

Development of leisure adaptation meanings scale

JUSUNG KIM

Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, CANADA

Published online: December 30, 2017

(Accepted for publication December 17, 2017)

DOI:10.7752/jpes.2017.04304

Abstract:

One of the gaps in leisure research is the lack of culturally contextualized leisure-generated meanings scales, and the role of culture and acculturation in leisure meanings has been a neglected area of research. This study involves both developing the Leisure Adaptation Meanings Scale (LAMS). Leisure adaptation meaning means domain-specific leisure meanings during coping with and adapting to life challenges. Using an exploratory factor analysis with 120 Korean immigrants in a western Canadian city, the LAMS with alpha of .93 was found to consist of five factors: (a) leisure companionship, (b) leisure adjustment, (c) leisure palliative coping, (d) leisure mood enhancement, and (e) leisure rejuvenation. The LAMS adds to existing knowledge about leisure meanings from a cross-cultural perspective.

Key Words: *leisure meaning, culture, acculturative stress, coping, scale*

Introduction

Statement of Problem

One of the most overlooked problems that leisure scholarship faces is the dearth of the development of culturally bounded leisure meaning scales for collectivistic cultural groups. Of concern, there is no specific, reliable, and valid scale to assess leisure meanings, not only in coping with acculturation stress, but also in adjusting to a life (e.g., identity construction and personal growth/transformation) from collectivistic cultures beyond an individualistic perspective. Roberts (2011) argues that because of an ethnocentric bias, measuring leisure concepts and dimensions has been criticized, and diverse voices from cross-cultural perspectives should be heard in leisure scholarship. Likewise, Gurbuz and Henderson (2013) note that “A final challenge regarding leisure meanings relates to cultural considerations” (p. 929). All in all, leisure studies need to develop leisure meaning scales focused on the multiple and complex meanings of leisure for immigrants during the acculturation process into the host culture in North America.

Second, despite an extensive research on leisure coping, past studies have not developed a leisure adaptation meaning scale in relation to acculturation and adaptation of immigrants based on conceptual frameworks addressing both coping and human development perspectives. To support this idea, Wong et al. (2006, p. 11) argue that “The main challenge to cross-cultural psychology of stress and coping is to develop constructs and instruments that reflect the preferred values of other cultures. The main problem of the current Euro-American approach to cross-cultural research is the lack of construct equivalence.” Like the term culture, one reason may be that the concepts of meaning, value, consciousness, and creativity had been largely unrecognized and treated as peripheral pseudo-psychology by the mainstream positivistic psychology because of methodological reasons (Arons & Richards, 2001, as cited in Richards, 2007). Culture and acculturation are a symbolic entity and the underlying context for determining leisure meanings and practices, yet the concepts of culture and acculturation in leisure meanings have been largely a neglected area of research.

Third, no systematic attempt has been made to explore global leisure meanings (e.g., group harmony, perceived freedom) of Korean immigrant groups in Euro-North American contexts. Although the past leisure research has well articulated key leisure meanings, some important variables including group harmony, ethnic identity, or self-development have been overlooked in the process of conceptualizing leisure meaning scales seen through acculturation and immigration contexts. Also, when investigating complex and multiple leisure meanings, it is important to distinguish between global leisure meanings and leisure adaptation meanings because with their different foci they may function differently in the processes of coping, adjustment, and adaptation. For example, when situational impact is not strong, people tend to employ dispositional or personality coping beliefs while situational impact is strong, people tend to display domain specific leisure coping actions or strategies (Iwasaki & Mannell, 2000). They go so far as to say that this distinction is important to better understand how leisure both buffers or moderates and mediates as a process in coping with stress on adaptation.

By addressing those concerns mentioned above, this study will make contributions to: (1) the knowledge production of leisure meanings with respect to acculturation and immigration contexts in Canada

beyond the mainstream theoretical framework; (2) the practical implications for leisure practitioners and social and health fields (e.g., settlement and integration counsellor); and (3) the possible applications of this study to other immigrant groups.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical foundation of the LAMS serving as pathways to coping and development represents the conceptual frameworks of both Iwasaki and Mannell (2000) and Kleiber, Hutchinson, and Williams (2002). They incorporate the role of leisure meanings into the process of coping and human development including identity construction and personal growth. The LAMS refers to the situational practice of coping behavior in a given stress context so that the LAMS means domain-specific meanings gained through leisure actions while coping with and adapting to life challenges. The LAMS is in line with the role of self-protection, self-restoration, and personal growth of Kleiber et al. (2002) and leisure coping strategies (Iwasaki & Mannell, 2000).

