essentialism" in the context of park spaces. Mowatt (2009) then draws out issues of power more explicitly in his discussion of whiteness and white supremacy. Inspired by Baldwin's *Notes From a Native Son* and using Winant's five racial projects for studying and challenging whiteness,

Mowatt injects into McDonald's (2009) analysis of whiteness the political ideology and power dominance that upholds whiteness. As McDonald (2009) stated, "rather than simply describing what whiteness is, it is more useful to explain what whiteness does" (p. 9).

Articles in this special issue also articulate the performative aspect of race; that is how it is expressed, performed, and in relation to this, how space becomes racialized. Drawing on Butler, Kivel, Johnson and Scraton (2009) suggest that in our examination of race there is a need to emphasize how individuals "perform" ideologically-based identities and how context influences performativity. Richmond and Johnson (2009) provide us with insight into the performative racialization of prison spaces. Specifically, they provide us with insight into how race organizes space in prison and the privilege attached to whiteness. In their article, ten men reflect upon their perceptions of race and power behind bars and analysis reveals that every decision in prison is made with survival in mind, and race is central to determining survival strategies and who has access to power. The system of Racially Organized Prison Politics (ROPP) influenced each and every decision behind bars, including leisure decisions, and was reinforced and regulated through indoctrination, maintenance, and structural support.

As whiteness is performed and spaces become racialized, explorations of whiteness must also consider how it is internalized and performed within people of color. As Roberts (2009) states, "To avoid risk of assimilation into a dominant culture, it may be appropriate to create awareness regarding how people of color have internalized whiteness and with this, enabling a deeper understanding of self-imposed, or internalized, oppression." (p. 500). Yuen and Pedlar (2009) provide us with insight into the continued performance of whiteness through the colonial oppression of Aboriginal people in Canada, which leads to their overrepresentation in Canada's prison system. They describe how historical and contemporary leisure practices are a part of the colonizing structures of Canada. Yuen and Pedlar describe leisure as a form of social control in that it may act to reproduce dominant social ideologies and contribute to the systematic production of individuals whose behaviour and general being are deemed as socially acceptable. Erickson, Johnson, and Kivel (2009) found that a history of oppression was also found to underlie historical and cultural factors influencing African-Americans' use of Rocky Mountain National Park. Where oppression has been internalized, authors also turn their attention to issues of transformation. Invoking Smith's model of Ethnic Identity Development, Roberts expands upon McDonald's description of race cognizance. Roberts states that a common human need for ethnic identity includes validation and reinforcement "in a positive manner by both his membership group and by the structure of the society's institutions" (p. 500). She also notes the strength it takes, "within a specific cultural group to break stereotypes and appreciate a group's 'distinctive contours' " (Roberts, p. 500). Taking up the issue of transformation, Yuen and Pedlar write that t*hrough ceremony in prison, Aboriginal women's identities and understanding of being Aboriginal evolved from pain and shame to pride and* connection with cultural values and traditions, leading to experiences of liberation from a colonized Aboriginal identity.

This fourth wave of race research also challenges previous notions of justice, and takes up issues of policy, and the inherent racism within. Richmond and Johnson (2009) and Yuen and Pedlar (2009) provide a critique of the current systems of jus-

tice. Yuen and Pedlar argue that the dominant conceptualizations of justice are based on white ideologies of crime and punishment. They make the argument for a move to encompass Aboriginal forms of justice, as manifest in the collective maintenance of harmony and balance. Writing about the legal system, Richmond and Johnson then argue that social justice requires both liberation and transformation. They describe policies within the prison system as color-blind, and citing Hylton they note that color-blindness encourages racial disadvantages. They argue that for social justice to be achieved, a critical lens is required to examine social markers which lead to varied treatment within a system that professes to value neutral policies. They further argue that transformation of the legal system is only possible if color-blind policies are abolished and the influence of whiteness is considered prior to arrest and punishment within the court system.

Racism persists in North America, and is bound up in social, legal and political institutions. For Mowatt (2009), "Policy analysis is another important pathway in leisure research to consider researching societal differences between groups based on race" (p. 514). Mowatt argues that with an expanded understanding of whiteness, leisure research could be a liberating tool for social justice to usher new conceptions, new theories, and new approaches to instruction, programming, and understanding in the field. Social justice then is the process of making the power and privilege of whiteness visible to those who possess it. Similarly, Roberts (2009) argues that we "must also consider how whiteness perpetuates itself through normality and invisibility", and the related actions of denial and evasion (p. 469). Roberts challenges that crucial questions about race must extend to asking questions about whiteness and its accompanying responsibility, such as: Where and with whom should the awareness and responsibility for whiteness lie? How responsible and aware of whiteness should Whites be? How should people of color relate to whiteness?

