

## **CHAPTER 2- LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **INTRODUCTION**

A comprehensive search of the literature was conducted to assess the need for this study, and to help determine the attributes associated with marginality.

A review of literature on marginality and other elements of the conceptual model such as race, income, education, occupation and residence is presented. The role of marginality and race in leisure travel and their influence upon the behavior of black and white American leisure travelers was also reviewed. The literature review was also reviewed to further explain the differences in travel behavior of blacks and whites based on the framework of marginality.

Cross cultural studies done to date, employed a social aggregate approach and was used to study ethnic differentiation. Throughout empirical studies by Cheek et al (1976); Washburne (1978); Kelly (1980); Edwards (1981); McMillen (1983); Stamps and Stamps (1985) two conceptual approaches are frequently cited. These approaches are used to explain ethnic differences in travel participation patterns. Approach one, "marginality, suggests that ethnic differences in participation patterns are a function of poverty and/or discrimination," (Washburne 1978). The Marginality viewpoint also suggests that Black Americans do not participate because of poverty and various consequences of socioeconomic discrimination (Richardson and Crompton 1988). This implies that if similar resources and opportunities were available, that Black Americans would develop similar leisure patterns to whites (Uysal and O'Leary, 1989). The Marginality thesis can be maintained if ethnic under participation is a direct result of socioeconomic disadvantages such as poverty and segregated living. However, if social classes are controlled the differences in participation patterns would most likely disappear (Edwards 1981 and Washburne, 1985). Level of income, educational attainment, and occupational prestige are the primary indicators of socio-economic status (Powers, 1982) and are used to operationalize the concept of marginality (Allison, 1988). There is a second explanation not investigated in this dissertation called the "ethnicity thesis that suggests participation patterns are due to subcultural variations in norms, values and expectations of the respective groups" (Edwards 1981; O'Leary and Benjamin 1982; Washburne 1978). This thesis assumes that ethnic groups have a distinct cultural identity and integrity, while at the same time keeping contact and interaction with mainstream society. If the ethnicity perspective is reasonable, differences in participation

patterns of different cultures would persist as a function of real differences in ethnic differences, values and beliefs (Allison 1988).

In discussing the marginality and ethnicity theses, most data support the ethnicity perspective which suggests black Americans and Whites Americans participate in different activities (controlling for social class). This thesis is thought to be the most reasonable explanation for differences among ethnic groups in leisure participation patterns (Allison 1988). Even though no direct evidence is provided, Stamps and Stamps (1985) study concluded that ethnic subcultural patterns are more dominant than social class in determining leisure participation patterns. Results from the study done by Uysal and O'Leary (1989) implies that there are differences between black and whites in terms of the factors that push them to travel and in the activities that may pull them to a particular destination. These differences may be attributable to both marginality and ethnicity (Uysal and O'Leary, 1989) and need further investigation and testing. This study will investigate the marginality thesis.

## **MARGINALITY**

### **A SOCIOECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE ON TRAVEL**

Studies by Bultena and Field (1978, 1980); Burdge (1969); Christensen and Yoesting (1973); Cicchetti (1972); Kelly (1980); Lindsay and Ogle(1972); Merriam and Ammons(1968); Mueller and Gurin (1962); Vaux (1975); Washburne (1976); West (1977); White (1975), and Yu (1981) examined the relationship between socioeconomic variables and recreational participation. Studies by Bultena and Field (1977 and 1981); Burdge (1969); Manning (1986) all seem to imply that recreation participation and socioeconomic status are positively related. A study by Snepenger and Crompton (1984) concludes that socioeconomic variables are better indicators of the extent of participation rather than intent of participation.

According to Lindsay and Ogle (1972) one's socio-economic status is important in the opportunity theory of leisure behavior. The opportunity theory states:

"Participation rates in outdoor recreation vary directly with both the cost and physical availability of outdoor recreational resources to the public. The higher the cost and the further removed outdoor recreation resources are

from low income persons, the less these resources are available to them" (Lindsay and Ogle, 1972).

Lindsay and Ogle concluded that although all socioeconomic groups may have similar preferences for outdoor recreation, all groups do not have equal financial resources to participate in these activities.