Iwasaki and Mannell (2000) conceptualised the hierarchical dimensions of leisure coping, comprising of leisure coping beliefs and leisure coping strategies. At the most general level, leisure coping beliefs consist of two sub-dimensions: leisure autonomy and leisure friendship. Self-determination as a dimension of leisure autonomy refers to people's belief that their leisure is personally chosen, whereas leisure empowerment as another dimension of leisure autonomy refers to the role of leisure in helping people feel empowered and resilient against stress. Leisure friendship is defined as people's dispositions that friendship developed through leisure provides them with perceived social support and networking. Leisure coping strategies consist of three sub-dimensions. First, leisure palliative coping refers to a time-out, escape, or break through leisure, which allows people to feel rejuvenated and refreshed. Second, leisure companionship involves enjoyable leisure activities that evoke a sense of closeness and belonging. Finally, leisure mood enhancement means the promotion of positive mood and the reduction of negative mood through leisure. Kleiber et al.'s (2002) framework of leisure's role in coping and adaptation is another foundation of this study. Of the four propositions, the first two ones, distraction and optimism, deal with self-protective functions of leisure, whereas the other two propositions address the adjustment role of leisure including self-restoration and personal transformation. As for self-restoration, leisure can restore a sense of the valuable past self, and it can also serve as a catalyst for personal change by facilitating cognitive reinterpretation, expanded interests, and a new sense of freedom (Kleiber et al., 2002).

The purpose of this study was to develop culturally relevant leisure meaning scales, the leisure adaptation meanings scale (LAMS) that was newly developed in order to measure the specific coping and adjusting leisure meanings for Korean immigrants during acculturation in a western city in Canada.

Method

Participants

A total of 120 participants aged over 18 years with Korean ethnicity were drawn from a non-random sample in Winnipeg, Canada. Data were collected at four different sampling sites, including three Korean churches and a Korean community centre/apartment complex to access a wide range of adults with Korean ethnicity. The detailed characteristics of the research participants were reported in another article.

Scale Development

The scale-development process followed combined recommendations of Hsiao (2015), Ragheb (1996), and Zhang and Long (2006). Based on these guidelines, the LAMS was newly developed. Specific steps are following: (a) conceptual and operational definitions were developed based on literature review followed by identifying specific components; (b) a pool of items for scales were generated from literature including some dominant leisure meanings; (c) the lead researcher modified necessary items of each scale to fit with the context of Korean immigrants and then translated them into Korean with the assistance of two certified translators because validity is contextual and progressive (DeVellis, 2012); (d) the initial draft of scales were reviewed by three professors in leisure fields; (e) to refine the first draft of measures, a pre/pilot-test was conducted using 10 participants in verbal and written formats to enhance the face and content validity of the questionnaire; (f) after gaining feedback from the participants and performing the back-translation by the translators, some items of scales were refined, and new items were added to the final version of the questionnaires; and (g) scales were tested by performing both factor analysis and alpha values.

After developing conceptual and operational definitions of the LAMS provided earlier, it involves the use of leisure not only to cope with life stress but also to generate one's hope, identity construction, and personal transformation. The LAMS consists of five constructs: (a) leisure companionship (12 items), (b) leisure palliative coping (12 items), (c) leisure mood enhancement (10 items), (d) leisure coping motivation (four items), and (e) leisure-generated growth (four items). The LAMS consists of 42 items with a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"). Table 1 shows the item pools, concepts, and definitions of the LAMS.

Table 1: *Items, Concepts, and LAMS*

Concepts & Definitions	Items
Leisure companionship: Enjoyable shared leisure activities to feel a sense of companionship and belonging.	I manage stress by discussing/sharing worries with someone in social gatherings or occasions. Shared leisure with others helps me cope with stress. I am aware of how mutual empathy during family time helps me manage stress. I feel mutual trust developed through leisure with friends enables me to handle stress. Social gatherings give me a sense of assurance and warmth. My experience of getting along with others in leisure helps me cope with stress. Laughter in social gatherings helps me better handle stress. I feel uncomfortable when I spend time with friends. I get a sense of belonging in social gatherings with companions. I feel affection toward companions in social gatherings. Having fun with family helps me deal with my stress and fatigue better. I feel a sense of closeness in social gatherings.
Leisure mood enhancement: The enhancement of positive mood and the reduction of negative mood through leisure activities.	Positive emotions in leisure help me better manage stress. To me, leisure activities reduce negative emotions. My feelings of calmness are enhanced through leisure. Rarely does leisure help me achieve emotional uplift. Getting out in the fresh air allows me to feel better. Emotional uplift through leisure results in a heightened state of consciousness. Leisure activities make me change my emotional state in a positive way. A shift in emotional atmosphere at social gatherings makes me become energized. Social gatherings make me feel nervous. Shared leisure helps me become less worrisome.
Leisure palliative coping: Having a time-out or break through leisure to gain a sense of refreshment and transcendence.	Leisure gives me a nice break from stress in life. A shift in emotional atmosphere during leisure enables me to escape from a routine life. Leisure affords me an escape from stress. I forget about life stress during free time. Escaping stress through leisure helps me cope. I feel free from society's restrictions or obligations during social gatherings. Social gatherings make me become aware of my inhibitions. Leisure keeps me busy to help my mind off daily worries. Leisure makes me become refreshed. A refreshed mind through leisure gives me flexible thinking. I feel rejuvenated from leisure. Connecting with nature helps me counteract stress.
Leisure coping motivation: Sustaining coping efforts by providing a sense of hope and optimism for their imagined futures or ideal selves.	Through leisure I gain a positive view to look forward to something positive. I get a sense of purpose or achievement through leisure. I get a sense of group solidarity during leisure activities. I have many opportunities to have fun through leisure.
Leisure-generated growth: The role of leisure in providing an opportunity or context for personal growth/transformation through facilitating reflection on one's life, expanded interests, and a new sense of freedom.	For me, leisure serves as a context for thinking about better dealing with challenges in life. Leisure enables me to develop expanded interests in my life. Leisure provides me with a new sense of freedom in my life. Leisure allows me to reflect on myself better.