To advance the call for more diverse methodological approaches in this fourth wave, authors in this special issue discuss memory work, Critical Race Ethnography, and Creative Analytic Practice. Kivel, Johnson and Scraton (2009) note that even within the interpretivist turn to understanding difference among feminist researchers, categories of social identity were emphasized over the examination of structural inequalities and systemic oppression. Where research focused on individual experiences and differences in participation rates among different groups based on racial markers of identity (marginality and ethnicity theory), the result was to deepen the implicit assumption that categories of social identity (i.e., race) are invariable and possess fixed properties. This acted to reduce race to biological, independent variables that we attach to individuals, and framed experiences of inequality as a social fact. Kivel, Johnson and Scraton raise the important question: "Given that we are unlikely to abandon experience as the basis of knowledge; and given the fluidity of individual's identities, standpoints and subjectivities; and because researchers need to avoid marginalizing and rendering people as "other," how can we approach the study of leisure, experience and identity?" (p. 480). Their critique, "is not a call to abandon Leisure Studies' focus on individuals and their experiences of leisure" (p. 475). Instead they offer a discussion of memory work and critical ethnography rooted in critical race theory as alternative strategies for (re)conceptualizing and conducting research that accounts for individual experiences within broader discourses of ideology and power. In their

work with Aboriginal women in prison, Yuen and Pedlar (2009) challenge traditional power relationships in research and incorporate the use of Creative Analytic Practice as a method of data collection, analysis, and representation whereby all participants became collaborators engaged in the research process.

Conclusion

Articles in this special issue advance our thinking in the fourth wave of race research in leisure studies. They address the limitations of essentializing race, and further arguments around the social construction and deconstruction of racial categories. With this, the authors focus on understanding race (and racism) in relation to power, ideologies, and specifically White hegemony and whiteness including a discussion of how whiteness becomes internalized. Here race is also understood as performance and authors examine the racialization of space. As we move more fully into the fourth wave there is also a need to reconsider notions of justice and to address racism inherent within policies and practices. The authors also advance the call for more diverse methodologies and discuss the role that memory work, Critical Race Ethnography, and Creative Analytic Practice may play in leisure research on race.

There has been a growing focus in leisure research on race and ethnicity as quantified by Floyd (2007). Despite the growing numbers in articles over the decades (4 between 1970 and 1980, 66 in the 1990s, 55 between 2000 and 2007) Floyd noted that, relatively speaking, these are a small number of papers. Drawing on Hutchison, he argued that the literature on race in leisure studies, "occupies a marginal position relative to the field as a whole and it is only loosely connected to race and ethnicity issues being addressed in the broader social sciences and society" (Floyd, p. 248). The papers in this special issue help to connect discussions of race in leisure studies to concepts used in the broader social sciences, and directly address issues of public policy. In doing so, we hope that the special issue will help to move discussions of race in leisure studies from the margins to the center of our research agenda.

In this special issue on critical race theory and social justice perspectives on whiteness, difference(s) and (anti)racism in leisure studies, we argue that research and scholarship that advances the fourth wave is important for deep and meaningful social change to occur. We are not advocating for this fourth wave to fully replace the first three waves as arguments and actions from all four waves are needed to target different foci for social change. From the first wave, basic inequalities and rights continue to be an issue for many groups based on racial marginalization, as noted in poverty statistics for Western nations. Given the marginal role that race research has played in leisure studies there is also room for more research into different subgroups based on race (second wave) and for more complex examination of the intersection of race with gender, class, sexuality and (dis)ability (third wave). However, to get to the root of systemic change we need to acknowledge the existence and power of white hegemony and racism through a fourth wave, that makes explicit the power and ideologies underlying individual action, and the policies and practices of social institutions. Here we are arguing for leisure studies to move beyond an understanding of race as individual and essentialized to acknowledge its fluidity; and to balance examination of individual agency with a critique of the institutions and structures that perpetuate racism.

References

Allison, M.T. (2000). Leisure, diversity and social justice. *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 2-6.

Bialeschki, M. D., & Walbert, K. L. (1998). "You have to have some fun to go along with your work": The interplay of race, class, gender, and leisure in the industrial new South. Researching diverse populations. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 79-100.

Bowker, J. M., & Leeworthy, V. R. (1998). Accounting for ethnicity in recreation demand: A flexible count data approach. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 64-78.

Chick, G. (2005). Are prejudice and discrimination learned? A comment on Stodolsk. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(1), 41-43.

Cordell, K., Betz, C.J., & Green, G.T. (2002). Recreation and the environment as cultural dimensions in contemporary American society. *Leisure Sciences*, 24(1), 13-41.

Dustin, D. L., Schneider, I. E., McAvoy, L. H., & Frakt, A. N. (2002). Cross-cultural claims on Devils Tower National Monument: A case study. *Leisure Science,* 24(1), 79-88.

Erickson, B., Johnson, C. W., & Kivel, B. D. (2009). Rocky Mountain National Park: History and culture as factors in African-American park visitation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 527-544.

Floyd, M. F. (1998). Getting beyond marginality and ethnicity: The challenge for race and ethnic studies in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 3–22.

Floyd, M. F. (2007). Research on race and ethnicity in leisure: Anticipating the fourth wave. *Leisure/Loisir, 31*(1), 245-254.