Because (as a group) blacks and other minority groups tend to be positioned in a lower socioeconomic status than whites (Moore, 1981; Farley, 1984; Valdiviseo and Davis, 1988) their opportunity for recreation participation may be subject more to socioeconomic constraints rather than their ethnic or cultural identity. Therefore, this comparative analysis of Black and White travelers will further define the role of marginality in their travel behavior.

Limited studies of leisure and recreation activities of Black American groups have investigated and concluded the following: Kronus's (1971) study analyzed two forms of activities of Black Americans. One activity labeled as "frivolous activities" which included drinking, playing cards and frequenting nightclubs and parties. The other form of activities was "family centered and self-improving" which included formal and informal activities such as cultural events and listening to music. In this study only 25 percent of the middle class participated in "frivolous activities" and the majority were involved in family centered activities.

In 1972, Craig studied suburban residents of a southern city. This study indicated that Black Americans tended to participate in inexpensive leisure due to a lack of discretionary income. In 1974, Willie found that Black Americans of all social class backgrounds had limited leisure time because of their work schedules. Washbourne (1978) argued that Black Americans have limited access to leisure due to poverty and discrimination. Dwyer and Hutchinson's (1988) study indicates a preference among Black Americans for urban activities in developed settings.

To analyze differences between Black and White American leisure and recreational activities, a study of social (church and political) participation in voluntary organizations was done by Klobus-Edwards, Edwards and Klemmack (1978); Hyman and Wright (1971); London (1975); Wright and Hyman (1958). Controlling for

socioeconomic status, they found that Black Americans participated in voluntary organizations at a greater rate than whites. This participation seemed to be due to compensation or need to meet social and psychological needs for association which are not met by participation in the dominant society.

## **TRAVEL BEHAVIOR**

Literature on general tourist motivation and behavior indicates the concept of two-dimensional forces as factors of tourist motivation. These involve the theory that people travel because they are pushed into making a decision by internal forces and pulled by external forces of the destination attributes.

Differences found between whites and non-whites may be due to many variables. However, culture is believed to be the most dominate variable that influences the decision making process and determines an individual's wants and overall behavior.

Black Americans as well as other racial groups have distinct attitudes and styles which greatly influence their travel behavior. As in the majority group, it is important to understand how behavior affects travel. Although all black Americans belong to the same subculture, they are not an homogeneous group as it relates to their travel behavior.

Black Americans, for the most part, are no longer uncomfortable with working with whites, however, the idea of being on vacation among white strangers can make the traveling experience disquieting. While the civil rights laws of the 1960's banned segregation, prejudice still exists and fears of Jim Crow practices still exists further emphasizing the need and desire for Black Americans to be among their own people in a non-working environment. When people are on vacation, they want to be in the most relaxed and stress free state possible. To decrease anxiety, travelers associate with those of "cultural kin". This is not unique to Black Americans. Whites and other ethnic groups go to places they have always gone and are comfortable and stress free.

The present knowledge of travel behavior patterns of Black American consumers is very limited. Because previous research by Stamps and Stamps (1985) and others concluded that social class and race were inconclusive predictors in explaining leisure participation, further research is needed to define the role of and relationship between race and marginality as it relates the travel behavior of Black and White American travelers.

The consumer market consist of all the individuals and households that purchase products and or services for personal consumption. The success of the marketing strategy is dependent upon the decision making process and behavior of the consumer. Therefore it is important to investigate the many factors which influence consumer travel behavior. The growing Black American travel market segment presents a challenge to the U.S. travel industry. In marketing a destination, it is essential to understand what motivates individuals to purchase a particular product and what makes them comfortable with and attracted to that destination, (Yuan and McDonald 1990)

## **MARGINALITY AND RACE**

Race is an important variable in studying travel behavior. Although as of the 1990 United States Census, 12% of the population, (approximately 30 million blacks),existed, a review of literature reveals that a focus on Black Americans and their travel behavior preferences and choices during leisure travel is lacking.