Scale Verification and Refinement

First, initial analyses were conducted to obtain descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients among variables. Alpha values were then calculated to estimate the reliability of the scales with item analysis procedures for the total scales and their dimensions.

Exploratory factor analysis. Factor analysis was performed to “identify the factor structure or model for a set of variables (Henson & Roberts, 2006, p. 395). The newly developed LAMS was tested with exploratory factor analysis (EFA) that is more suitable for analyzing new scales (McCoach, Gable, & Madura, 2013). A series of EFAs were then run using a principal axis factoring extraction, Promax oblique rotation method, and listwise deletion of missing values. Initially, the EFA with the 42 items of the LAMS was run to examine if there were items with negative loading values, item loadings below .30, and non-sensible factors or items, using the pattern matrix. Then, the EFAs were rerun after deleting psychometrically weak, unreasonable items using communality above .5, primary factor loading above |.5|, cross-loadings, useful contribution to a factor, and reliability, and kept doing these procedures until finding possible factor structures. On the basis of literature review, mixed criteria were used to determine an appropriate number of factors to retain for rotation including: (a) eigenvalue above 1, (b) the scree plots where there is a noticeable drop or the ‘elbow’, (c) item loadings above .30, (d) no or few item cross loadings, (e) factors with at least three items, (f) conceptual clarity and simplicity of the factors, (g) the total variance explained ideally 50 % to 75 % of the variance by the least

number of factors, and, most importantly, (h) theoretical meaningfulness and interpretability (i.e., make sense of naming and description) of the rotated factor solutions (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hair et al., 2010; Henson & Roberts, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Considering these criteria above, four-, five-, six-, and seven-factor solutions for the LAMS were extracted and rotated as possible factors to retain for further EFAs and then the results were compared with each other. Of these, the five factor solution of the LAMS was identified as the most reasonable and acceptable construct because its factor structure was more conceptually sound and more interpretable than the other factor solutions.

Results

EFA of LAMS

The criteria for deleting items included inter-item and corrected item-total correlations, reliability scores, and theoretical foundations (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Accordingly, 12 items were deleted from the original item pools. The overall Cronbach’s alpha score for the LAMS was .93, indicating strong internal consistency of the scale. The alpha coefficients for the components of the LAMS were .87 (leisure companionship), .80 (leisure mood enhancement), .84 (leisure palliative coping), .75 (leisure rejuvenation), and .80 (leisure adjustment). The values of the factor correlations ranged from .37 to .62, showing relatively high correlations, which justified the use of an oblique rotation rather than an orthogonal rotation.

Tables 2 and 3 show the final results of the pattern matrix and the item pools from the EFA of the LAMS, consisting of five factors, *leisure companionship*, *leisure adjustment*, *leisure palliative coping*, *leisure mood enhancement*, and *leisure rejuvenation*.

Table 2: Results of Pattern Matrix of EFA of LAMS

		<i>Factors</i>					<i>Communalities</i>
		<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
Leisure Companionship	Comp9	<u>.757</u>				.322	.640
	Mood10	.755					.535
	Comp2	.710					.571
	Comp12	.634					.465
	Comp10	.632					.511
	Comp6	<u>.618</u>				-.381	.519
	Mood8	.577					.506
	Comp5	.558					.513
Leisure Adjustment	Mood3		.844				.571
	Comp3		.648				.491
	Motiva3		.590				.373
	Pallia3		.557			<u>.307</u>	.577
	Grow3		.422				.516
	Comp4	<u>.329</u>	.402				.350
	Grow2		.379				.311
	Pallia1		.364		<u>.350</u>		.454
Leisure Palliative Coping	Mood5			.856			.721
	Pallia5			.781			.676
	Pallia12			.724			.542
	Comp11			.554			.552
	Grow4		<u>.336</u>	.378			.530
	Motiva1				.747		.708
Leisure Mood Enhancement	Comp1	<u>.405</u>			.582		.391
	Mood2				.505		.413
	Mood1				.494		.417
	Pallia2				.467		.459
	Pallia9					.607	.584
Leisure Rejuvenation	Mood4					.532	.234
	Pallia11		.306			<u>.421</u>	.580
	Grow1				.327	<u>.402</u>	.566
	Eigenvalues	10.54	2.53	1.66	1.58	1.36	
	Variance %	35.14	8.43	5.52	5.27	4.54	
Cumulative %	35.14	43.57	49.09	54.34	58.88		
Alpha	.87	.80	.84	.80	.75	Total alpha:	
						.93	

Note 1: Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization. Values below .30 suppressed.