Floyd, M. F., Bocarro, J. N., & Thompson, T. D. (2008). Research on race and ethnicity in leisure studies: A review of five major journals, *Journal of Leisure Research, 40*(1), 1-22.

Floyd, M. F., & Johnson, C. (2002). Coming to terms with environmental justice in outdoor recreation: A conceptual discussion with research implications. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(1), 59-77.

Gobster, P. H. (2002). Managing urban parks for a racially and ethnically diverse clientele. *Leisure Sciences*, 24(2), 143-159.

Gomez, E. (2002). The ethnicity of public recreation participation model. *Leisure Studies, 24*(2), 123–142.

Henderson, K. A. (1998). Researching diverse populations. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 157-170.

Henderson, K. A. (2005). Discrimination in the social context of leisure: A respons. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(1), 45-48.

Hollingshead, K. (1998). Tourism, hybridity, and ambiguity: The relevance of Bhabha's 'third space' cultures. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 121-156.

Hutchison, R. (2005). The racialization of leisure: Comments on Stodolska's discrimination model. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(1), 29 – 36.

Jackson, P. A. (1992). The racialization of labour in post-war Bradford. *Journal of Historical Geography, 18*, 190–209.

Johnson, C. Y., Bowker, J. M., English, D. B. K., & Wothern, D. (1998). Wildland recreation in the rural South: An examination of marginality and ethnicity theory. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 101-120.

Kesler, J. T. (2000). The healthy community movement: Seven counterintuitive next steps. *National Civic Review, 89*(3), 271-284.

Kivel, B. D. (2000). Leisure, experience and identity: What difference does difference make? *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 79-81.

Kivel, B. D. (2005). Examining racism, power, and white hegemony in Stodolska's conditioned attitude model of individual discriminatory behavior. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(1), 21–27.

Kivel, B. D., Johnson, C. W. & Scraton, S. (2009). (Re)theorizing leisure experience and race. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 471-492.

McDonald, M. (October, 2008). Dialogues on whiteness, leisure and (anti)racism. Leisure Research Symposium, Congress of the National Recreation and Park Society. Baltimore, Maryland.

McDonald, M. G. (2009). Dialogues on Whiteness, leisure, and (anti)racism. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(1), 5-21.

Mowatt, R. A. (2009). Notes from a leisure son: Expanding an understanding of Whiteness in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 509-526.

Outley, C. W., & Floyd, M. F. (2002). The home they live in: Inner city children's views on the influence of parenting strategies on their leisure behavior. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(2), 161-179.

Payne, L. L., Mowen, A. J., & Orsega-Smith, E. (2002). An examination of park preferences and behaviors among urban residents: The role of residential location, race and age. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(2), 181-198.

Phillipp, S. (2000). Race and the pursuit of happiness. *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 121-124.

Rehman, L. A. (2002). Recognizing the significance of culture and ethnicity: Exploring hidden assumptions of homogeneity. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(1), 43-57.

Richmond, L. P., & Johnson, C. W. (2009). It's a race war:" Race and leisure experiences in California state prison. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 563-578.

Roberts, N. S. (2009). Crossing the color line with a different perspective on whiteness and (anti) racism: A response to Mary McDonald. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 493-508.

Sasdiharan, V. (2002). Special issue introduction: Understanding recreation and the environment within the context of culture. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(1), 1-11.

Shaull, S. L., & Gramann, J. H. (1998). The effect of cultural assimilation on the importance of family-related and nature-related recreation among Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 47-63.

Shaw, S.M. (2005). Discrimination is a societal issue too: Moving beyond individual behavior. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(1), 37-40.

Shinew, K. J., Stodolska, M., Floyd, M., Hibbler, D., Allison, M., Johnson, C., & Santos, C. (2006). Race and ethnicity in leisure behavior: Where have we been and where do we need to go? *Leisure Sciences, 28*(4), 403-408.

Stewart, W. P., Glover, T. D., & Parry, D. G. (2008). Writing leisure: Values and ideologies of research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 40*(3), 360-384.

Stodolska, M. (2000). Looking beyond the invisible: Can research on leisure of ethnic and racial minorities contribute to leisure theory? *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 156-160.

Stodolska, M. (2005). A conditioned attitude model of individual discriminatory behavior. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(1), 1-20.

Stodolska, M., & Jackson, E. L. (1998). Discrimination in leisure and work experienced by a white ethnic minority group. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 23-46.

Stodolska, M., & Walker, G. J. (2007). Ethnicity and leisure: Historical development, current status, and future directions. *Leisure/Loisir, 3*(1), 3-26.

Thapa, B., Graefe, A. R., & Absher, J. D. (2002). Information needs and search behaviors: A comparative study of ethnic groups in the Angeles and San Bernardino national forests, California. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(1), 89-107.

Tinsley, H. E. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Croskeys, C. E. (2002). Park usage, social milieu, and Psychoso-cial benefits of park use reported by older urban park users from four ethnic groups. *Leisure Sciences*, *24*(2), 199-218.

Willis, C. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Yuen, F., & Pedlar, A. (2009). Leisure as a context for justice: Experiences of ceremony for Aboriginal women in prison. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 545-562.