Past social studies of racial discrimination and prejudice have discussed topics such as employment, education and housing but all nearly neglect to analyze the effects of racial discrimination on travel/tourism behavior and attitudes of blacks (Bobo,1987). “The racial background of leisure participants appear to have an important effect on their leisure participation” (Floyd,1991). Edwards,1981, agrees in that he found that racial background has a significant effect on recreational behavior.

Black Americans have been associated with discrimination and prejudice for years (Jaynes and Williams,1989). Therefore, it would stand to reason that the results of the discrimination would result in black tourism preferences, attitudes, and behaviors that are different from White Americans(Philipp,1994). These differences in leisure travel behavior between Black and White Americans may also be due to differences in levels of socioeconomic factors such as lower income, education, occupation and residence leading to a marginal status.

A general literature review of articles by Mueller and Gurin, 1962; Washburne, 1978; Klobus-Edwards, 1981; Stamps and Stamps, 1985; Yancey and Snell, 1976; and Dwyer and Hutchinson, 1990 states that Black and White Americans participate in different forms of leisure activities, with African Americans participating in many of these activities at lower levels than White Americans(Floyd, McGuire, Shinew and Noe, 1994). According to Washburne, 1978 low levels of income, education and occupation coupled with past discrimination negatively affects the recreational “leisure” activity or

“participation” of minority races. The parallel to this is that as members of minority groups’ socioeconomic status rise to those of the White population, their participation differences will disappear (Floyd, 1991).

Other earlier empirical research resulted in conflicting findings on differences in black and white leisure participation. In 1976 Cheek, Field and Burdge found a few significant differences between blacks and whites when they were matched on residential pattern and household income. In 1978, Washburne found significant differences between blacks and whites in wildland recreation participation patterns. Stamps and Stamps, 1985 study implied that participation in leisure activities is explained to a limited degree by race and social class.

Race seems to be more important than class in determining leisure and travel participation especially among the middle class (Stamps and Stamps 1985). Current studies on travel and tourism behavior reveal that travelers are not homogeneous groups and that travel behavior is affected by several factors which overlap and operate on a continuum.

The present knowledge of the travel behavior patterns of black American consumers is very limited. Further research is needed to define the role of and relationship between race and marginality as it relates the travel behavior of black and white American travelers. Results from the study done by Uysal and O’Leary (1989) implies that there “are enough differences between the two groups they researched, in terms of the factors that push or motivate people to travel and in the activities that may pull the tourist to an area.” These differences may be attributable to both marginality and ethnicity.

## **MARGINALITY AND INCOME**

The concept of economic marginality refers to “the extent to which individuals occupy positions which are integrated with the national economy.” (Oropesa, 1986). This concept is dynamic and refers to a changing economic position as a result of recessions, depressions and employment patterns.

Increased occupational requirements and qualifications continue to result in the unemployment and underemployment of Black Americans. This pattern places blacks in an ongoing marginal, poverty stricken position.

Marginalization and real (objective) poverty have many elements in common and sometimes may be used interchangeably.

As it relates to economics, there are two types of marginalization. objective and subjective. Both result in poverty or lack of sufficient income. Objective marginalization

results from inadequate income to meet the basic needs or necessities of life. Subjective marginalization refers to self-perceived deprivation. This form of marginalization leads to low self-esteem and other psychological problems therefore making it hard to reenter mainstream society which results in the individual becoming even more marginalized. Blumberg, 1980; and Thomas, 1986 suggests that reoccurring recessions in society which produce structural unemployment or unemployment as a result of structures in society may contribute to the redistribution of income.

Economic marginalization and racial inequalities continue to be reflected in the income disparities between the races and social levels which results in less integration with the national economy.

## **MARGINALITY AND EDUCATION**

As a result of income disparities in society, interracial politics and social strata, Sinclair and Ghory, 1987 reveals that inaccessibility and discrimination can affect the education of any student in spite of economic background, race, sex and family structure.

Education has long been viewed as a means of achieving economic power and upward social mobility. More specifically, in the United States education is considered more economic-political and is a result of social stratification and parallels economic marginality (Yeakey and Bennett, 1990).