Note 2: Comp = leisure companionship, Mood = leisure mood enhancement, Pallia = leisure palliative coping, Motiva = leisure coping motivation, and Grow = leisure-generated growth.

Note 3: Underlined items theoretically belong to the column on which the items were loaded.

Two unique results should be noted. First, the dimension of leisure palliative coping originally conceptualized as only one component was identified as two factors: leisure rejuvenation and leisure palliative coping. This result indicated that a rejuvenating role of leisure seemed somewhat distinct from leisure palliative

coping. In contrast, the two original dimensions of leisure coping motivation and leisure-generated growth merged to only one factor, leisure adjustment, potentially implying non-separable characteristics of leisure coping motivation and leisure-generated growth. In terms of cross loadings of items, several items loaded on across two factors. Consequently, the theoretical foundation and meaningfulness of those items were considered to interpret the results, thereby determining which items conceptually match with which factors.

Table 3: Results of Item Pools of Final EFA of LAMS

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Variable Names</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Alpha if item deleted</i>
Leisure Companionship (alpha = .87)	Comp9	I get a sense of belonging in social gatherings with companions.	.929
	Mood10	Shared leisure helps me become less worrisome.	.930
	Comp2	Shared leisure with others helps me cope with stress.	.929
	Comp12	I feel a sense of closeness in social gatherings.	.929
	Comp10	I feel affection toward companions in social gatherings.	.929
	Comp6	My experience of getting along with others in leisure helps me cope with stress.	.930
	Mood8	A shift in emotional atmosphere at social gatherings makes me become energized/confident.	.929
	Comp5	Social gatherings give me a sense of assurance and warmth.	.929
	Comp4	I feel mutual trust developed through leisure with friends enables me to handle stress.	.930
	Comp1	I manage stress by discussing/sharing worries with someone in social gatherings or occasions.	.932
Leisure Adjustment (alpha = .80)	Mood3	My feelings of calmness are enhanced through leisure.	.929
	Comp3	I am aware of how mutual empathy during family time helps me manage stress.	.929
	Motiva3	I get a sense of group solidarity during leisure activities.	.930
	Grow3	Leisure provides me with a new sense of freedom in my life.	.928
	Grow2	Leisure enables me to develop expanded interests in my life.	.930
Leisure Palliative coping (alpha = .84)	Mood5	Getting out in the fresh air allows me to feel better.	.929
	Pallia5	Escaping stress through leisure helps me cope.	.929
	Pallia12	Connecting with nature helps me counteract stress.	.930
	Comp11	Having fun with family helps me deal with my stress and fatigue better.	.928
Leisure Mood Enhancement (alpha = .80)	Motiva1	Through leisure I gain a positive view to look forward to something positive.	.929
	Mood2	To me, leisure activities reduce negative emotions.	.929
	Mood1	Positive emotions in leisure help me better manage stress.	.930
	Pallia2	A shift in emotional atmosphere during leisure enables me to escape from a routine life.	.929
	Pallia1	Leisure gives me a nice break from stress in life.	.929
Leisure Rejuvenation (alpha = .75)	Pallia9	Leisure makes me become refreshed.	.929
	Mood4	Rarely does leisure help me achieve emotional uplift.*	.935
	Pallia11	I feel rejuvenated from leisure.	.928
	Grow1	For me, leisure serves as a context for thinking about better dealing with challenges in life.	.928
	Pallia3	Leisure affords me an escape from stress.	.929
Total alpha = .93			

* Reversely coded question.

Note: Comp = leisure companionship, Mood = leisure mood enhancement, Pallia = leisure palliative coping, Motiva = leisure coping motivation, and Grow = leisure-generated growth.

The first factor, *leisure companionship*, measures the extent to which and how leisure helps people gain a sense of companionship and belonging to a group as a way of coping with stress. This factor consisting of 10 items accounted for 35.1% of the total variances. The second factor, *leisure adjustment*, refers to leisure meanings for personal adjustment through promoting one's interest, a new sense of freedom, group solidarity, and calmness. It had six items that accounted for 8.4% of the total variances. Interestingly, according to the original theory, two items (Mood 3 and Comp 3) in this factor fit conceptually with leisure mood enhancement and leisure companionship. However, Mood 3 and Comp 3 were shown to belong to the leisure adjustment meaning perhaps because these represent adjustment functions through leisure from a collectivist/interdependent perspective (as was the case for the present study with Korean immigrants). Specifically, the item, Mood 3, "my

feelings of calmness are enhanced through leisure,” indicates purified emotion or stabilized calmness in the process of coping, which seems similar to the state of meditation with a sense of peace and comfort. Likewise, the item of Comp 3, “I am aware of how mutual empathy during family time helps me manage stress,” may be considered as a generalized perception of the family’s mutual empathy, as a way of coping and adjustment through meaningful family interactions. That is, family times appear to provide an important context for sharing mutual empathy during acculturation processes.

The third factor, *leisure palliative coping*, assesses a perception of having a time-out, escape, or break through leisure as a way of coping with stress. This factor including four items accounted for 5.5% of the total variances. The fourth factor, *leisure mood enhancement*, means the promotion of positive moods and the reduction of negative emotions through leisure. Consisting of five items, it accounted for 5.3% of the total variances. The fifth factor, *leisure rejuvenation*, involves a sense of refreshment, vigor, and rejuvenation gained through leisure. It included five items and accounted for 4.5% of the total variances. As a whole, these five constructs of the LAMS explained 58.9% of the total variances, showing a good psychometric quality as a valid and reliable measurement within a range of acceptable factor structures (Hair et al., 2010).

The LAMS showed good psychometric qualities of validity. The scales proved to be good signs of convergent and divergent constructs, construct validity, by looking at the pattern and the factor correlation matrixes (Hair et al., 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Face and content validity of the scales were enhanced by a well-designed cognitive pre-test and an expert review for the scale development (Artino et al., 2014).

Discussion

Recent research has shown popularity in examining a meaning-making role of leisure in the process of coping with stress and adapting to life challenges among marginalized groups (Kim et al., 2015; Lim, 2016; Sharabi, 2014). This study involved the development of leisure adaptation meanings scales: the LAMS, which measures leisure meanings of non-dominant immigrants from a cross-cultural perspective beyond the dominant framework of leisure meanings.

Leisure Adaptation Meanings Scale

A unique contribution of this study involved the development of Leisure Adaptation Meanings Scale culturally relevant for Korean Canadians from collectivistic cultural orientation. A set of 30 items of the LAMS was developed to measure domain specific leisure meanings with respect to the role of leisure in coping and development. Specifically, new constructs conceptualized in the LAMS include the meanings of leisure rejuvenation and leisure adjustment, in addition to leisure companionship, leisure mood enhancement, and leisure palliative coping that were conceptualized in the past research (Iwasaki & Mannell, 2000).

The strengths of the LAMS are summarized below. First, the LAMS is designed to measure the meanings of life gained from leisure pursuits in the processes of acculturation and adaptation experienced by non-dominant groups of people, including ones who are raised in and/or value a collectivistic culture. In contrast, other existing scales for measuring similar constructs (e.g., leisure coping beliefs and leisure coping strategies) focus on general or normal life stress experienced by general populations who tend to live in and/or value an individualistic culture orientation (Iwasaki & Mannell, 2000).

Second, the philosophical underpinning of the LAMS is culture and its pervasive effects on people’s lives including leisure. It can be assumed that subjective meanings of an individual’s viewpoint are necessary but not sufficient to make sense of the complexity of broad meanings in life. Culture, however, is considered to be a bedrock containing all meanings, so giving more attention to cultural and historical contexts is important to better understand complex and multiple meanings in life particularly for less privileged groups. In essence, the conceptualizations and assumptions of the LAMS are deeply embedded and rooted in cultural and historical contexts, and its philosophical underlying characteristics value social constructivism from cross-cultural perspectives that operate in people’s lives beyond an individual paradigm (Creswell, 2013; Watkins, 2000; 2010). From this position, the LAMS is considered to be a culturally grounded measure as it incorporates lay beliefs and life contexts of marginalized groups (e.g., Koreans) into the conceptualization of the LAMS.

Third, the LAMS is a theory-driven and data driven measurement, which is recommended by Hsiao (2015), Ragheb (1996), and Zhang and Long (2006). In accordance with the philosophical claim mentioned above, strategies for searching for the relevant literature targeting acculturating Koreans and minority ethnic members to develop the LAMS are mostly based on an array of sources coming from cross-cultural and global contexts from which various samples across cultures are drawn, including some dominant perspectives. Thus, with the help of these many cross-cultural and globalization views (Stodolska, Shinew, Floyd, & Walker, 2015; Gurbuz & Henderson, 2013; Ito & Walker, 2014; Iwasaki, 2008; 2016; Samdahl, 2011), the LAMS represents a more balanced and robust measure of leisure meanings than the other existing measures that tend to rely on only one culture over the others. Consequently, this approach was an intentional attempt to challenge Western-oriented conceptualizations of leisure phenomena from a cross-cultural and global perspective. Fourth, as shown in the present study, the psychometric qualities (i.e., reliability and validity) of the LAMS prove to be strong with an overall alpha value of .93 and good signs of construct validity by looking at convergent and divergent

construct of the LAMS. Its dimensions, identified through an exploratory factor analysis, mostly correspond with previous theories and empirical findings.