As it relates to black students' a sense of mattering and survival in predominately white schools, Gossett, et al, 1996, found that many rules and regulations on white campuses are not sensitive to black students. As a result blacks are left on the periphery, discriminated against and not included. This lack of inclusion denies empowerment to achieve material well being through the process of education, restricting upward social mobility and denying movement from the poor or lower class.

## **MARGINALITY AND OCCUPATION**

The racial composition of occupation, spatial location, educational level of the races, and industrial structure significantly effect the difference in occupational opportunities of blacks and whites (Semyonov and Scott, 1983).

Past research on race and occupation done by Turner, 1951; Blalock, 1956, 1957; Breton and Glenn, 1965; Jiobu and Marchall, 1971; Martin and Poston, 1972; Frisbie and Neidert, 1977; Wilcox and Roob, 1978; and LaGory and Magnani, 1979 focused on the connection between the size of the minority populations and their occupational opportunities. Turner 1951; Martin and Poston, 1972; Frisbie and Neidert, 1977; and

Collins, 1989 examined whether the employment gains of blacks was a true indicator of equal employment opportunities and closes the gap between them. Although employment barriers seem to have been removed to allow more blacks the opportunity of upward mobility into managerial and higher paying professional positions, these rites of mobility might have been racially delineated (Collins, 1989). The advancement that blacks make seem to be in response to affirmative action policies and civil rights demands. This was unfortunate in that these racially delineated positions became obsolete and lost their value after the socially intense environment of the 1960's (Collins, 1989). The placement into these positions due to affirmative action policies made blacks visible at the time of employment. However, due to the change of focus in the society from enforcing affirmative action policies, and limited management, dependence upon failed and unfair policy enforcement, blacks were put into economically vulnerable positions. Evans, 1992 contends that because of the opportunities made available to the middle class, blacks have had a greater amount of social mobility due to the increased amount of white collar occupations available.

On the contrary, according to Marable, 1982, black men are underrepresented in the higher paying white collar jobs but remain supporters of labor unions which were to the advantage of black workers.

According to the analysis of 1960 and 1970 U.S. Census samples, black workers made employment gains in blue and white collar occupations in several sectors of the economy (Hayward and Coverman, 1987). The structural growth of the 1960's has substantial benefits for employment opportunities of blacks (Hayward and Coverman, 1987). LaGory and Magnani, 1979 research supported the idea that occupational opportunities of the subordinate (minority) population declines as their proportion (size) in the population increases.

The proposal that race linked occupational opportunities of minority populations decline as their proportion in the population increases have two theoretical explanations.

One view focuses on the social organization of occupational labor markets. Job positions or organizations are split across racial lines. Different ethnic minority groups are channeled to lower-status occupations. On the other hand, members of the majority groups are channeled into higher-status positions or occupations (Bonachich, 1972, 1976;



Bech et al., 1978). Although there is a large number of the minority group members available for equal employment, this same minority group represents a bigger supply of cheap labor (unequal employment) to the workforce, especially the lower status occupations. As a result, blacks are disproportionately represented in the lower-status blue-collar service positions (Brown and Fuguitt, 1992; Spilerman and Miller, 1977).

The second explanation is socio-psychological. This view is that as an increase in the minority population increases, this presents a greater threat to whites as well as greater competition over jobs. As a result, whites seem to feel the need and motivation to discriminate against minorities (Allport, 1954; Williams, 1947; Blalock, 1957).

Both of these views agree that the increase in minorities results in a greater difference in occupations to be related to characteristics in communities such as the educational level of the races, industrial structure, spatial location, and percent of black residents. All of these were found to be important determinants of differences in occupational status (Cutright, 1965; Glenn, 1964, 1966; Spilerman, 1969).

As it relates to leisure and occupations, the study done by Cosper and Hughers, 1978 concludes that occupations differ in the extent to which non-work time is spent with coworkers. They hypothesized that occupational properties influences patterns of leisure behavior of those in their study. In reviewing social class and consumption of cultural activities or participation a greater difference was evident among nonmanual groups than among the working class (Semkus and Peterman, 1990). Meier and Hans' 1990 study results showed that there is a strong relationship between leisure activities and occupational class position.