Lastly, the LAMS integrates the ideas of both leisure stress-coping and developmental aspects of leisure, the role of leisure in facilitating identity reconstruction and personal transformation. In other words, the characteristics of leisure meanings are circular and spiral in relation to coping and development as they are interconnected and are influenced by each other over the life course in a unique cultural context (Spencer et al., 2006). Specifically, leisure stress-coping is a first and most essential step for surviving and thriving, and can be considered as a pathway to human development, and this adjustment meaning could in turn influence the specific meanings of leisure coping and vice versa (Spencer et al., 2006).

Comparison between LAMS and LMI

Although the Leisure Meanings Inventory (LMI) developed by Schulz and Watkins (2007) presents a new conceptualization of *global* leisure meanings, it does not embrace *domain-specific* leisure coping and adjustment meanings. In essence, the LAMS addresses this gap/weakness by covering both partial global and domain-specific (i.e., coping-specific) leisure meanings. With this in mind, the following section offers a critical discussion comparing and contrasting the two measures (i.e., LMI & LAMS) by clarifying not only strengths but also weaknesses both epistemologically and methodologically.

First, the LAMS is aligned with the epistemology of social construction from cross-cultural perspectives mentioned earlier, whereas the epistemological assumption of the LMI is in line with a phenomenological root. Even though both measures deal with an interpretive paradigm of leisure meanings beyond cognitively constructed meanings, the process of meaning of the LAMS people pursue is more likely to be tied to and be influenced by history and culture. In contrast, the construction of meaning for the LMI people make tends to focus on an individual's subjective meaning of leisure that mostly represents Western notions. Moreover, the LMI also considers relational qualities between an individual and leisure contexts, but it does not, however, address broader cultural, historical, and social contexts to incorporate them to the LMI. For this reason, the approach of the critical stance from cross-cultural lens (as is the case of LAMS) is assumed suitable for culturally shared experiences in historical, cultural, and global contexts (i.e., mind in society). In contrast, a phenomenological perspective (as is the case of LMI) is assumed to be suitable for measuring an individual's experience of leisure (i.e., society in mind).

Keeping those epistemological assumptions in mind, a summary of the different conceptualizations between the LMI and the LAMS is needed. The LMI measures a generalized constellation of meanings gained from leisure in conjunction with contextual situations. The LMI consists of the categories of escaping pressure, exercising choice, passing time, and self-fulfillment that represent dispositional leisure meanings. Furthermore, unlike the LAMS, the LMI identifies that contextual contents of leisure meanings are differently activated and interrelated depending on time, context, emotion, outcome, intention, and action. In other words, "a different relational value expresses the quality of meaning for each dimension" (Schulz & Watkins, 2007, p. 484), so the LMI addresses some of the complex phenomena of leisure meanings. In contrast, the LAMS is developed to measure the extent to which and how people gain meanings in life through the processes of adapting to challenges of life via leisure engagements. That is, leisure coping or leisure development as part of the LAMS determines how leisure specifically enables people to gain meanings of life via coping with stress and grow from it in their lives. In comparison to the LMI, the LAMS is assumed to be contingent on specific, situational contexts in the process of leisure coping and transformation through leisure, and the conceptualization of the LAMS is culturally grounded beyond a dominant Western context.

Methodologically speaking, although both the LMI and the LAMS have made an attempt to develop different leisure meaning measures by adopting a mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) for item creation, the research methodologies used differ due to the different epistemological origins as described above. First, the sample upon which the LAMS was tested was a marginalized cultural group (Koreans) in Canada, whereas the sample upon which the LMI was tested was seemingly mostly dominant cultural groups (e.g., university students) in Australia. Accordingly, the focus of inventing items underpinning the LAMS is considered specific, cultural leisure meanings whose voices are relatively weak and disfranchised (i.e., culture shapes leisure meanings over an individual). However, the direction of creating items underlying the LMI tends to focus on the dominant paradigm of subjective individual meanings in leisure (i.e., an individual makes leisure meanings over culture).

Furthermore, the LMI uses enough sample sizes at different time frames (e.g., $n=220$ for inventory creation, $n=151$ pilot test, $n=475$ main study) for running an exploratory factor analysis to develop the LMI. However, the LAMS uses only 10 participants for the pre-test and 120 samples for the main study. In addition, the LMI employs a combination of short statements and longer contextualized items along with leisure content dimensions to enable the participants to better respond to the context of items in a meaningful way. In contrast, the LAMS only uses short-item statements and does not embrace leisure content factors (e.g., time, intention, act) although the strategy for developing item pools relies on an integrative, cross-cultural review of literature. Therefore, the LMI was designed to explain complex leisure contexts within a single leisure meaning, whereas the LAMS was aimed to address culturally grounded leisure meanings from a non-dominant perspective.

Conclusions

Implications

Theoretically, the development of culturally relevant leisure meaning scales from the perspective of an immigration population could contribute to the important development of our knowledge base of leisure research beyond the current mainstream paradigm. Consequently, the LAMS complements existing leisure meaning scales and leisure conceptualizations based on the Euro-North American perspectives of leisure meanings because marginalized populations such as immigrants have only been included in a homogenized voice in the form of a hegemonic model. Thus, this research aspires to explore the hidden voices of leisure meanings for Korean immigrants in North America, as they should be acknowledged in leisure studies so as to better represent their collective leisure goals and needs.

Another potential significance of this research may be the power of leisure meanings to explain and predict culturally bounded leisure dosages such as leisure types, frequency, intensity, and duration of Korean Canadians' adaptation. In this manner, Isen argues that "positive affect enhances people's ability to see alternative cognitive perspectives" (Isen, 1999, p. 531). Moreover, cognition, affect, and motivation are not completely separate entities, but they mutually influence one another. As such, positive affects including leisure can facilitate intrinsic motivation and positively reinforce what people enjoy or want (Isen & Reeve, 2002), thus resulting in both continued and future participation in leisure. Although there are a handful of theories (e.g., self-determination and planned behaviour) to predict leisure behaviour, a meaning-focused orientation is rare, but has the potential to be developed in part due to its culturally appropriate nature in a global context (Iwasaki, 2008; 2016; Porter et al., 2010). If life meanings guide our daily life practices as a beacon, it is highly possible for leisure meanings to lead to everyday leisure practices that are contingent on cultural orientation, thereby necessitating future research.

There are three important practical implications from this research. First, leisure service providers may use leisure meanings scales as reference points to better serve culturally diverse people and groups who may have different leisure expectations and goals. Foremost, leisure practitioners and leisure service deliveries should understand how different cultural orientations determine unique worldviews and self-structures (Ishi et al., 2014; Wong et al., 2006), leisure meanings (Ito & Walker, 2014; Walker & Wang, 2009), and leisure behaviour (Stodolska et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2015) so that educating leisure practitioners and leisure providers about culture and its impact on leisure is necessary. For example, sometimes many immigrant groups and their members tend to prefer spontaneous leisure activities rather than organized ones favored in North America, so opening soccer fields or leisure spaces before or after organized time frames is a good simple start to address their leisure needs and meanings.

A second significance of this study in addition to being an effective modality for coping with multiple stressors, is that leisure meanings can serve as tool kits for, identity development, personal and cultural expression, and personal change. The potential exists for health and leisure fields to maximize the effectiveness of their interventions and programs designed to help their clients promote health, manage stress, and grow through the use of leisure meaning-focused approaches. For instance, because personal life stories (e.g., values, identity) tend to influence the ways people gain leisure meanings (e.g., leisure ethnic identity), health practitioners, therapists, or social workers might help diverse clients set goals to have a meaningful life via engagement in leisure depending on their unique cultural background(s) and life circumstances.

Finally, those individuals who encounter social inequalities do not carry those burdens by themselves and their families, but leisure researchers and the entire society have to make a collective effort to solve social injustices. Particularly marginalized populations are often left vulnerable in part because of a lack of access to resource to assist in the handling of life stress as well as the economic constraints that make it difficult to afford leisure opportunities. It is this interest that has led to the focus of this paper on the role of leisure meanings in managing acculturation stress and transforming individual identities enroute to the Korean Canadians' adaptation to new cultures.

Limitations

There are some limitations of the LAMS. For instance, the LAMS could be improved by carefully adding, refining, and modifying some items to improve the psychometric properties of the scales. Qualitative approach via interview or focus group methods can strengthen and expand the richness and variety of items of the scales by incorporating complex and multiple meanings of leisure gained through leisure. The LAMS might also be improved by incorporating additional constructs of leisure meanings into the current LAMS. For instance, collective or group-based leisure coping and a religious or spiritual dimension may be added to the LAMS because in a collective culture, people often seek out help and resources from family, relatives, and/or communities. There is also a problem of a cross-sectional research design to measure leisure meanings since "the search for meaning in leisure might fluctuate over time" (Ragheb, 1996, p. 255), thus needing a longitudinal research approach to better grasp leisure meanings.