## **MARGINALITY AND RESIDENCE**

The racial composition of a community is determined by the individual characteristics such as cultural assimilation, socio-economic status, racial or ethnic group identification (or subjective social class), and characteristics of the region or area (Logan, Alba, and Leung, 1996). The composition of communities have drastically changed. "One of the most common demographic changes in U.S. communities is the replacement of an existing white population by ethnic minority groups." (Phelan, Thomas, Schnieder, and Mark, 1996).

Several variables affect the racial composition of suburbs or communities in which a person lives. These variables include: income, occupation, education, language, nativity, and home ownership (Logan, Alba and Leung, 1996).

According to Snipp, 1996, "racial and ethnic groups occupy specific or unique geographic and social places in American society." He further states there are "Venues of

Race.” African Americans, American Indians, and Latinos live in culturally identifiable communities (Snipp, 1996). Although each community is uniquely identified by specific characteristics of each race, they all have some things in common.

The two main characteristics common among all groups are: (1) they are isolated from mainstream society or nearby white neighbors, and (2) they are very, poor (Snipp, 1996).

To further understand residential patterns and marginality, a 1993 study by Alba and Logan employed two complimentary theoretical models - spatial assimilation and place stratification.

Spatial assimilation views how groups are spatially distributed and looks at this distribution as a reflection of the level of assimilation. Mobility in residential location begins at acculturation and social movement of individuals. This process of mobility is the middle step moving towards structural assimilation and is the process of becoming acculturated to the majority (white) group. To make this move, minorities (blacks, Hispanics, Asians) establish themselves in the labor market and make efforts to advance ahead of less successful members of their individual racial group and use their socio-economic and assimilation advances to take advantage of individual opportunities. These opportunities come by purchasing homes in places with “perceived” greater advantages and amenities. This process disperses or divides minority group members thereby increasing contact with the majority (white) population and decreases desegregation. Younger blacks who have higher prestige occupations, higher education level, more money and fewer children, upwardly mobile and enjoy an overall higher socio-economic status, are more likely to live near whites (Fiegelman and Gorman, 1990). The spatial assimilation model expresses that as income is increased, individuals acculturate thereby increasing social interaction with whites and increase the likelihood of achieving residence in “advantage” (white) neighborhoods increases.

The Place Stratification theory addresses the differences in hierarchy within communities and its reflection in the mapping or location of these groups. This means that according to this stratification theory, racial and ethnic minorities are sorted or placed according to their group’s standing (relative) in society. In the case of blacks, the concentration of African American communities (especially in the South) is by design. The rural communities were socially and economically isolated because of the implementation of Jim Crow(segregation) laws and reconstruction. As a result, these communities are among the poorest in the world, Snipp, 1996, and are in sharp contrast to middle class blacks and affluent whites (Dell and Williams, 1992). To further facilitate place stratification, reconstructive zoning and dual housing was put into practice. Dual

housing practices (racial stratification model) involved Realtors showing black and white prospective home buyers houses in different neighborhoods. This also included financial institutions discriminating against blacks and other minorities by being extra cautious in granting mortgages to these minority buyers. These obstacles made it hard for minorities to enter some (white) communities and limited the ability of socially mobile members of minority groups to live in the same community as comparable whites.

In spatial assimilation the location of groups can be described by individual level variables such as income, education, and English-language ability. In place stratification, group membership is taken into account in analyzing, locational processes. Place stratification implies that members of the same group are not able to fully connect socio-economic and assimilation gains into actual residence in white communities. The levels of variables such as income, education, and English-language ability achievements are individualized and may differ substantially across groups. As blacks move into higher income and occupational levels, they increasingly move into predominately white residential areas(Stamps and Stamps,1985).

In 1981 Edwards found that social class may explain the variations in Black and White American leisure and recreation, and determine residential patterns. Edwards also concluded that Black Americans living in predominately white neighborhoods had the same activities as white residents.

## **CHAPTER SUMMARY**

The literature review focuses on seven areas: (1) marginality, (2) travel behavior (3) marginality and race, (4) marginality and income, (5) marginality and education, (6) marginality and occupation, and (7) marginality and residence. It appears from the review of the literature, that more information is needed to understand the marginality framework and how it affects the travel behavior of black and white travelers.