References

- Artino, R., La Rochelle, S., Dezee, J., & Gehlbach, H. (2014). Developing questionnaires for educational research: AMEE guide No. 87. *Medical Teacher, 36*(6), 463-474.
- Chick, G. (2009). Culture as a variable in the study of leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 31*(3), 305-310.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation, 10*(7), 1-9.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- DeVellis, R.F. (2012). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.
- Gurbuz, B., & Henderson, K. (2013). Exploring the meanings of leisure among Turkish university students. *Croatian Journal of Education, 15*(4), 927-957.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis with readings* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, USA: Prentice Hall.
- Henson, R., & Roberts, J. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*, 393-416.
- Hsiao, Y. (2015). The culturally responsive teacher preparedness scale: An exploratory study. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (Online), 8*(4), 541.
- Isen, A. M. (1999). On the relationship between affect and creative problem solving. In S. Russ (Eds.), *Affect, creative experience, and psychological adjustment* (pp. 3-17). Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Isen, A. M., & Reeve, J. M. (2002). *Positive affect promotes intrinsic motivation*. Manuscript. Cornell University.
- Ishii, K., Kitayama, S., & Uchida, Y. (2014). Voluntary settlement and its consequences on predictors of happiness: The influence of initial cultural context. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 1311. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01311
- Ito, E., & Walker, G. J. (2014). Similarities and differences in leisure conceptualizations between Japan and Canada and between two Japanese leisure-like terms. *Leisure/loisir, 38*(1), 1-19.
- Iwasaki, Y. (2008). Pathways to meaning-making through leisure-like pursuits in global contexts. *Journal of Leisure Research, 40*(2), 231-249.
- Iwasaki, Y. (2016). Contributions of leisure to “meaning-making” and its implications for leisure studies and services. *Annals of Leisure Research, 1*-11. doi:10.1080/11745398.2016.1178591
- Iwasaki, Y., & Mannell, R. C. (2000). Hierarchical dimensions of leisure stress coping. [http://web5s.silverplatter.com.proxy2.lib.umanitoba.ca/webspirs/doLS.ws?ss=Leisure-Sciences+in+SO -_blankLeisure Sciences, 22\(3\), 163-181](http://web5s.silverplatter.com.proxy2.lib.umanitoba.ca/webspirs/doLS.ws?ss=Leisure-Sciences+in+SO_blankLeisure+Sciences,22(3),163-181).
- Kim, J., Kim, M., Han, A., & Chin, S. (2015). The importance of culturally meaningful activity for health benefits among older Korean immigrant living in the United States. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 10*, 27501.
- Kleiber, D. A. Hutchinson, S., & Williams, R. (2002). Leisure as a resource in transcending negative life events: Self-protection, self-restoration, and personal transformation. *Leisure Sciences, 24*(2), 219-235.
- Lim, J. (2016). *A narrative study on the meaning of sports activity in acculturation among Korean immigrants in the United States*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Iwha Women University, Seoul, Korea.
- McCoach, D. B., Gable R. K., & Madura J. P. (2013). *Instrument development in the affective domain school and corporate applications* (3rd ed.). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Porter, H., Iwasaki, Y., & Shank, J. (2010). Conceptualizing meaning-making through leisure experiences. *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure, 33*(2,) 167-194.
- Ragheb, M. G. (1996). The search for meaning in leisure pursuits: Review, conceptualization and a need for psychometric development. *Leisure Studies, 15*(4), 245-258.
- Richards, R. (2007). *Everyday creativity and new views of human nature*. Washington, USA: American Psychology Association.
- Roberts, K. (2011). Is leisure studies “ethnocentric”? If so, does this matter? *World Leisure Journal, 52*(3), 164-176.
- Samdahl, D. M. (2011). Is leisure studies “ethnocentric”? It takes more than optimism: A view from Athens, Georgia, USA. *World Leisure Journal, 52*(3), 185-190.
- Schulz, J., & Watkins, M. (2007). The development of the leisure meanings inventory. *Journal of Leisure Research, 39*(3), 477-497.
- Sharabi, M. (2014). The relative centrality of life domains among Jews and Arabs in Israel: The effect of culture, ethnicity, and demographic variables. *Community, Work & Family, 17*(2), 219-236.
- Spencer, M. B., Harpalani, V., Cassidy, E., Jacobs, C. Y., Donde, S., Goss, T. N., Munoz-Miller, M., Charles, N., & Wilson, S. (2nd ed.) (2006). Understanding vulnerability and resilience from a normative developmental perspective: Implications for racially and ethnically diverse youth. In D. Cicchetti & D. J.

- Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology, Vol. 1: Theory and method* (pp. 627-672). Hoboken, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stodolska, M., Shinew, K., Floyd, M., & Walker, G. (Eds.) (2015). *Race, ethnicity, and leisure: Perspectives on research, theory, and practice*. Human Kinetics.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Walker, G. J. & Wang, X. (2009). The meaning of leisure for Chinese/Canadians. *Leisure Sciences*, 31(1), 1-18. doi:10.1080/02614367.2010.518622
- Watkins, M. (2000). Ways of learning about leisure meanings. *Leisure Sciences*, 22, 93-107.
- Watkins, M. N. (2010). A longitudinal study of changeability in leisure meanings. *Leisure Studies*, 29(4), 361-376. doi:10.1080/02614367.2010.518622
- Wong, P. T. T., Wong, L. C. J., & Scott, C. (2006). Beyond stress and coping: The positive psychology of transformation. In P. T. T. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 1-26). Dallas, USA: Spring Publications.
- Zhang, D., & Long, B. C. (2006). The multicultural perspective on work-related stress: Development of a collective coping scale. In P. T. T. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 555-576). Dallas, USA: S